

复旦博学 · 21 世纪 研究生英语系列 教材

博
学

研究生 综合英语 2

English for Graduate Students

陆效用 曾道明 主编

复旦大学出版社

复旦博学 · 21 世纪 研究生英语系列教材

复旦博学

研究生 综合英语 2

English for Graduate Students

陆效用 曾道明 主编

复旦大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

研究生综合英语. 2/陆效用,曾道明主编. —上海:复旦大学出版社,2003.1
(复旦博学·21世纪研究生英语系列教材)
ISBN 7-309-03495-3

I. 研… II. ①陆…②曾… III. 英语-研究生-教材 IV. H31

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2002)第 097684 号

出版发行 复旦大学出版社

上海市国权路 579 号 200433

86-21-65118853(发行部) 86-21-65642892(编辑部)

fupnet@fudanpress.com <http://www.fudanpress.com>

经销 新华书店上海发行所

印刷 江苏句容市排印厂

开本 787×960 1/16

印张 24 插页 2

字数 443 千

版次 2003 年 1 月第一版 2003 年 1 月第一次印刷

印数 1—6 000

定价 30.00 元

如有印装质量问题,请向复旦大学出版社发行部调换。

版权所有 侵权必究

编辑出版说明

21 世纪,随着科学技术的突飞猛进和知识经济的迅速发展,世界将发生深刻变化,国际间的竞争日趋激烈,高层次人才的教育正面临空前的发展机遇与巨大挑战。

研究生教育是教育结构中最高层次的教育,肩负着为国家现代化建设培养高素质、高层次创造性人才的重任,是我国增强综合国力、增强国际竞争力的重要支撑。为了提高研究生的培养质量和研究生教学的整体水平,必须加强研究生的教材建设,更新教学内容,把创新能力和创造精神的培养放到突出位置上,必须建立适应新的教学和科研要求的有复旦特色的研究生教学用书。“21 世纪复旦大学研究生教学用书”正是为适应这一新形势而编辑出版的。

“21 世纪复旦大学研究生教学用书”分文科、理科和医科三大类,主要出版硕士研究生学位基础课和学位专业课的教材,同时酌情出版一些使用面广、质量较高的选修课及博士研究生学位基础课教材。这些教材除可作为相关学科的研究生教学用书外,还可供有关学者和人员参考。

收入“21 世纪复旦大学研究生教学用书”的教材,大都是作者在编写成讲义后,经过多年教学实践、反复修改后才定稿的。这些作者大都治学严谨,教学实践经验丰富,教学效果也比较显著。由于我们对编辑工作尚缺乏经验,不足之处,敬请读者指正,以便我们在将来再版时加以更正和提高。

复旦大学研究生院

2001 年 3 月

前言

我国高等院校的研究生教育在21世纪之初有了较大规模的发展,同时对研究生英语教学也提出了更高的要求。为了使研究生英语课程更好地适应新世纪高素质人才培养的需要,我们在总结过去十多年教材编写和课堂教学经验的基础上,参照教育部(原国家教委)1992年颁布的《非英语专业研究生英语教学大纲》,并根据继承和创新的原则,编写了新一代研究生英语教材——《研究生综合英语》。

本教材有以下几个特点:一、选材多样化。所有材料均选自英美报刊书籍,选文既重视语言的规范性,又关注社会热点话题,使课文具有较强的趣味性、可读性和思考性,并能促进学生的英语表达欲望。二、注重口语和写作能力的培养。每课练习包含了丰富的口语、翻译和写作习题,有利于培养学生使用英语的综合能力。尤其是第一册中的口语技能(Speaking Skills)和第二册中的写作技能(Writing Skills),具有很强的实用性。三、补充材料(Additional Work)内容丰富。它包括习语学习(Idiom Studies)、词汇扩充(Vocabulary Expansion)和阅读欣赏(Reading Appreciation)三个部分,为学有余力的学生提供一块饶有趣味的英语学习园地。

