

이화여대 통역번역대학원 석사학위과정 입학시험

한영번역전공 필기시험 기출 문제(B→A)

It was the practice of historians to treat the development of the arts, however obvious and profound their roots in society, as separable from their contemporary context, as a branch or type of human activity subject to its own rules. Yet in the 20th century, the era of the most revolutionary transformations of human life, even this ancient and convenient principle became increasingly unreal. Not only because the boundary between what is and what is not classifiable as art became increasingly hazy, or even disappeared altogether, or because an influential school of literary critics thought it impossible, irrelevant and undemocratic to decide whether Shakespeare's Macbeth was better or worse than Batman. It was also because the forces determining what happened within the arts were overwhelmingly external. As might have been expected in an era of extraordinary techno-scientific revolution, they were predominantly technological.

Technology revolutionized the arts most obviously by making them omnipresent. Radio had already brought sounds into most households but what made it universal was the transistor, which made it both small and portable, and the long-life battery which made it independent of official networks of electric power. Television never became as readily portable as radio but it domesticated the moving image and with the spread of domestic computers, the small screen seemed about to become the individual's major visual link with the outside world.

At the same time technology transformed the perception of the arts. It is barely possible, for someone brought up in the age when any child can freeze frames and repeat a visual passage, to recapture the simple linearity of perception from the days before modern high-tech allowed any viewer to move within seconds through hundreds of television channels.

이화여대 통역번역대학원 석사학위과정 입학시험

한영번역전공 필기시험 기출 문제(B→A)

The most important thing to know about the term "social media" is that it's a misnomer; we should instead refer to it as a "social industry," because platforms like Twitter and Facebook are not designed to connect us or convey information, but are designed to mine data from user behavior, package this data, and sell it to the highest bidder. We posters are essentially digital serfs working for nameless tech giants under conditions of the latter's choosing. Moreover, like any good capitalist operation, social media companies do whatever they can to keep us addicted to their products. They need us to remain enthralled, as our addiction ensures there is data to be sold. The means of addiction are obvious even to the most casual Twitter user: Every time we tweet, we're gambling that someone will find us interesting and reward us with likes and retweets. And like all addicts, we posters are also aware that one wrong tweet could have catastrophic consequences, from social ostracization to losing one's job. Why would anyone tweet if the rewards are so fleeting and the downsides potentially disastrous? The pleasure and pain of social media serve as distractions from the alienation at the heart of our everyday lives. It's not social media that's the problem; it's the world that's the problem. Is it really any surprise that at the very moment when most people feel alienated from one another, from their government, and from history itself, new platforms promising simulacra of connection proliferate? The relationships we form online stand in for the social relationships that have been upended by the turbulence of capitalism.

* misnomer: a misapplied or inappropriate name or designation.

** ostracize: to exclude, by general consent, from society, friendship, conversation, privileges, etc.

*** simulacrum: a slight, unreal, or superficial likeness or semblance.

이화여대 통역번역대학원 석사학위과정 입학시험

한영번역전공 필기시험 기출 문제(B→A)

During the process of reading, there is an active interweaving of anticipation and retrospection, which on a second reading may turn into a kind of advance retrospection. The impressions that arise as a result of this process will vary from individuals to individual, but only within the limits imposed by the written as opposed to the unwritten text. In the same way, two people gazing at the night sky may both be looking at the same collection of stars, but one will see the image of a plough, and the other will make out a dipper. The "stars" in a literary text are fixed; the lines that join them are variable. The author of the text may, of course, exert plenty of influence on the reader's imagination--he has the whole panoply of narrative techniques at his disposal--but no author will ever attempt to set the whole picture before his reader's eyes. If he does, he will very quickly lose his reader, for it is only by activating the reader's imagination that the author can hope to involve him and so realize the intentions of his text.

The "picturing" that is done by our imagination is only one of the activities through which we form the "gestalt" of a literary text. We have already discussed the process of anticipation and retrospection, and to this we must add the process of grouping together all the different aspects of a text to form the consistency that the reader will always be in search of. While expectations may be continually modified, and images continually expanded, the reader will still strive, even if unconsciously, to fit everything together in a consistent pattern. In the reading of images, it is always hard to distinguish what is given to us from what we supplement in the process of projection which is triggered off by recognition.