

Please read carefully the following passages:

“...Readers who are reading literature closely to exercise the imagination to play the double bind are...interested in form rather than the author. The death of the (authority of the) author (in establishing contextual correctness as literary criticism) is the birth of the reader (concentrating on the practices of reading) – a good formula from the 1960s that remains useful today, in sparer times. We would use the formula as a double bind, rather than understand it as a turf battle.” [Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Introduction” to *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization* (Harvard, 2012), p. 12]

“Certain interpreters focus their work on such technical issues – metrical and prosodic studies, for instance, or analytic and descriptive bibliography – that they often deliberately avoid engaging their foundational interpretive frames of reference and agencies. Interpretation always negotiates a compromise between the demands of procedural rigor and the call for critical reflection. These kinds of technical studies remind us that an engineer and a theologian live and work inside even the most nuanced reflexive interpreter – Roland Barthes, say, or Umberto Eco. There is a foul rag and bone shop of the brain too, after all. To the degree that an interpretive procedure makes an ideological engagement with its subject, to that degree it will be forced to study the codependent pair of historical determinants (production history and reception history) and to reflect critically upon its own place within those histories.” [Jerome McGann, *A New Republic of Letters: Memory and Scholarship in the Age of Digital Humanities* (Harvard, 2015), p. 82]

In the above passage, Spivak borrows Roland Barthes’ famous, liberatory announcement of the birth of the reader out of the death of the author (1967), posing it as a “double bind” (an aporetic or contradictory double commitment – to universal *and* particular, to planetary *and* local, or here to the text and its historical context on the one hand, *and* to the living concerns and uses of the reader and the present on the other) which we must literally “play out” in the imaginative but disciplined engagement of the text in close reading (borrowed, via Spivak’s teacher Paul de Man, from those fusty old New Critics). In this programmatic formula, she can be seen to approach the hermeneutic imperative expressed by a very different critic indeed, Jerome McGann, in his discussion of the contemporary importance of philology (the historical tradition of close reading, as it were, albeit an historicist rather than aestheticist one) with its reference to the late Yeats’s acknowledgement of the materiality of inspiration. In any case, both critics are very attentive to the complex and countervailing responsibilities of reading (towards criticism or teaching, as more generally towards understanding).

見背面

題號： 11

國立臺灣大學 105 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

科目：專業英文(A)：英文作文

節次： 3

題號： 11

共 2 頁之第 2 頁

Whatever your particular interests are in literary (or cultural) studies, and whatever your theoretical and methodological inclinations may (turn out to) be, you will have to have principled positions on a range of issues raised separately by Spivak and McGann here. In a brief response essay, please discuss what you think, at this point in your studies, about these concerns.

What are the issues here? (Pay careful attention to the terms employed by Spivak and McGann.) What is the point of literary (or cultural) studies? [So, what are you coming to graduate school, potentially in this department, *to do*?] What is the *object* of study or critique? Who are *you* (for the purposes of such an inquiry) and why does this matter?

試題隨卷繳回