

國立中正大學哲學系

九十九學年度碩士班甄試考試：英文

請將段落 1 與 2 翻譯為中文，段落 3 則以中文解釋其大意

1. That p is true (false) if and only if that p is not false (not true).
That p is true if and only if p . [‘ p ’ 代表句子]
請以上述二式作為參考來翻譯下文。
To say of what is that it is not, or of what is not that it is, is false, while to say of what is that it is, and of what is not that it is not, is true.
(Aristotle: *Metaphysics* 1011b25) (20%)
2. But reason now persuades me that I should withhold my assent no less carefully from opinions that are not completely certain and indubitable than I would from those that are patently false. For this reason, it will suffice for the rejection of all of these opinions, if I find in each of them some reason for doubt. Nor therefore need I survey each opinion individually, a task that would be endless. Rather, because undermining the foundations will cause whatever has been built upon them to crumble of its own accord, I will attack straightaway those principles which supported everything I once believed.
(Descartes: “Meditation I: On What Can Be Called Into Doubt”) (35%)
3. 以電影 *Matrix* 為藍本來理解‘brains in a vat’，解釋下文大意，尤其是最後一段。
Instead of having just one brain in a vat, we could imagine that all human beings (perhaps all sentient beings) are brains in a vat...Of course, the evil scientist would have to be outside—or would he? Perhaps there is no evil scientist, perhaps (though this is absurd) the universe just happens to consist of automatic machinery tending a vat full of brains and nervous systems.
...
I now want to ask a question which will seem very silly and obvious...but which will take us to real philosophical depths rather quickly. Suppose this whole story were actually true. Could we, if we were brains in a vat in this way, *say* or *think* that we were?
(Putnam: “Brains in a Vat”) (45%)