

正確使用學術文獻

學術研究工作既然是在學術專業社群中的專業活動，就一定要 **engage**（也就是積極的對話挑戰）已經在學術圈內存在的觀點和資料。因此任何入門學徒都得學會處理這些文獻資料的方法和倫理。

如何引用文獻？

「引用」就是說原本那是人家做了工的成果。因此引用的第一原則就是一定要承認人家做的努力，一定要說明是從哪裡引用而來，給了出處就已經完成了一半責任。這樣不但可以引經據典，顯示你的研究工夫扎實，也可以讓別人有查證的機會，以確認你沒有言過其實或者斷章取義。至於要以什麼形式呈現原來出處的相關資訊，各個學術領域成規不同，請參見行規示範。

如果說引用文獻的一半責任是呈現原出處，那麼另外一半責任就是在引用的同時顯示你自己的思想消化工夫何在。換個角度來說，「引用文獻」以兩種方式來呈現，一種就是「直接引用」，精選對方的說法據實呈現，透過重現原文來凸顯對方的用詞用語，以說明其真正意含，佐證你的論證。另一種就是「轉述」，把對方的論點融會貫通的放到你的書寫中，流暢的重述對方的論點以便在你的重述中凸顯其重點所在。

什麼時候要引用文獻？引用文獻是為了什麼目的？

第一， 展現你的閱讀和寫作廣度：說明什麼樣의思想和文獻引導至你此刻的問題意識，佐證你的說法確有可信度，或者標出你想挑戰或對話的立場。很多人的論文後面都跟著長長的書目。不過，真正的大師們通常不會用很長的書目，因為他們已經不需要用這種小技巧來證明自己博學，他們在相關論點上的周延堅實創意突破反而更具有說服力和權威感。

第二， 表示你對相關領域的熟悉：不但熟悉學術領域中有關這個議題的各種論述，可以舉例描述他人的論點，而且明確知道各自觀點的相關位置。論文中對於各家說法的綜合討論和佈局呈現，並非僅僅各自表述，而必須在你手中呈現為彼此之間的差異對話。辯論點、出發點、立場價值的差異都需要被你整理出來。

第三， 表示你對自己的問題意識有清楚的認知：透過文獻探討來顯示你很清楚自己在和誰對話，在哪些論點上廝殺。論述不是無的放矢，當然需要說明你所批判的對象確實有你指控的那些觀點，就像提證據一樣，而且可以透過細讀 close reading 來解析對方的論點關鍵所在，也針對這樣的分析展現自身論點的更為周延。

第四， 表示你對對手的論點和來由有著深刻的認知：你熟到能挑得出適當的一針見血的引文，來證明你對他的批判是合理的。你得能挑出一

些真的很重要而明確、很徵兆性的文句，作為立論的基礎或批判的對象或證據。真正本事就在於能否在這種選擇和呈現中分析得出對方的真正蘊涵，並表達出你個人對這些蘊涵的真知灼見。

那麼，到底要怎麼樣引用才能達成這些目的呢？

不用說，你要引用的文句當然是相應於你的研究進路，換句話說，就你的書寫而言，你的引文絕對要直接相關你的論點。無論是把人家說的話當稻草人來打、當靠山來引用、當徵兆句來畫龍點睛、當證據來批判等等，都要在你的安排和論述過程裡標出其意義來。特別要提醒的是，不要以為只要剪貼了文句放在你的文章裡面就叫做「引用」。大錯特錯！你一定要自己做點工夫，以下逐一說明。

Basic guidelines for using quotations:

1. Use direct quotations only when the original language is so uniquely phrased and the details so vital that you cannot paraphrase and produce the same strong effect. Of course, if the quote directly bears upon the aspect you are discussing, do use the original and give credit to the author through a footnote or endnote. In most other cases, paraphrase will do.

Ex. In arguing that men should cry when they feel the need to, Montagu states: “Crying is a natural function of the human organism which is designed to restore the emotionally dis-equilibrated person to a state of equilibrium” (382).

Ex. But it is crucial to note that the alternative of the Asian eyelid is not absolute, but rather, measured. McCurdy advises his colleagues, “Many patients...simply desire a small ‘double eyelid’ while maintaining the Oriental look” (4). Similarly, a press release from the American Academy of Cosmetic Surgery notes, “The procedure they seek are not so much to look ‘western’ but to refine their features to attain facial harmony.”