本教材共分四册。原则上第一、二册供非英语专业硕士生使用,第三、四册供非英语专业博士生使用;但使用者可根据学生的实际情况灵活处理。

本教材由复旦大学大学英语教学部研究生教研室负责编写。第二册由陆效用、曾道明任主编,卢玉玲、陶友兰任副主编,主要编写人员还有谢晓燕、何静、赵海、赵蓉、雍毅、谷红欣、王绍梅等。英国语言专家 Gary Green 和新西兰语言专家 Kerin Coleman 为编写工作提供了帮助,美国语言专家 Sue Davis 审阅了部分单元。

本教材在编写过程中,得到了复旦大学研究生院领导及培养处负责同志的大力支持,并获得研究生项目经费的资助。在此表示衷心的感谢。

由于编写人员教学任务重、时间紧,又限于水平,教材中的错误和不妥之处,敬请读者提出宝贵的意见。

编者
2002年10月

使用说明

本书为研究生综合英语（共四册）第二册，供硕士生第二学期使用。

本书共有十个单元，每单元包括两篇课文。第一篇课文前面的作者和内容简介，主要为学生提供必要的背景材料，帮助学生更好地理解课文内容。第二篇课文基本上与第一篇题材相似，或选自同一作家的作品，以进一步拓宽学生的知识面。

课文中出现的生词或短语均采用英语释义。课文注释以介绍背景知识为主，对个别难以理解的语言点也适当作了解释，供学生预习时参考。

本书强调语言基本功的训练和语言实用能力的培养，因此在每单元的第一篇课文后均配有大量练习，其中包括回答问题(Comprehension Questions)、话题讨论(Topics for Discussion)、词汇(Vocabulary)、短文填空(Cloze)、翻译(Translation)和写作(Writing)。回答问题旨在帮助学生加深对课文内容的理解。话题讨论要求学生结合课文或与课文有关的话题发表自己的见解。词汇练习包括A、B、C三部分，A和B部分通过同义词和反义词练习，帮助学生掌握课文中常用词和词组的用法，C部分主要操练课文中出现的单词和词组以及它们的其他用法，以进一步扩大学生的词汇量。单数课文中的短文填空，要求学生根据短文的意思和所给的词或词组，在空白处填入适当的词和词组；在双数课文中，不提供词或词组，要求学生根据上下文的意思，在空白处填入适当的词或词组，使全文的意思完整。这一部分练习有助于学生提高运用语言的综合能力。翻译练习分为A和B两部分，A部分选自课文，B部分选自课文以外的材料，要求学生将它们分别译成汉语和英语，并要求译文准确通顺。写作练习要求学生根据提示，写出一篇条理清楚、用词恰当、行文流畅的英语短文。

每一单元中还有一项是体现本书特色的写作技能(Writing Skills)。这一部分介绍了常用文体的写作技能，并配有范文，要求学生在课后进行写作训练，以便进一步提高运用英语的实际能力。

每一单元中还增设了补充材料(Additional Work)和谚语(Proverbs)。补充材料包括三个部分：习语学习、词汇扩充和阅读欣赏。习语和词汇练习与课文无关，主要供语言基础较好或希望参加国际英语考试的学生使用。阅读欣赏主要介绍一

些英语习语的来源和文学价值较高的散文、诗歌等，以提高学生的文学修养。谚语通常与课文内容有关，旨在加深学生的文化底蕴。

编 者
2002年10月

Contents

Unit One

Text	How to Talk about the World	1
Further Reading	You Are What You Say	16
Writing Skills	Essay Writing: Overall Introduction	29

Unit Two

Text	Is Love an Art?	43
Further Reading	Courtship through the Ages	55
Writing Skills	Essay Writing: Argumentative	65

Unit Three

Text	Cheating: Alive and Flourishing	75
Further Reading	Let's Put the Heat on Campus Cheats	95
Writing Skills	Functional Writing: Application Letters	103

Unit Four

Text	The Gift of Gift-Giving	113
Further Reading	How to Be Generous	129
Writing Skills	Functional Writing: Resumes (Résumés)	136

Unit Five

Text	Science and Humanity in the Twenty-First Century	149
Further Reading	Science Doesn't Kill People...People Kill People	166

Writing Skills	Functional Writing: Business Letters	174
----------------	--------------------------------------	-----

Unit Six

Text	The Art of Pleasing — A Letter to Son	187
Further Reading	Why I Am Afraid of You?—A Letter to Father	201
Writing Skills	Practical Writing: Summaries	211

