

ISSN 2520-4920 (Print)
ISSN 2616-4566 (Online)

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 3, Number 3
September 2019



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

**Volume 3, Number 3
September 2019**

Editor

Nie Zhenzhao, Zhejiang University

Associate Editors

Wu Di, Zhejiang University

Wang Yong, Zhejiang University

Director of Editorial Office

Yang Gexin, Zhejiang University

Published by

**Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong**

About: *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* (“ISL”) is a peer-reviewed journal sponsored by the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of World Literature (Zhejiang University) and published by Knowledge Hub Publishing Company (Hong Kong) in collaboration with the International Conference for Ethical Literary Criticism. With a strategic focus on literary, ethical, historical and interdisciplinary approaches, ISL encourages dialogues between literature and other disciplines of humanities, aiming to establish an international platform for scholars to exchange their innovative views that stimulate critical interdisciplinary discussions. ISL publishes four issues each year in both Chinese and English.

International Conference for Ethical Literary Criticism (ICELC, since 2012) is an annual international conference for academics and research-oriented scholars in the area of literature and related disciplines. ICELC is the flagship conference of the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism which is an international literary and cultural organization aiming to link all those working in ethical literary criticism in theory and practice and to encourage the discussions of ethical function and value in literary works and criticism.

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature is registered with ISSN 2520-4920(print) and 2616-4566(online), and is indexed by Arts and Humanities Citation Index. It is also included in EBSCO, MLA International Bibliography and Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature.

Submissions and subscription: As the official journal of International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism (IAELC), *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* publishes articles only from members of IAELC, and their submissions presented in the annual convention and forums will be accepted for publication in priority. Those authors who are not members of IAELC are encouraged to apply for membership of the association before their submissions. All submissions must include a cover letter that includes the author’s full mailing address, email address, telephone numbers, and professional or academic affiliation. The cover letter should indicate that the manuscript contains original content, has not previously been published, and is not under review by another publication. Submissions or subscription should be addressed to: isl2017@163.com.

Contact information: Editorial office, *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*, Amtel Building, 148 Des Voeux Road Central, Hong Kong SAR, China.

Copyright ©2017 by *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*. All rights reserved. No copy shall be made without the permission of the publisher.

Advisory Board

Massimo Bacigalupo / Università di Genova, ITA

Michael Bell / University of Warwick, UK

Charles Bernstein / University of Pennsylvania, USA

Vladimir Biti / University of Vienna, AT

Shang Biwu / Shanghai Jiaotong University, CHN

Marshall Brown / University of Washington, USA

Galin Tihanov / Queen Mary University of London, UK

Knut Brynhildsvoll / University of Oslo, NOR

Stefan Collini / University of Cambridge, UK

Khairy Douma / Cairo University, EGY

Barbara Foley / Rutgers University, USA

Su Hui / Central China Normal University, CHN

Luo Lianggong / Central China Normal University, CHN

Byeongho Jung / Korea University, KOR

Anne-Marie Mai / University of Southern Denmark, DEN

Wolfgang Müller / Friedrich-Schiller University Jena, GER

Marjorie Perloff / Stanford University, USA

John Rathmell / University of Cambridge, UK

Claude Rawson / Yale University, USA

Joshua Scodel / University of Chicago, USA

Igor Shaytanov / *Problems of Literature*, RUS

Inseop Shin / Konkuk University, KOR

Wang Songlin / Ningbo University, CHN

Contents

- 389-414 Rejuvenation and Innovation: The Past, Present and Future of Ethical
Literary Criticism
Chen Lizhen
- 415-427 On the Theatricality of Historical Narrative and Mass Heroism in Thomas
Carlyle's *The French Revolution*
Wang Songlin
Jooyoung Kim
- 428-442 The Ecological Value of Georgic Ethic and Its Contemporary
Adaptations: A Case Study of Ted Hughes's Georgic Poetry
Chen Hong
- 443-457 "The New World Order" and Politics of Home in Caryl Phillips's
Narrative of Transatlantic Diaspora
Xu Bin
Liu Peng
- 458-469 The Impact of Globalization on the Narrative Tradition Reflected from
the Ba Man Jin Bao Porcelain Vase: The Transition from an Acquaintance
Society to a Stranger Society
Fu Xiuyan
- 470-481 *Jill*: A novel on Brain Text and Novel Writing
Chen Xi
- 482-493 Wallace Stevens and Ethical Writing of Tea
Ma Xiaoli
- 494-503 Female Physical Transformation and Subjectivity Construction in
Metamorphosis Myths: The White-Snake Lady and Lamia
Zhang Xin
Lai Qilin
- 504-515 Intergenerational Trauma and Memory Writing in *Herzog*
Liu Xiying
- 516-527 The Declaration of White Supremacy: A Study on Eugenic Racism
Reflected in Thomas Dixon's "Trilogy of Reconstruction"
Wang Yezhao