Ex. 伊希葛黑指出，在父權體制下，如果孩童與母親的前伊底帕斯關係是心理分析裡的黑暗大陸，那麼母女關係必然是「黑暗大陸當中的黑暗大陸」（引自 Grosz 1989: 120）。表面上，《女戰士》中，女兒重講母親所講的故事即已代表母女傳承。然而對湯亭亭而言，這份母女傳承卻令她百感交集。

Ex. 佛洛伊德終其一生一再明言他不明白夠了解女人，甚至以「黑暗大陸」形容女人(Freud, 1974, Vol. 19 : 243-4)

Ex. 1947 年，導演在此片談話中使用了類似「通俗劇」的詞語闡述這部電影的主題：「真正有良心的公教人員過不了日子，卑鄙下流的奸偽搖身一變而為地下工作。」

Ex. Third, political insurgency must be informed by a commitment to, in Stuart Hall’s words, “the vocation of the intellectual life” (qtd. In Giroux,

“Doing” 300).

2. Never let any quote stand alone as if it were “self-explanatory.” Instead, always precede it with some kind of explanation of your own and try to work the quote into the flow of your text. It is also nice to follow the quote with a deeper level analysis/interpretation/implication centering precisely on the point you are trying to get across through using this quote.

Ex. Lakoff **sums up** the essence of sexual discrimination **clearly**: “A man is defined by what he does, a woman by her sexuality.” **This implies** that a man is supposed to *act* while a woman is supposed to *be*, or that a man is supposed to do things while a woman is supposed to do nothing except becoming a sex object for men.

Ex. **His insurgent cultural pedagogy de-reifies popular culture**, while respecting its power to teach, just as it provides a theoretical framework for interrogating popular culture as a “commodity that must be examined as a source and effect of supra-individual relations” (Sholle 151).

Ex. Palahniuk’s novel, however, is **far more suggestive on the purpose of the homoerotic attraction**. In the novel, Jack reflects that maybe “self-improvement isn’t the answer....Maybe self-destruction is the answer” (49). **The homoeroticism, in my view, is a part of the self-destruction.**

Ex. Suzanne Clark’s response to Giroux is **much more accurate with regard to its suggestion** that the characters played by Norton and Pitt are in a homoerotically charged relationship that appears repeatedly in the history of film. Clark writes that *Fight Club* “suggests homosexual themes and relationships even though the narrative does not openly admit them” (417). **Clark’s assessment is a strong beginning to the recognition of the homoeroticism of *Fight Club*.**

Ex. As humans we are, as Freire has commented, in a “permanent process of searching” and our being in the world is “far more than just ‘being’”; it is a “presence” that is “relational to the world and to others” (23, 25). Concrete dreaming represents an insurgent praxis of possibility that takes into account this presence; it is the existence we live out beyond the horizon of pure reason and toward the aspiration of collective freedom.

3. For the effect of highlighting certain key notions, it is often more effective to use only key words or phrases taken from a passage rather than quoting the original text in great length. Unnecessary words tend to distract and dilute rather than concentrate the force of your argument.

Ex. The above-mentioned case serves as a nice demonstration of “the linguistic double-standard” widely practiced in our society (Lakoff 410).

Ex. By making students more attentive to popular culture as a site of pedagogical and political struggle, we can address the epistemological

demands of a multicultural community, just as we attempt to disrupt those commonsense “representations of the real” that draw their legitimacy from hegemonic formations of power (“Private” 24).

Ex. 單德興說得好，這種「特殊的親切感」所造就的「看似有力的處境也有其陷阱」：台灣學者在詮釋華美文本時固然較處理傳統英美文學作品更有自信，但有時也難免「但有權威、獨斷的口吻」或「自認道地甚至權威的作風」（單德興 2000：22-24）。事實上，單德興可能只說對了一半。台灣學者的「特殊的親切感」，也可能是一種假象。華美文學中的「漢字」，可能粵語、台山話或華埠俗語居多，台灣學者未必勝任，閱讀時恐怕還是得請教高明。

4. If the quote is longer than four lines, then you need to set it apart from your main text by using single spacing inbetween the four (or more) lines of quote an double indentation for the margin.

Other examples:

A fairly typical response appeared in the June 1992 issue of the popular journal *Cosmopolitan*, which **gleefully announces**: “Sex is in the air and men are trembling” (Zhang 18).

