

哲學英文

英文翻譯為中文 (各 25 分)

1. ...What is the relation between myself and the instrument that I make use of – i.e., my body? Obviously I do not restrict myself to *making use of* my body. There is a sense in which I *am* my body, whatever that may mean. Note that communication by signs or symbols can only be effected on the basis of sensation and that sensation can in no way be compared with a message. Beings who did not feel one another, that is to say, did not grasp one another as affected, could not communicate in that way...

For an inquiry such as the one I am tackling here, it is essential to disentangle the exact meaning of the ambiguous formula; "I am my body". It can be seen straight away that *my* body is only *mine* inasmuch as, however, confusedly, it is felt. The radical abolition of coenesthesia, supposing it were possible, would mean the destruction of my body insofar as it is mine. If I am my body this is insofar as I am a being that feels. It seems to me that we can be even more exact and say that I am my body *first of all*, that is to say before my attention can be fixed on any other object whatsoever. Thus the body would benefit from what I may be allowed to call an absolute priority.

(Gabriel Marcel, *Metaphysical Journal*, tr. Bernard Wall)

2. War or peace, increasing alienation or reconciliation, management of nature or resacralization of nature, transgenic pigs or deep ecological identification with wild nature: in the face of the global ecological crisis the problem of nature and spirit poses itself with great urgency. The Promethean project of modernity of a total subjugation of the earth by the human spirit has carried humankind to the brink of the abyss: the destruction of its natural environment.

At the moment of ultimate triumph and greatest power, the human spirit becomes painfully aware of our continuing dependency on nature. Or is it only a continuing attachment, a nostalgic longing for the motherly womb; an anxious hesitation regarding the resolute step into the absolute freedom of the world-city, in which the spirit is alone with itself surrounded only by technical, i.e., spiritual artifacts? But is this spirit in reality not a monster consisting of steel and iron, concrete and plastics and of human bodies, an insatiable dragon which, driven by electronic news, by an unending flood of information and pictures, but above all by a greed for money and power, poisons, maltreats,

and finally devours our mother Earth?

(Ulrich Melle, "Nature and Spirit", )

將以下英文翻譯為中文，並加以申論（50分）

3. There is also a deeper desire which can arise from the experience of embodiment relations. It is the doubled desire that, on one side, is a wish for *total transparency*, total embodiment, for the technology to truly "become me." Were this possible, it would be equivalent to there being no technology, for total transparency would be my body and senses; I desire the face-to-face that I would experience without the technology. But that is only one side of the desire. The other side is the desire to have the power, the transformation that the technology makes available. Only by using the technology is my bodily power enhanced and magnified by speed, through distance, or by any of the other ways in which technologies change my capacities. These capacities are always *different* from my naked capacities.

The desire is, at best, contradictory. I want the transformation that the technology allows, but I want it in such a way that I am basically unaware of its presence. I want it in such a way that it becomes me. Such a desire both secretly *rejects* what technologies are and overlooks the transformational effects which are necessarily tied to human-technology relations. This illusory desire belongs equally to pro- and anti-technology interpretations of technology.

(Don Ihde, *Technology and the Lifeworld : From Garden to Earth*)

哲學基本問題：

1. 既然當今科技的快速發展看起來已使科學自哲學的園地中一勞永逸地分離開來，當前舉足輕重的科際整合與作為科學之母的哲學又有何干係？不論你對此論點持正面或消極的看法，請你從任何一種哲學的學說中加以申論之。(20分)
2. 理性、非理性與反理性的分辨何在？哲學該如何去面對這個分辨？或是，倒過來說，如何用這個分辨來看待哲學？並請論述這兩個問法，其不同的意義何在？(30分)
3. 面對當今資本主義社會的審美「時尚」現象，不禁讓人在迷惑中反思，人類的審美感受條件與其自我欲望究竟有什麼關聯？美學史的發展如何呈現了對這個問題的不同回應？請試著從至少兩種或兩種以上的美學觀點，來回答上面這個問題。同時請說明你所贊成的立場，申論你的理由。(20分)
4. 你認為人與人之間，有任何相互體會、同情共感或相互理解的可能嗎？如果有的話，那麼這種相互體會、同情共感或相互理解的條件是什麼？如果人與人之間沒有任何相互體會、同情共感或相互理解的可能，請你解釋人與人之間的情感、社會和知識的關係，其本質是什麼？試以哲學理論申論之。(30分)