請以中文翻譯以下英文文章，共兩題，各佔 50%

一、

What, then, might this 'Taiwan in its own terms' be like? To begin, Taiwan is not likely to be an independent identity, free from external factors that have compelled existing history to define it in a myriad of terms other than its own. What Chen Kuang-Hsin has called a 'global nativism' characterizing Taiwan cinema, although a useful starting point, ends up flattening out a complex history. For if both 'global' and 'nativist' are two key operative terms that bracket an understanding of Taiwan cinema today, they must also be complicated by an acknowledgement of the historically specific density of coloniality and modernity. Furthermore, the place of Taiwan has been provocatively termed 'insignificant' by Shu-Mei Shih precisely to call attention to its very significance. Various individual film -makers' accomplishments in the last two decades have contributed to an ironic erasure of Taiwan's historical specificity in the circulation of cinema, art and culture as objects of global consumption, especially those clearly labelled as 'national' icons, auteurs standing in for national subjects. 'Global nativist' or 'insignificant', Taiwan appears in those discursive systems already trapped within the framework to and by which it is always referenced and defined - be it marginal cinema whose emergence in world cinema is accidental at best (Thompson and Bordwell) or a subordinate case whose position in world history is always on the margins of China (Sklar).

.....

With Healthy Realism, we have finally come to the focal point of this issue with the selected essays addressing various significant aspects of Taiwan cinema during this period. At a time before a solid industrial infrastructure was established, 'culture', vernacular or state-sanctioned, and 'policy', explicitly political or inherently ideological, generated a highly diverse cinematic imagining of the nation and its modernizing project Reflecting changing political pressures from the Nationalist government, Taiwan cinema in the 1960s and 1970s must be understood as an active agent that partakes in the representation and imaginary construction of the nation. In fact, Mandarin-language cinema in these two decades, albeit still a commercial endeavour, was not produced for mass consumption completely designed 'from above' (Adorno), nor was it 'from the very beginning' a mere commodity (Jay). Instead, it was an intricate operation under shifting cultural and political conditions, which included language, ethnic identification, distribution/exhibition, and later, volatile international politics and diplomatic crises. This matrix determined cinema's highly unstable modes of production and consumption.

From Hong, Guo-Juin, "Historiography of absence: Taiwan cinema before New Cinema 1982." *Journal of Chinese Cinemas* 4.1 (2010): 5-14.

二、

Sinophone studies—conceived as the study of Sinitic-language cultures on the margins of geopolitical nation-states and their hegemonic productions—locates its objects of attention at the conjuncture of China's internal colonialism and Sinophone communities everywhere immigrants from China have settled. Sinophone studies disrupts the chain of equivalence established, since the rise of nation- states, among language, culture, ethnicity, and nationality and explores the pro-tean, kaleidoscopic, creative, and overlapping margins of China and Chineseness, America and Americanness, Malaysia and Malaysianness, Taiwan and Taiwanness, and so on, by a consideration of specific, local Sinophone texts, cultures, and practices produced in and from these margins. Sinophone Tibetan literature and Sinophone American literature are two examples in an expansive

背面有題，請繼續作答。

consideration of Sinophone studies in literature. If the critical operation of Sinophone studies involves a trenchant critique of China-centrism, it equally involves a critique of Eurocentrism and other centrisms, such as Malay-centrism in Malaysia. It is, in short, always a multidirectional critique.

In the past few years, scholars have used the term Sinophone for largely denotative purposes to mean "Chinese- speaking" or "written in Chinese." Sau- ling Wong used it to designate Chinese American literature written in "Chinese" as opposed to English ("Yellow"); historians of the Manchu empire such as Pamela Kyle Crossley, Evelyn S. Rawski, and Jonathan Lipman described "Chinese-speaking" Hui Muslims in China as Sinophone Muslims as opposed to Uyghur Muslims, who speak Turkic languages; Patricia Schiaini- Vedani and Lara Maconi distinguished between Tibetan writers who write in the Tibetan script and "Chinese-language," or Sinophone, Tibetan writers. Even though the main purpose of these scholars' use of the term is denotative, their underlying intent is to clarify contrast by naming: in highlighting a Sinophone Chinese American literature, Wong exposes the anglophone bias of scholars and shows that American literature is multilingual; Crossley, Rawski, and Lipman emphasize that Muslims in China have divergent languages, histories, and experiences; Schiaini-Vedani and Maconi suggest the predicament of Tibetan writers who write in the "language of the colonizer" (Schiaini-Vedani 89) and whose identity is bound up with linguistic difference. Building on these denotative meanings, which describe both ethnic minority cultures in China and cultures of settlement and immigration outside China, this paper blows open the concept of the Sinophone to explore its historical content, its linguistic multiplicity, and its theoretical potentialities.

From Shih, Shu-mei, "The Concept of the Sinophone," *PMLA* 126.3 (May 2011): 7-9-718.