

上海研究生教育丛书

博士生

英语泛读

主 编 曾道明

Extensive Readings for Ph.D. Students

复旦大学出版社

* 本教材得到上海市研究生教育专项经费资助

博士生英语泛读

主 编 曾道明
副主编 俞宝发

复旦大学出版社

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

博士生英语泛读/曾道明主编. —上海:复旦大学出版社,
2000. 2
ISBN 7-309-02456-7

I. 博… II. 曾… III. 英语-阅读教学-研究生-教材
IV. H319.9

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(1999)第 57613 号

出版发行 复旦大学出版社

上海市国权路 579 号 200433

86-21-65102941(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 江苏大丰市印刷二厂

开本 850×1168 1/32

印张 13.625

字数 354 千

版次 2000 年 2 月第一版 2000 年 2 月第一次印刷

印数 1—3 000

定价 18.50 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

前 言

《博士生英语泛读》是复旦大学非英语专业博士生英语系列教材之一,根据教育部1992年11月颁布的《非英语专业研究生英语(第一外语)教学大纲》编写而成,旨在为博士生提供内容广泛的学习材料,使他们通过大量阅读、逐步掌握阅读技巧,不断提高阅读水平,从而达到教学大纲中提出的要求,具有比较熟练地阅读英文书刊和专业文献的能力。

本书编写者除主编曾道明和副主编俞宝发外,还有陈进、卢玉玲、陶友兰、曾庆茂和陈立青。刘雯和徐欣提供了部分素材。翟象俊教授担任了本书主审。除主审外,还承美籍教师 Dolores Ray 和 Elizabeth Stromseth 审阅了全部课文和练习。

此外,研究生院培养处叶绍梁、廖文武等同志也为本书的编写做了很多工作,外文系资料室高健民等同志也为本书的编写工作提供了很多方便,在此一并表示感谢。

由于时间仓促,加之编者水平与经验有限,教材中难免有不妥之处,欢迎读者批评指正。

编者

1999年12月

使用说明

《博士生英语泛读》供非英语专业博士生使用。全书共有十个单元,每个单元各有两篇课文。所有课文均选自当代英美文学作品以及一些报刊杂志,个别课文略有删改。选材注重了文章的知识性和趣味性,因而具有较强的可读性和实用性。每篇课文后附有注释、词汇表和练习。注释基本上以介绍有关背景知识为主,对课文中个别比较难以理解的词句作了重点解释。词汇表中的生词以英语解释为主,个别还加注了汉语。

练习包括选择题、词汇运用和课堂讨论,旨在检查学生对课文的理解程度,加强语言基本功训练和提高口语能力。

本教材可在教师的指导下,由学生在课前预习,然后在课堂上进行检查或围绕课文内容进行专题性讨论。教师也可根据学生的具体情况和课文的难易程度有选择地加以指导和使用。

编辑说明

自恢复研究生招生以来,我校广大的研究生指导教师及担任研究生教学工作的同志,结合教学任务,编写讲稿,编印讲义,在研究生的教材建设方面进行了大量的工作,但由于种种条件的限制,目前正式出版的研究生教材为数很少。为了进一步提高研究生的教学质量,方便广大研究生和有志深造的同志学习或自学,并有利于学术交流,都有必要迅速改变这一状况,大力加强研究生的教材建设。

这套研究生丛书,正是适应为国家培养高层次人材这一需要而编辑出版的。本丛书分文科及理科两大类,目前将主要出版硕士研究生专业基础课的教材,同时也酌情出版一些适应面较广、并具有较高质量的硕士研究生选修课教材及博士研究生专业基础课教材。我们的目标,是逐步地建设起一套比较完整的研究生教材,使它们不仅可用作研究生专业基础课或选修课的教材或参考书,部分内容也可用作大学高年级学生的选修课教材或补充读物,同时也可用作有关的自学和课外阅读教材。

收入本丛书的教材大都是在编成讲义后经过教学实践,再修改定稿。但由于我们对编辑工作缺乏经验,仍可能存在某些不妥和不足的地方,热忱欢迎广大读者提出宝贵意见,以便将来再版时改正。