Unit Seven

Text	One Vote for This Age of Anxiety	223
Further Reading	Our Way of Life Makes Us Miserable	237
Writing Skills	Practical Writing: Book Reports and Book Reviews	247

Unit Eight

Text	Personal Stability Zones	259
Further Reading	The Personality of the Future	274
Writing Skills	Academic Writing: Constructing a Research Paper(1)	282

Unit Nine

Text	The Money Game	293
Further Reading	There Has Always Been Olympic Mischief	310
Writing Skills	Academic Writing: Constructing a Research Paper(2)	320

Unit Ten

Text	Reflections on His Eightieth Birthday	337
Further Reading	The View From 80	351
Writing Skills	Academic Writing: Abstracts	361

UNIT ONE

Text

Introduction to the Author and the Article

Peter Farb (1929—1980) was trained as a linguist and developed wide-ranging interests in the role language plays in human behavior. He also took a particular interest in American Indians. His books include *Man's Rise to Civilization as Shown by the Indians of North America*. He is co-author of *Consuming Passions: The Anthropology of Eating* (1980).

This selection *How to Talk about the World* comes from *Word Play: What Happens When People Talk* (1974). In this selection Peter Farb examines how we bring order to the world by simplifying the overwhelming mass of information which surrounds us into categories. He also explains how different cultures categorize information in different ways.

How to Talk about the World

Peter Farb

5

If human beings paid attention to all the sights, sounds, and smells that besiege them, their ability to codify and recall information would be swamped. Instead, they simplify the information by grouping it into broad verbal categories. For example, human eyes have the extraordinary power to discriminate some ten million colors, but the English language reduces these to no more than four thousand color words,

of which only eleven basic terms are commonly used. That is why a driver stops at all traffic lights whose color he categorizes as *red*, even though the lights vary slightly from one to another in their hues of redness. Categorization allows people to respond to their environment in a way that has great survival value. If they hear a high-pitched sound, they do not enumerate the long list of possible causes of such sounds: a human cry of fear, a scream for help, a policeman's whistle, and so on. Instead they become alert because they have categorized high-pitched sounds as indicators of possible danger.

Words, therefore, are more than simply labels for specific objects; they are also parts of sets of related principles. To a very young child, the word *chair* may at first refer only to his highchair. Soon afterward, he learns that the four-legged object on which his parents sit at mealtimes is also called a *chair*. So is the thing with only three legs, referred to by his parents as a *broken chair*, and so is the upholstered piece of furniture in the living room. These objects form a category, *chair*, which is set apart from all other categories by a unique combination of features. A *chair* must possess a seat, legs, and back; it may also, but not necessarily, have arms; it must accommodate only one person. An object that possesses these features with but a single exception—it accommodates three people—does not belong to the category *chair* but rather to the category *couch*, and that category in turn is described by a set of unique features.

Furthermore, Americans think of *chairs* and *couches* as being related to each other because they both belong to a category known in English as *household furniture*. But such a relationship between the category *chair* and the category *couch* is entirely arbitrary on the part of English and some other speech communities. Nothing in the external world

decrees that a language must place these two categories together. In some African speech communities, for example, the category *chair* would most likely be thought of in relation to the category *spear*, since both are emblems of a ruler's authority.

The analysis of words by their categories for the purpose of determining what they mean to speakers of a particular language—that is, what the native speaker, and not some visiting linguist, feels are the distinguishing features or components of that word—is known as “componential analysis” or “formal semantic analysis.”¹ The aim, in brief, is to determine the components or features that native speakers use to distinguish similar terms from one another so that more exact meanings can be achieved.

Anyone who visits an exotic culture quickly learns that the people are linguistically deaf to categories he considers obvious,² yet they are extraordinarily perceptive in talking about things he has no easy way to describe. An English-speaking anthropologist studying the Koyas³ of India, for example, soon discovers that their language does not distinguish between dew, fog, and snow. When questioned about these natural phenomena, the Koyas can find a way to describe them, but normally their language attaches no significance to making such distinctions and provides no highly codable words for the purpose. On the other hand, a Koya has the linguistic resources to speak easily about seven different kinds of bamboo—resources that the visiting anthropologist utterly lacks in his own language. More important than the significance, or the lack of it,⁴ that a language places on objects and ideas is the way that language categorizes the information it does find significant. A *pig*, for example, can be categorized in several ways: a mammal with cloven hoofs and bristly hairs and adapted for digging with its

snout; a mold in which metal is cast; a British sixpence coin. The Koyas categorize the pig in none of these ways; they simply place it in the category of animals that are edible. Their neighbors, Muslims, think of it in a different way by placing it in the category of defiled animals.

