

所別：英美語文學系碩士班 科目：批判閱讀

Choose **ONLY ONE** of the following two topics and write a coherent essay. You do not need to answer all the questions. Be as detailed as you can, however, in fleshing out your argument and reading. (100%)

1. The following passage is quoted from Patricia Fumerton's Introduction to *Renaissance Culture and the Everyday* (1999). Bracketed notes are added. According to Fumerton, how do the cookbooks she has mentioned "refine" the common practice of food preparation? Who were the readers of those cookbooks? Why did cookery and eating matter to them? How might such cookery improve the taste and flavor of the meat and change its status? What did taste and flavor have to do with the status of the consumer? What do you think of the distinctions Fumerton makes between modern and Renaissance approaches to eating and cooking?

When preparing a pig for consumption in the Renaissance, it was common practice to stick a knife in its side and watch it hurl itself around in agony until it finally collapsed through sheer exhaustion and loss of blood. Alternatively, an Elizabethan manual suggests, with almost tender consideration, you could "gently bait him with muzzled dogs." . . . The common idea behind these diverse preparatory torments, as with the baiting of bulls and boars before eating them, was to render the flesh more tender and tempting. Whereas moderns whack their meat when it is dead and anonymous (cut into steaks and laid out on a kitchen cutting board), the Renaissance pounded its meat when it was alive and identifiable as a feeling creature.

The torture of animals in the service of gustatory gratification was so much a part of everyday life in the early modern period that it found its way into household cookbooks, which proliferated in England in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. . . . Pig was dressed, or more accurately "dressed up" (pig was considered lower-class meat) as in its forced translation into higher fare in Vincent La Chapelle's recipe "To make a Pig taste like a wild Boar": "Take a living Pig, and let him swallow the following Drink, viz. boil in a Stew-pan a little Water and Vinegar with some Rosemary, Thyme, sweet Basil, Organy, Mirlirot, Bay-leaves, Sage, and Marjoram. This being boiled and then cold, make the Pig swallow it, and whip him to Death. . . ."

Such torturous cookery instructions reached fullest cultivation in the following recipe twice told by John Wecker, in his *Secrets of Nature* (published in Latin, 1582; translated into English by R. Read in 1660):

"To roast a Goose alive"

A Goose, or Duck, or some lively Creature, (but the Goose is best) must be pulled all clean off her Feathers, only the head and neck must be spared. Then make a fire round about her, not too close to her, that the smoke do not choke her, and that the fire may not burn her too soon: not too far off, that she may not escape free; within the circle of the fire let there be set small cups and pots full of water, wherein Salt and Honey are mingled, and let there be set also Chargers [large, flat dishes] full of sodden [boiled or steeped] Apples, cut into small pieces in the dish. The Goose must be all Larded and basted over, to make her the more fit to be eaten, and may roast the better, put then fire about her, do not make too much haste, when as you see her begin to Roast; for by walking about, and flying here and there, being cooped in by the fire that stops her way out, the unwearied Goose is kept in by drinking of the water, which cools her heart and all her body, and the Apples make her dung, cleanse and empty her. When she grows scalding hot, her inward parts roast also, then wet with a Sponge her head and heart continually; and when you see her giddy with running, and begin to stumble, her heart wants moisture: she is Roasted, take her up, and set her upon the Table to your Guests, and as you cut her up she will cry continually, that she will be almost all eaten before she be dead.

In his second telling of this recipe, Wecker adds the appreciation, "it is very pleasant to behold." The mighty pleasure felt in watching the cooked goose suffer, which is personalized by calling the goose "she" and captured in loving detail (recalling the "gentle" baiting of the pig), finds final satisfaction in hearing her cry out in pain as she is sliced open. . . . Our sense of excess may be explained by the writer's efforts to make a common practice more "refined" and thus exciting for his readers (who were mostly of the aspiring middle class). But the effect is only different in degree. In all such cases of animal torment, the torture is the tasty seasoning that flavors the otherwise plain meat. It adds spice to the culinary experience, a mouth-salivating flavoring which — unlike the costly East Indies spices — was economically available to all classes. Indeed, despite La Chapelle's