复旦大学研究生院

1999 年 12 月

CONTENTS

UNIT ONE	1
1. Who's in Charge of the English Language?	1
2. Euphemisms	22
UNIT TWO	44
3. The Insufficiency of Honesty	44
4. The Catbird Seat	61
UNIT THREE	86
5. The Coercive Power of Drugs in Sports	86
6. Banning Drugs in Sports: A Skeptical View	107
UNIT FOUR	127
7. The Hidden Persuaders	127
8. The Social Responsibility of Business	142
UNIT FIVE	163
9. Our Titanic Love Affair	163
10. Confessions of a Female Chauvinist Sow	189
UNIT SIX	208
11. Consumer Socialization	208
12. Green Consuming in Perspective	228
UNIT SEVEN	248
13. Ingredients of the "Success-Type" Personality	248
14. The Virtues of Ambition	273
UNIT EIGHT	289
15. Predictable Crises of Adulthood	289

	16. Why Don't We Complain?	312
UNIT	NINE	329
	17. How Far Should We Push Mother Nature?	329
	18. Will We Follow the Sheep?	355
UNIT	TEN	374
	19. The Make-Believe Media	374
	20. Celebrity Journalists	391
KEY	417

UNIT ONE

1

Who's in Charge of the English Language?

Casey Miller & Kate Swift¹

(1) In order to encourage the use of language that is free of gender bias, it's obviously necessary to get authors to *recognize* gender bias in their writing. The reason that's so difficult is that our culture is steeped in unconscious attitudes and beliefs about gender characteristics, a condition reflected in our use of words.

(2) Every human society has recognized the relationship between power and naming: that the *act of naming* confers power over the thing named. In the Book of Genesis², Adam³ named all the animals and was given dominion over them, and then, later, the story says "Adam called his wife's name Eve." Those who have the power to name and define other things—animals, wives, whatever—inevitably take themselves as the norm or standard, the measure of all things.

(3) English is androcentric because for centuries it has been evolving in a society where men have been dominant. They were

the ones in charge of the major social institutions; government, law, commerce, education, religion. They shaped the course of history and were the subjects of history. It's natural that the languages of patriarchal societies should come to express a male-centered view. That's basic anthropology. Anthropologists know that the single best way to understand the culture of any society is to study the lexicon of its language: a people's words reflect their reality. But the question is: whose reality? The English language still reflects a world in which the power to define gender characteristics is a male prerogative.

(4) We all know that English contains a variety of words that identify and emphasize difference between the sexes. A number of English words actually express polarization of the sexes. Never mind that beyond having one or the other set of biological features necessary for reproduction, every individual is distinct in personality, combining in a unique way those polarized qualities called "masculine" and "feminine." Never mind that virtually no one fits the mold at either pole. It remains a cherished precept of our culture, semantically underlined in our lexicon and embraced by the purveyors of every commodity imaginable, that the sexes must be thought of as opposite.

Female-Negative-Trivial

(5) This linguistic syndrome can be described as "female-negative-trivial" on the one hand, and "male-positive-important" on the other. If that strikes you as overly exaggerated, consider for a moment a group of people who are *not* in charge of the Eng-

lish language—that is, lexicographers—and the definitions they have come up with for a pair of words which relate to gender—the words *manly* and *womanly*. These definitions are from the most recently updated edition of *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (copyright 1986).

Manly 1. a: having qualities appropriate to man: not effeminate or timorous: bold, resolute, and open in conduct or bearing... b. (1): belonging to or appropriate in character to man [*and they give as examples*] “manly sports,” “beer is a manly drink,” and “a big booming manly voice.” (2): of undaunted courage: gallant, brave [*and among the quotations they give as examples*] “it seemed a big manly thing to say” and “a manly disregard of his enemies”...

Now compare the same dictionary's definition of *womanly*, remembering that lexicographers base their definitions on hundreds of examples of usage that have appeared in print.