Everyone, whether he realizes it or not, classifies the items he finds in his environment. Most speakers of English recognize a category that they call *livestock*, which is made up of other categories known as *cattle*, *horses*, *sheep*, and *swine* of different ages and sexes. An English speaker who is knowledgeable about farm life categorizes a barnyardful of these animals in a way that establishes relationships based on distinguishing features. For example, he feels that a *cow* and a *mare*, even though they belong to different species, are somehow in a relationship to each other. And of course they are, because they both belong to the category of Female Animal under the general category of Livestock. The speaker of English unconsciously groups certain animals into various sub-categories that exclude other animals:

	LIVESTOCK			
	<i>Cattle</i>	<i>Horses</i>	<i>Sheep</i>	<i>Swine</i>
<i>Female</i>	cow	mare	ewe	sow
<i>Intact Male</i>	bull	stallion	ram	boar
<i>Castrated Male</i>	steer	gelding	wether	barrow
<i>Immature</i>	heifer	colt/filly	lamb	shoat/gilt
<i>Newborn</i>	calf	foal	yearling	piglet

A table such as this shows that speakers of English are intuitively aware of certain contrasts. They regard a *bull* and a *steer* as different—which they are, because one belongs to a category of Intact Males⁵ and the other to a category of Castrated Males. In addition to discriminations made on the basis of livestock's sex, speakers of English also contrast

mature and immature animals. A *foal* is a newborn horse and a *stallion* is a mature male horse.

The conceptual labels by which English-speaking peoples talk about barnyard animals can now be understood. The animal is defined by the point at which two distinctive features intersect: sex (male, female, or castrated) and maturity (mature, immature, or newborn). A *stallion* belongs to a category of horse that is both intact male and mature; a *filly* belongs to a category of horse that is both female and immature. Nothing in external reality dictates that barnyard animals should be talked about in this way; it is strictly a convention of English and some other languages.

In contrast, imagine that an Amazonian Indian⁶ is brought to the United States so that linguists can intensively study his language. When the Indian returns to his native forests, his friends and relatives listen in disbelief as he tells about all the fantastic things he saw. He summarizes his impressions of America in terms of the familiar categories his language has accustomed him to. He relates that at first he was bewildered by the strange animals he saw on an American farm because each animal not only looked different but also seemed to represent a unique concept to the natives of the North American tribe. But after considerable observation of the curious folkways of these peculiar people, at last he understood American barnyard animals. He figured out that some animals are good for work and that some are good for food. Using these two components—rather than the Americans' features of sex and maturity—his classification of livestock is considerably different. He categorized *stallion*, *mare*, and *gelding* as belonging to both the Inedible and Work (Riding) categories. The *bull* also belonged to the Inedible category but it was used for a different kind of Work as a draught animal.⁷ He further placed a large number of animals—*cow*,

ewe, lamb, sow and so on—in the category of Edible but Useless for Work. Since his method of categorizing the barnyard failed to take into account the breeding process, which depends upon the categories of sex and maturity, he no doubt found it inexplicable that some animals—*ram, colt, boar*, and so on—were raised even though they could not be eaten or used for work.

To an American, the Amazonian Indian's classification of barnyard animals appears quite foolish, yet it is no more foolish than the American's system of classification by the features of sex and maturity. Speakers of each language have the right to recognize whatever features they care to. And they have a similar right to then organize these features according to the rules of their own speech communities. No one system is better than another in making sense out of the world in terms that can be talked about; the systems are simply different. A speaker of English who defines a *stallion* as a mature, male horse is no wiser than the Amazonian who claims it is inedible and used for riding. Both the speaker of English and the speaker of the Amazonian language have brought order out of the multitudes of things in the environment—and, in the process, both have shown something about how their languages and their minds work.