Michel Foucault has written that “man is an invention of recent date. And one perhaps nearing its end” (*The Order of Things* 387)

In a sensational report titled “College Women are Hooked on Adult Films,” one journalist **tries to characterize this trend as a catastrophe** (Lee 28).

As the movement pushes on, even other famous writers also felt the pressure and could not help but take a stand on the issue of women’s sexual emancipation (Lee 3; Lung 90).

It may be true, as Dean of the College Eric Robertson writes, that “in the appreciation of medieval art the attitude of the observer is of primary importance...” (136).

In his *Autobiography*, Benjamin Franklin claims that he prepared a list of thirteen virtues (135-137).

A 1995 report found “a decline in the academic quality of students choosing teaching as a career” (“White Collar Unemployment” 5).

Computerworld has devoted a thoughtful editorial to the issue of government and technology (“Uneasy Silence”), and one hopes that such public discussion will continue in the future.

引用文句要找那種具有特殊 wording 而非只提供事實數據的。如果沒有特殊 wording 的意義而只有資訊的提供，那就嘗試濃縮改寫原來的文句。

不適合直接引用的句子：“Levi’s also opened two pilot girl-only stores, in Hong Kong and Kuala Lumpur, in April and May...”

不適合直接引用的句子：“Hong Kong-based retail chain Giordano International Ltd., which has a large presence throughout Asia, has been expanding its women’s denim line for two years,”

它們適合消化後改寫：The Asian Wall Street Journal recently reported that the top manufacturers and retailers of blue jeans throughout Asia are expanding their production of women’s denim and opening women-only stores in order to compete for the fast growing market.

到底怎麼轉述改寫才算抄襲

關鍵不是你的轉述是否貼近原來的文字：有很多人即使是換了字句，但是結構和思想和描述基本上還是跟隨原來的文字結構，這種情況都還是不夠理想的轉述，因為你個人的頭腦工夫沒顯現出來，讀者也會覺得你抄了近路，輕鬆過關。真正的關鍵在於：（1）你有沒有把 credit 標示清楚說明來源。（2）你有沒有在轉述中把原始資料的論證邏輯寫得更為清楚，而且讓讀者能夠分辨得清楚哪些是原始資料中的東西，哪些是你延伸詮釋的東西。（3）你有沒有在轉述中重新模塑原始資料以便顯示它和你的關切議題如何連得起來。舉例：

Original: At home too, the Wilson administration was moving against radicals and other imprecisely defined as Bolsheviks or Communists. After the War, Americans were edgy: the war had disrupted race relations, the workplace, and the family; it had increased the cost of living; postwar unemployment loomed; and in 1919 the Russian Communists established the Comintern to promote world revolution. Already hardened by wartime violations of civil liberties, legal and illegal, Americans found it easy to blame their postwar troubles on new scapegoats. A rash of labor strikes in 1919 sparked the Red Scare.

Plagiarism: There were several reasons why radicals were persecuted during the post-war years. The war had disrupted race relations, the jobs, and the family. The war had also increased the cost of living while reducing employment. When the Russian communists established the Comintern in 1919 to promote world revolution, Americans felt the threat. The emotional stress as a result of these conditions exploded when labor strikes broke out in 1919, leading up to the Red Scare.

為什麼這是抄襲呢？第一，沒說資料來源，這就等於偷竊；第二，資料幾乎只是簡略的剪貼濃縮而已，沒有展現思考的大工夫；第三，整個結構和原文大致一樣，看不出自己有什麼整理重寫的工夫。

Paraphrase: As Norton et. al. have argued in *A People and A Nation*, the Red Scare was sparked by American uneasiness after the war as well as the potential threat of world revolution following the establishment of the Comintern in 1919.（這裡已經重整了原文的分析，不是直接描述美國政府做什麼或者提供一堆原因，而是把原文的一堆原因重整成為兩

大主因，接下來就一個一個解說清楚） Faced with the domestic problems of disrupted race relations and human relationships in general, of high unemployment rate and at the same time high costs of living, Americans were emotionally troubled and needed an outlet. The established revolutionary machine of the Comintern became the symbol of evil and anybody in the US who was remotely related to or supportive of the Communists were branded and persecuted. （以下把原文的蘊涵向前推展一步，直指 Red Scare 是美國政府有意以掃紅來轉移注意力，避免民眾對政權不滿。這個結論已經把原文的含意說得非常明顯） In essence, the Red Scare not only provided an emotional diversion from post-war domestic problems but also allowed the Wilson administration to purge the country of dissent (657).