Womanly 1: marked by qualities characteristic of a woman, esp. marked by qualities becoming a well-balanced adult woman [*and their examples are*] “womanly manners” and “womanly advice.” 2: possessed of the character or behavior befitting a grown woman: no longer childish or girlish: becoming to a grown woman [*and their example is from Charles Dickens*'] “a little girl wearing a womanly sort of bonnet much too large for her.” 3: characteristic of, belonging to, or suitable to women: conforming to or motivated by a woman's nature and attitudes rather than a man's. [*The first example here is*] “convinced that drawing was a

waste of time, if not downright womanly, like painting on china." [*And another example*] "her usual womanly volubility."

(6) What are these two supposedly parallel entries telling us? They're saying that in addition to defining characteristics appropriate to a man, like vocal pitch, *manly* is synonymous with admirable qualities that all of us might wish we had. "Bold, resolute, open in conduct or bearing; of undaunted courage, gallant, brave." And where is the list of comparable synonyms for *womanly*? There aren't any. Instead, *womanly* is defined only in a circular way—through characteristics seen to be appropriate or inappropriate to women, not to human beings in general. And the examples of usage cited give a pretty good picture of what is considered appropriate to, or characteristic of, a well-balanced adult woman: she's concerned with manners, advice, and hat styles (as distinguished from sports and beer, which are felt to be manly); she wastes time in trivial pursuits like painting on china; and she talks too much.

The Slippery Slope

(7) Most writers and editors today recognize that the female-negative-trivial syndrome is clearly evident in the use of so-called feminine suffixes with nouns of common gender. In 1990 no publishable author would identify someone as "a poetess," except in ridicule. (Adrienne Rich⁵ says the word brings out the "terroristress" in her.) But respectable writers are still using *heroine*, *suffragette*, and *executrix* when referring to a hero, a

suffragist, or an executor who is a woman.

(8) These words illustrate what Douglas Hofstadter⁶ calls “the slippery slope” of meaning. In a book, Hofstadter shows diagrammatically how the slippery slope works. A triangle represents the idea of, let’s say, a heroic person. At one base angle of this triangle is the word *heroine*, representing the female heroic person. At the other base angle is the word *hero*, representing the male heroic person. And at the apex is the generic word, again *hero*, encompassing both. But because the *hero* at the apex and the *hero* at one base angle are identical in name, their separate meanings slip back and forth along one side of the triangle, the slippery slope. The meanings blend and absorb each other. They bond together on the slope. And *heroine*, at the other base angle, remains outside that bond.

(9) Another word that comes to mind in this connection is *actress*. It’s our impression that women performers in the theater and films today are tending more and more to refer to themselves and one another as “actors.” It may be deliberate, conscious usage on the part of some. Considering that their union is called Actors Equity, and that they may have trained at Actors Studio, and performed at Actors Playhouse, they simply accept that the generic word for their profession is *actor*. But when this word appears in juxtaposition with *actress*, the generic meaning of *actor* is absorbed into the gender-specific meaning, and women are identified as nonactors, as being outside or marginal, in Simone de Beauvoir’s⁷ phrase, as “the other”.

(10) Many people will undoubtedly go on feeling that *actress* is a term without bias, but we would like to suggest that it is on

its way to becoming archaic, or at least quaint, simply because people it has identified are abandoning it by a process that may be more visceral than cerebral. In a sense it's their word, it has defined them, and, whether intentionally or not, they are taking charge of it, perhaps dumping it. We'll see.

(11) Because linguistic changes reflect changes in our ways of thinking, a living language is constantly being created and re-created by the people who speak it. Linguistic changes spring from nothing less than new perceptions of the world and of ourselves.

(12) Obviously we all know that over time the "rules" of grammar have changed, and we know that words themselves change their meanings; they lose some and acquire others; new words come into existence and old ones disappear into that word heaven, the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Nevertheless, most people resist change, especially, it seems, changes in grammar and the meanings of words. What we tend to forget—or choose to forget—is that the only languages which don't change are the ones no one speaks any more, like classical Greek and Latin.

