

淡江大學 101 學年度博士班招生考試試題

17-1

系別：英文學系 A 組

科目：文學理論

考試日期：5 月 26 日 第 2 節

本試題共 2 大題， 2 頁

Choose two out of the following questions to answer. Your answers should demonstrate your understanding of the theoretical discourses as well as your reflections upon them. 50 points each.

1. In the preface of *Structuralist Poetics*, Jonathan Culler makes the following statement:

The type of literary study which structuralism helps one to envisage would not be primarily interpretive; it would not offer a method which, when applied to literary works, produced new and hitherto unexpected meanings. Rather than a criticism which discovers or assigns meanings, it would be a poetics which strives to define the conditions of meaning. Granting new attention to the activity of reading, it would attempt to specify how we go about making sense of texts, what are the interpretive operations on which literature itself, as an institution, is based. Just as the speaker of a language has assimilated a complex grammar which enables him to read a series of sounds or letters as a sentence with a meaning, so the reader of literature has acquired, through his encounters with literary works, implicit mastery of various semiotic conventions which enable him to read series of sentences as poems or novels endowed with shape and meaning. The study of literature, as opposed to the perusal and discussion of individual works, would become an attempt to understand the conventions which make literature possible.

How would you understand Culler's statement? What points does he draw in this short passage? Do you agree/ disagree with him? Why? Is the term "structuralism" employed in this statement different from the one that is generally understood? Discuss your understanding and your reflections upon "structuralism" along with Culler's statement.

2. When Deleuze talks about literature and life, he maintains that literature is delirium, which forces language out of its usual furrows, creating "a foreign language." He then claims that a foreign language "cannot be hollowed out in one language without language as a whole in turn being toppled or pushed to a limit, to an outside or reverse side that consists of Visions and Auditions that no longer belong to any language. These visions . . . are not interruptions of the process but breaks that form part of it, like an eternity that can only be revealed in a becoming, or a landscape that only appears in movement. They are not outside language, but the outside of language." It is perhaps not unusual to see contemporary thinkers pay special attention to the notion of "foreignness" or "other", such as the face of the Other in Levinas, the ear of the Other in Derrida, Lacanian notion of Other, woman as an other, the cultural other, Blanchot's elaborations on the Other and the Outside, and Foucault's thinking from outside. Please choose one specific notion concerning "other" or "outside" and carefully demonstrate your

本
試
題
雙
面
印
刷

背面尚有試題

淡江大學 101 學年度博士班招生考試試題

17-2

系別：英文學系 A 組

科目：文學理論

考試日期：5 月 26 日 第 2 節

本試題共 1 大題， 2 頁

understanding of that concept, and then further elaborate how that notion can help us better understand "literature."

3. Paul de Man's groundbreaking essay "The Resistance to Theory" was intended to respond the hostility directed at literary theory in the name of ethical and aesthetic values in contemporary academia. De Man draws the conclusion that "nothing can overcome the resistance to theory since theory is itself this resistance. . . . Yet literary theory is not in danger of going under; it cannot help but flourish, and the more it is resisted, the more it flourishes, since the language it speaks is the language of self-resistance. What remains impossible to decide is whether this flourishing is a triumph or a fall."

Despite the fact that de Man's responses aim at the academia in the 60s - 70s, the tension between literary theory and literature as such remains nowadays and the relationship between the two is never clearly defined. In your opinion, will literary theory continue to flourish, as de Man asserts? Or, will literary theory be secondary to literature as such in one way or another? Discuss how you think about the tension between literary theory and literature as such, and talk about how you comprehend the "future" of literary theory.