注意：背面有試題

## 所別：英美語文學系碩士班 科目：批判閱讀

violent efforts to turn the lowly pig into high meat (boar) befitting, as the title-page to his cookbook claims, "the Tables of Princes, Ambassadors, Noblemen, and Magistrates," he also has more common aims in mind: "As also," the title-page continues, "The least Expensive Methods of providing for private Families." Making or supervising such affordable cookery would be the woman of the house, who is often specifically addressed in cookbook title-pages, prefaces, and recipes of the period. Whereas moderns might add A-I [commercial barbeque source] to their steak, the Renaissance populace—and preeminently its housewives—found assorted tasty ways to torture the steer [animal raised for meat].

2. The following two passages are quoted from Lu Hsiu-lien, *These Three Women* (呂秀蓮, 《這三個女人》, 1985). Each is followed by a tentative translation. Discuss the exchange relation between money and female sexuality. Note the language of money and wealth in both passages. What is wrong with money and wealth? How does Liu evaluate female sexuality and chastity? How is the sexual transaction fraught with danger and risk for women? What constitutes an equitable or fair exchange for women and what should be done to ensure such an exchange? Note too the language and images of bonds and bondage in both passages. How are those bonds related to sex and money? Are there inconsistencies in Liu's conception of the bondage imposed from without? If there are, can they be reconciled? Justify your answers.

我以為貞操不應限於兩性的性關係，它是每個人對自己的尊嚴的維護，與對生活原則的堅持。現代化的貞操觀念，應從禮教的桎梏提昇為人性的修鍊，從被動的束縛轉為主動的操守，更從女性片面的倫理擴充為兩性全面的道德誠律。故事主角藍玉青原為富家千金，由於一場大火而家破人亡，為償父債並為養母弟，她淪為紅牌舞女，在面對豪門巨賈的銀彈攻勢下，她怎樣把持住自己？因為她背後有一位剛毅不俗的男孩在從旁激勵—女性在傳統的桎梏中掙扎解脫時，男士們，請擺出你們的紳士風度來助她一臂之力！

I think chastity should not be restricted to the relations between the two sexes. It is the mainstay of each person's self-respect as well as each person's adherence to life's principles. A modern notion of chastity ought to liberate it from the strictures of Classic Rites and Rituals, and elevate it to the level of the self-cultivation of humanity. It ought to transform it from passive restriction into active virtue. It should especially be expanded from a partial female ethics to a universal moral interdiction for the two sexes. Lan Yuqing, the heroine of the story, was the daughter of a wealthy family. A great fire killed [the father] and destroyed the family. To pay off her father's debts and support her mother and younger brother, she falls into a disreputable profession by working as a hostess in a dance hall. Coming face to face with the assaults of silver bullets launched by millionaires and business magnates, how does she protect herself? Because she is backed up and encouraged by an upright and unusual young man. Gentlemen, please show your manners by lending your assistance to women while they are struggling to free themselves from the shackles of tradition.

世上有多少繾綣的情話能夠當真的？有多少戀人的誓言經得起考驗？唯其答案常是否定的，老祖宗們才設立一種叫「婚姻」的制度，使原本一對不易天長地久的男女牢繫在一起，婚姻制度之於兩性愛情，猶如金箍咒之於孫悟空，前者是用來約束後者的，若無前者，孫悟空將大鬧天庭，而愛情的販子尤將肆虐純真的心靈—沒有婚姻作屏障的雲雨之歡，到頭來吃虧的往往是女性，有時甚至險遭滅頂。

In this world, how many of the romantic words spoken for wooing can be taken as truth? How many of the promises made by lovers will stand up to the test of time? Because the answer is so often in the negative, our ancestors have set up an institution called "marriage," so that a man and a woman who would otherwise have difficulty staying together as long as heaven and earth would be firmly bound together. In relation to the love between the two sexes, the institution of marriage is like Sun Wukong the Monkey King's headband of metal. The latter is used to constrain the former. For without [Tripitaka's] headband, Sun Wukong would wreak havoc in heaven. Just so would the peddlers of love abuse and torture innocent hearts—without the protection of marriage, the pleasures of cloud and rain will mostly cause women to incur loss, sometimes to the extent of their lives.