(13) Take the narrowing process that turned the Old English word *man* into a synonym for "adult male human being." As long ago as 1752 the philosopher David Hume⁸ recognized how ambiguous that word had already become: "All men," he wrote, and then added, "both male and female." And you are probably familiar with the numerous experimental studies done in the last few years, primarily by psychologists and sociologists rather than linguists, which show that most native speakers of English simply do not conceptualize women and girls when they en-

counter *man* and *mankind* used generically. In fact the narrowing process is felt so strongly, at least at an existential level, that a growing number of women today strongly object to being subsumed under those male-gender terms. "We aren't men," they're saying; "we're women, and we're tired of being made invisible."

(14) Yet despite women's objections, and despite the slippery, ambiguous nature of generic *man*, lots of people, especially formally educated people, have a hard time giving it up. They forget, it seems, that words have a power of their own—the power of taking over meaning. A writer starts out talking about the species as a whole and, more often than we'll ever know, ends up talking about males. Listen to this well-known author, for example, who was discussing aggressive behavior in human beings—all of us, *Homo sapiens*. "[M]an," he wrote, "can do several things which the animal cannot do. . . . Eventually, his vital interests are not only life, food, access to females, etc. , but also values, symbols, institutions."

Resistance to Change and the Problem of Precision

(15) It's probably helpful, once in a while, to look back at the way some of the most familiar and accepted words in use today were greeted when they were newcomers.

(16) Back in 1619, for example, the London schoolmaster Alexander Gil described what he called "the new mänge in speaking and writing." What he was deploring was the introduction of newly coined, Latin-derived words to replace older English ones. According to him, the "new mänge" included such terms as

virtue, justice, pity, compassion, and grace. And he asked, "Whither have you banished those words our forefathers used for these new-fangled ones?" Alexander Gil was headmaster of St. Paul's school at the time, and it might be noted that one of his students was an eleven-year-old named John Milton⁹ who—fortunately—was not persuaded to reject Gil's "new-fangled" words.

(17) And how about old terms that have lost favor, like the once-accepted use of the pronoun *they* with a singular referent, as in "If a person is born of a gloomy temper, they cannot help it." That was written in 1759 by none other than the very correct, well-educated British statesman, Lord Chesterfield¹⁰. However, since most academics are not yet ready to revive that convenient usage, it still isn't surprising to come across a recently published book about, let's say, the psychology of children, in which the distinguished author uses *he* and its inflected forms as all-purpose pronouns, leaving readers to guess whether a particular problem or development applies to boys only or to children of both sexes. We submit that such writing is not just unfortunate. It's inexcusable.

(18) These days more and more writers acknowledge that *he* used generically is, like *man* used generically, both ambiguous and insidious, and they take the time and trouble to write more precisely. But sometimes, even after several polite but probably exhausting battles between author and editor, all the author will agree to do is add a disclaimer. Disclaimers can be helpful, of course (for example, those providing guidance as to what a writer of some previous century may have meant by a now-ambiguous term). More often, however, they are nothing but excuses

for sloppiness.

(19) There is also an element here which we don't think should be ignored; the deep if often unacknowledged *psychological* impact of the grammatical "rule" mandating masculine-gender pronouns for indefinite referents. As long ago as the 1950s, Lynn White, Jr., then the president of Mills College, described with great perception the harm that rule can do to children when he wrote:

The penetration of this habit of language into the minds of little girls as they grow up to be women is more profound than most people, including most women, have recognized; for it implies that personality is really a male attribute, and that women are a human subspecies. . . . It would be a miracle if a girl-baby, learning to use the symbols of our tongue, could escape some universalized wound to her self-respect; whereas a boy-baby's ego is bolstered by the pattern of our language.

(20) Obviously many literate men (and some literate women) must find the truth of White's perception difficult to accept, or we wouldn't still be battling the generic use of masculine-gender pronouns. But since accuracy and precision are what we're talking about today, let us ask this question: what is one to make of a scholar—a professor of communications with a special interest in semantics, as a matter of fact—who dismissed the problem of sexist language as follows: "I tend to avoid 'gender-exclusive' words," he wrote, "except when in so doing, I would injure the rhythm of a sentence."