Notes

1. “componential analysis” or “formal semantic analysis”: an approach to the study of meaning which analyzes a word into a set of meaning components or semantic features
2. the people are linguistically deaf to categories he considers obvious: the people in one culture are unable to hear, i.e. recognize or understand, the same categories used by people in another culture
3. Koyas: a tribe in India

4. More important than the significance, or the lack of it: Although one culture may place significance on a particular object or idea, another may not.
5. Intact males: Male animals that have not been castrated
6. an Amazonian Indian: a tribal Indian from the Amazon rain forest
7. a draught animal: an animal used for pulling heavy loads

New Words

besiege /bɪ'si:dʒ/ <i>vt.</i>	surround (sb. or sth.) closely; surround (a town, castle, etc.) with armed forces so as to prevent the people inside from getting out
swamp /swɒmp/ <i>vt.</i>	overwhelm (sb. or sth.) with a great quantity of things; flood or soak (sth.) with water
high-pitched <i>adj.</i>	(of a sound or voice) at a level close to the highest that can be heard; high and shrill
enumerate /ɪ'nju:məreɪt/ <i>vt.</i>	name (things on a list) one by one
upholster /ʌp'həʊlstə/ <i>vt.</i>	provide (a seat) with comfortable coverings and fillings
couch /kaʊtʃ/ <i>n.</i>	a long piece of furniture, usu. with a back and arms, on which more than one person may sit or lie
decree /dɪ'kri:/ <i>vt.</i>	state (sth.) officially, with the force of law; order officially
emblem /'embləm/ <i>n.</i>	an object which is regarded as the sign of sth.
semantic /sɪ'mæntɪk/ <i>adj.</i>	of or related to meaning in language
dew /dju:/ <i>n.</i>	the small drops of water which form on cold surfaces during the night
cloven hoof /'cləʊvən hu:f/ <i>n.</i>	(also cloven foot) a foot, such as that of a cow, sheep, goat, etc., divided into two parts
bristly /'brɪʃli/ <i>adj.</i>	like or full of bristles
snout /snaʊt/ <i>n.</i>	a long nose of any of various animals, such as a pig
mold /məʊld/ <i>n.</i>	a hollow vessel of metal, stone, glass, etc.,

cast /kɑːst/ <i>vt.</i>	having a particular shape, into which melted metal or some soft substance is poured, so that when the substance becomes cool or hard, it takes this shape
Muslim /'mʊzlim/ <i>n.</i>	make (an object) by pouring (hot metal or plastic) into a shaped container (also Moslem) a person of the religion started by Mohammed
defile /dɪ'faɪl/ <i>vt.</i>	destroy the pureness or cleanness of (anything sacred); profane
swine /swaɪn/ <i>n.</i>	a pig or pigs
barnyardful /'bɑːnjɑːdful/ <i>n.</i>	as many animals as fill a farmyard
mare /meə/ <i>n.</i>	a female horse or donkey
castrate /'kæstreɪt/ <i>vt.</i>	remove all or part of the sex organs of (a male animal or person)
steer /stiə/ <i>n.</i>	a young male animal of the cattle family with its sex organs removed, kept for meat
heifer /'heɪfə/ <i>n.</i>	a young cow which has not yet given birth to a calf
stallion /'stæljən/ <i>n.</i>	a fully-grown male horse kept for breeding
gelding /'ɡeldɪŋ/ <i>n.</i>	a horse that has been castrated
colt /kəʊlt/ <i>n.</i>	a young male horse
filly /'fɪli/ <i>n.</i>	a young female horse
foal /fəʊl/ <i>n.</i>	a young horse
ewe /juː/ <i>n.</i>	a fully grown female sheep
ram /ræm/ <i>n.</i>	an adult male sheep that can be the father of young
wether /'weðə/ <i>n.</i>	a male sheep or goat that has been castrated before becoming sexually mature
yearling /'jɪəlɪŋ/ <i>n.</i>	an animal, esp. a young horse or sheep, between one and two years old
sow /saʊ/ <i>n.</i>	a fully grown female pig
boar /bɔː/ <i>n.</i>	a male pig on a farm that is not castrated and is