

考試科目	中國通史	所別	歷史學研究所	考試時間	2月26日(六)第一節
------	------	----	--------	------	-------------

- 一、請說明江漢流域考古發現在古史研究上的意義。25%
- 二、請說明道、釋二教在中古社會扮演的角色。25%
- 三、請說明宋元「儒醫」形成的歷史背景與意義。25%
- 四、請說明明清時期女性社會角色的變遷。25%



考試科目	世界通史	所別	歷史學	考試時間	> 月>6日(六)第2節
------	------	----	-----	------	--------------

1. 拜占庭帝國 (the Byzantine Empire) 的歷史從古代延續至 1453 年，在千年的歷史中，拜占庭不但延續羅馬帝國的輝煌，更扮演東西兩方橋樑的角色，也對東西兩方文明有深刻的影響。請說明拜占庭帝國與東西兩方互動的歷程，及其在歷史上的意義。(25%)
2. 人藉由觀察宇宙星象、自然萬物，以及人類社會，形成一套世界觀，並在這套世界觀中建立人自身的定位。請以歐洲中古時期 (600-1500) 為例，說明當時人們的世界觀如何形成？這套世界觀如何受到十七世紀科學革命 (the Scientific Revolution) 的衝擊。此外，也請討論從中古時期到十七世紀，有哪些文獻或圖像可以讓我們瞭解歐洲人的世界觀。(25%)
3. 1899 年美國學者范伯倫 (Thorstein Veblen) 發表《有閒階級論》(The Theory of the Leisure Class) 之後，歷史學家或社會學家常以「炫耀性消費」(conspicuous consumption) 來理解部分人們的消費行為。這類消費非出於日常生活的必要性，而是為了維持或提升社會地位，並以消費的形式展現財富與品味。范伯倫所針對的是 19 世紀美國的資產階級，但這類消費行為早已存於各地區的歷史中。請由中國以外的地區舉兩例說明：在某些特定時空中誰是炫耀性消費的主力、此類消費透過何種方式表現，又展現了哪些歷史意義？(25%)
4. 1907 年的《愛丁堡評論》(The Edinburgh Review) 中某篇文章有以下兩段文字：  
'Let us in the first place say boldly that the modern European movement of expansion is not purely, nor even primarily, a colonizing movement. It is not a movement merely in favor of annexing territory, of opening up new countries, of settling on the soil and brining backwoods and prairies under cultivation. It is much more a movement towards organizing, directing and controlling where organization, direction and control are needed and are lacking.'  
'Most of us, probably, are ready enough to admit our own disinterestedness. We are no greedy landgrabbers, but the apostles of an idea, the missionaries of Western civilization.'  
請依據這兩段文字，回答以下的問題：  
(1) 這些文字出現的歷史背景為何？(10%)  
(2) 「文明」(civilization) 一詞對近現代歐洲人而言有何特殊的意義？(15%)

考 試 科 目	中國近現代史與臺灣史	所 別	歷史系	考 試 時 間	2月26日(六) 第3 節
---------	------------	-----	-----	---------	---------------

1. 清末以降的反纏足和反鴉片運動長期以來被視為近代中國的重大現代化發展。然而近年來不少中外學者對這些運動的歷史意義提出若干不同的看法。請就你所知，從文化史、社會史、經濟史、性別史等角度，解釋分析這些新看法的主要論點和其立論的依據。(25%)
2. 美國史學家Paul A. Cohen針對近代中國史的研究方向，曾提出*Discovering History in China*的見解。此見解引發學界許多迴響和討論。(A) 請論述分析Cohen的主要論點和其所反映的西方學界對異文化研究的態度轉向 (B) 以近年來有關中國近代史代表著作成果為例，檢討反省Cohen論點的優缺點和其可能的盲點。(25%)
3. 就你閱讀所及，請說明並分析近十年間有關台灣近、現代史有何重要研究成果及史料的公佈與整理？其所表現的研究趨勢為何？(25%)
4. 「文明開化」為日本殖民政府統治臺灣重要的「正當性」口號之一。請述析日本殖民政府在臺灣推動何種「文明開化」的統治方針？臺灣漢人及原住民對於殖民政府「文明開化」政策的回應為何？(25%)



