

# 國立中山大學 95 學年度碩士班招生考試試題

科目：哲學基本問題【哲學所碩士班】

共 / 頁 第 / 頁

問答申論題(共兩題，每題 50 分)

一、倫理學同時具備應然的要求與實然的條件，從知識論的觀點來看，這是怎麼可能的？若照應然的要求，實然的條件會被壓抑，這時候，還有倫理實踐的空間嗎？若照實然的條件，應然的要求會遙不可及，這時候，倫理價值難道不會錯亂嗎？當此之際，為何倫理知識是可能的？請用任何一種倫理主張加以申論之。並注意其知識型的特質，如何讓它在不同於理論知識之餘，仍能達成客觀知識的目的？（50 分）

二、形象(figure)與話語(discourse)的差異，從存有學上來看，屬於非意義與意義之間的差異，例如我們一方面對這個世界有各種身體感知與情緒，另一方面使用語言表述這個世界的意義與理性結構；從美學角度來看，形象是仍然不可被話語吸收和理性表述所同化的東西，例如我們可以對一篇散文的意義與概念結構進行解釋，但其核心靜默處，仍然留下無法言傳的詩的成份。這樣說來，形象感覺與表述話語雖是彼此糾纏不清的兩種對立性的存有活動，但卻無法彼此消解其存有地位。相形之下，形上思考運用話語論述不斷想要脫離形象世界，審美判斷則依隨形象感受浸淫於自身之悅樂與不爽之中；前者執著於意義的結構中思考，後者堅持在感覺的起伏中尋求滿足。現在，(1)請你運用任何現代或當代的哲學路徑或任何一位現當代哲學家的相關思考，闡述當代存有學與美學如何面對兩者間這種既差異又交纏的關係，不論是運用語言思考時可能潛藏或引導的欲望或形象作用，或者是另一方面感覺感受本身所可能潛藏或引發的意義邏輯；(25%)(2)應用你上面的闡述內容，舉出一個語言存有的特定例子(如某種理論或意識型態)以及一個審美感受的特定例子(如某位畫家的畫作)，並展示你所採取的理論如何分析這兩個例子，又為什麼你的闡述會比傳統或其他的某些理論說明有效。(25%)

**TRANSLATE AND COMMENTATE THIS TEXT .:**

My embodying organism is such by virtue of its continuous functioning as the orientational locus of the sensorium, which is inseparably bound up with the motorium as co-presented in all effectual bodily ventures and adventures, in strict correlativity with the environing world of resistant things. Still, an ambiguity in the crucial phenomenon of "feeling" remains. If I reflect more carefully on even the simplest of bodily effectuating, or being bodily affected -- i.e., on the moratorium itself -- something singularly elusive begins to become more salient.(30 分)

--R. M. Zaner, *The Context of Self*, p. 41.

...ideology is not simply a 'false consciousness', an illusory representation of reality; it is, rather, this reality itself which is already to be conceived as 'ideological' -- 'ideological' is a social reality whose very existence implies that the individuals 'do not know what they are doing'. 'Ideological' is not the 'false consciousness' of a (social) being but this being itself in so far as it is supported by 'false consciousness'.(20 分)

--S. Zizek, ed., *Mapping Ideology*, p. 305

**TRANSLATE AND COMMENTATE THIS TEXT :**

But is it inevitable that we should know of no other function for speech than that of commentary? *Commentary* questions discourse as to what it says and intended to say; it tries to uncover that deeper meaning of speech that enables it to achieve an identity with itself, supposedly nearer to its essential truth: in other words, in stating what has been said, one has to re-state what has never been said. In this activity known as commentary which tries to transmit an old, unyielding discourse seemingly silent to itself, into another, more prolix discourse that is both more archaic and more contemporary – is concealed a strange attitude towards language: to comment is to admit by definition an excess of the signified over the signifier; a necessary, unformulated remainder of thought that language has left in the shade – a remainder that is the very essence of that thought, driven outside its secret – but to comment also presupposes that this unspoken element slumbers within speech, and that, by a super-abundance proper to the signifier, one may, in questioning it, give voice to a content that was not explicitly signified. By opening up the possibility of commentary, this double plethora dooms us to an endless task that nothing can limit: there is always a certain amount of signified remaining that must be allowed to speak, while the signifier is always offered to us in an abundance that questions us, in spite of ourselves, as to what it 'means'. Signifier and signified thus assume a substantial autonomy that accords the treasure of a virtual signification to each of them separately; one may even exist without the other, and begin to speak of itself: commentary resides in that supposed space. But at the same time, it invents a complex link between them, a whole tangled web that concerns the poetic values of expression: the signifier is not supposed to 'translate' without concealing, without leaving the signified with an inexhaustible reserve; the signified is revealed only in the visible, heavy world of a signifier that is itself burdened with a meaning that it cannot control. (50分)

- Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic*, 1975, XVI-XVII