備 註	試 題 隨 卷 繳 交
-----	-------------



考試科目	歷史英文	所別	歷史系	考試時間	2月26日(六)第4節
------	------	----	-----	------	-------------

**A. Please read the passage below and answer the following questions in English.**

“Why did Japan choose not to surrender to the United States in June 1945 along with Germany but stay in the war until August of that year? When Japan rejected the Potsdam Declaration of July 26, 1945, did it have a blueprint for post-surrender survival? In spite of voluminous works on World War II and the Pacific War as well as the Cold War, the last phase of Japan's war remains murky. Standard studies attribute impediments to Japan's "timely" surrender to such factors as the Imperial Army's determination to fight a homeland battle against the United States and also to the inability of pro-Anglo-American Japanese to influence decisionmakers in Tokyo. Concerning Japan's "abrupt" capitulation, most studies ascribe it to the shock of either the atomic bombs or the "surprise" attack by the Soviet Union, or both, followed by the "sacred" decision by Emperor Hirohito. An orthodox lesson of the Pacific War is that Japan should have surrendered to the United States earlier, to save hundreds of thousands of deaths and casualties. Had Japan done so, however, the United States would have taken over the entire sphere of Japan's continental empire and become a dominant power in the region, perhaps imposing harsh constraints on defeated Japan. That was not what Japan desired. Japanese leaders saw a need to investigate the best way to leave the war, and, as this article will show, they calculated an end game for the nation by staking its survival on the future of East Asia after the empire's collapse.”

1. In this article, the author promises a conclusion that is different from the “orthodox lesson.” What does this first paragraph indicate that the new lesson might be? (20%)
2. Discuss the types of primary sources that the author might have used. (20%)

**B. Please read the passage below and answer the following questions in English.**

“AS [Joan] Scott noted, by 1986, feminists had already adopted the term “gender” to refer to the social construction of sex differences, and theorists had already posed “gender” as an analytic category, akin to class and race. A few historians had begun to use the term “gender history” in addition to “women’s history,” and a handful had looked at men and masculinity as part of a gender history that did not focus solely on women. Scott intervened in this historiographic process at a critical moment. For some historians of women, the

備註	試題隨卷繳交	請注意：背面還有試題。
----	--------	-------------

考試科目	歷史英文	所別	歷史系	考試時間	2月26日(六) 第4節
------	------	----	-----	------	--------------

shift toward gender history was mostly unwelcome. To replace “women’s history” with “gender history” and to include men and masculinity seemed to some at the time like a conservative retrenchment, a quest for respectability, or an abandonment of the study of marginalized and oppressed groups. Scott recognized the pitfalls and offered reassurance. She directly repudiated the use of “gender” as a de-politicized, social-scientized synonym for women or sex, and she promised to reinvigorate feminist history by expanding its realm of influence. In this way, she helped historians of women to approve (and other historians to discern) an emerging shift in historiography.

Scott outlined a problem faced by women’s historians and proffered a solution. Two decades after the launching of the field, women’s history was, she implied, stuck in a descriptive rut, relegated to the limited byways of social history inquiry. It had failed in its earlier claims to rewrite the master narrative of history, and it had not yet adequately explained the “persistent inequalities between women and men.” Existing theories, Scott said, were ahistorical and reductionist. She offered a different approach for rethinking and rewriting history. Influenced by Derrida’s deconstructionism and Foucault’s formulation of dispersed power, she asked historians to analyze the language of gender, to observe how perceived sex differences had appeared historically as a natural and fundamental opposition. These perceived differences, she wrote, had often subordinated and constrained women, yes, but they had also provided a “primary way of signifying” other hierarchical relationships. This was the heart of her contribution: she invited us to look at how “the so-called natural relationship between male and female” structured, naturalized, and legitimated relationships of power, say, between ruler and ruled or between empire and colony. The history of gender could, it seems, inhabit more of the historical turf than could the history of women. It could even enter and remap the most resistant domains, such as the history of war, politics, and foreign relations.”

1. According to the article, how was historian Joan Scott’s concept of gender different from women’s history? (20%)
2. Discuss the implications of the last sentence, that the history of gender could “inhabit more of the historical turf.” In other words, what are the implications of these developments for broader historiography? (20%)

考試科目	歷史英文	所別	歷史系	考試時間	2月26日(六)第4節
------	------	----	-----	------	-------------

**C. Please read the passage below and answer the following questions in English.**

“Military history today is in the same curious position it has been in for decades: extremely popular with the American public at large, and relatively marginalized within professional academic circles. Its public profile continues to expand apace, and it has a particularly imposing media presence, whether it be on television in the form of the History Channel, or on the screen in a steady diet of war-themed movies such as Clint Eastwood’s pair of 2006 releases, *Flags of Our Fathers* and *Letters from Iwo Jima*, or the Thermopylae epic *300*. While military history dominates the air-waves, however, its academic footprint continues to shrink, and it has largely vanished from the curriculum of many of our elite universities. It has been this way for a long time, and frankly, there seems little chance that things will change any time soon. No military historian should be pleased with the situation. At the same time, there seems little point in obsessing about it. It helps no one and does nothing to advance understanding on either side of the academic divide.”

1. In light of the above passage regarding the status of military history within American universities, what could military historians do to make their work more relevant? (20%)