- 528-533 A New Approach to Shakespeare: A Review of *Shakespeare in the Post-war English Drama*
Nie Zhenzhao
- 534-540 The Conflict and Intergration of Historical Factuality and Literary Fictionality: On Lucia Boldrini's *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction*
Yuan Xuesheng
- 541-551 Transborder, Intercommunication and Innovation: A Review of *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*
Li Minrui
- 552-558 A Review of *Perversion's Beyond. Life at the Edge of Knowledge* by Torgeir Fjeld
Jørgen Veisland

目 录

- 389-414 复兴与创新：文学伦理学批评的过去、现状与未来
陈礼珍
- 415-427 论卡莱尔《法国革命》历史叙事的戏剧性及群众英雄主义
王松林
金周英
- 428-442 农事伦理的生态价值及其当代变化：以特德·休斯的农事诗为例
陈 红
- 443-457 归属焦虑与“世界新秩序”：卡里尔·菲利普斯跨大西洋流散的后殖民叙事
徐 彬
刘 鹏
- 458-469 从八蛮进宝瓷瓶看全球化进程对叙事传统的冲击：兼论熟人社会向陌生人社会的转型
傅修延
- 470-481 《吉尔》：脑文本与小说创作
陈 晞
- 482-493 华莱士·史蒂文斯与茶的伦理书写
马晓俐
- 494-503 人兽变形神话中的女性身体改造与主体性建构：拉弥亚与白娘子
张 欣
赖琦琳
- 504-515 《赫索格》中的代际创伤与记忆书写
刘兮颖
- 516-527 白人至上主义的宣言书：释读托马斯·狄克逊“三部曲”中的优生学种族主义思想
王业昭

- 528-533 莎士比亚研究新路径: 评陈红薇教授的《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》
聂珍钊
- 534-540 历史性与文学性的冲突与融合——评露西娅·波尔德里尼的《他人的自传: 历史主体与严肃小说》
袁雪生
- 541-551 跨界、交融与创新: 《跨界的非自然叙事: 跨国与比较视域》介评
李敏锐
- 552-558 评托尔盖·弗杰尔德的《变态的来世今生: 生活在知识的边缘》
乔根·维斯兰德

Rejuvenation and Innovation: The Past, Present and Future of Ethical Literary Criticism

Chen Lizhen

Abstract: The year of 2019 marks the 15th anniversary of Ethical Literary Criticism. As “the father of Chinese Ethical Literary Criticism,” Professor Nie Zhenzhao initiated Ethical Literary Criticism in China in the year of 2004. Since then, the new critical paradigm has gained more and more attention in the global intellectual community. Ethical Literary Criticism fulfils the goal of the rejuvenation of traditional ethical criticism in literature. More importantly, it is defined and distinguished by the trail-blazing courage for theoretical innovation. Over the past 15 years, many scholars have been making great efforts to tap the potential, sharpen the critical edge and expand the boundary of the theory. Ethical Literary Criticism aims to encourage the discussion of ethical value in literature and criticism. In this interview, 8 distinguished scholars, including Claude Rawson (Yale University, USA), Knut Brynhildsvoll (University of Oslo, Norway), Youngmin Kim (Dongguk University, South Korea), Wolfgang G. Müller (Friedrich-Schiller University of Jena, Germany), Igor Shaytanov (Russian State University for the Humanities, Russia), Jüri Talvet (University of Tartu, Estonia), Galin Tihanov (Queen Mary University of London, UK) and Tsuyoshi Namigata (Kyushu University, Japan), evaluate the significance of the rise of Ethical Literary Criticism by tracing the history, commenting on the recent developments and depicting a vision for the prospect of this theory.

Key words: Ethical Literary Criticism; contributions; International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism; global intellectual community

Author: **Chen Lizhen** is professor of English literature, Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences, Deputy Dean of the Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou Normal University (Hangzhou 311121, China). He is mainly engaged in the studies of British literature and culture, ethical literary criticism and narrative theory (Email: lizhenchen@hznu.edu.cn).

标题: 复兴与创新: 文学伦理学批评的过去、现状与未来

内容摘要: 文学伦理学批评到今年已走过 15 年历程。聂珍钊教授被誉为“中国文学伦理学批评之父”, 他在 2004 年首次提出将文学伦理学批评作为一种

新的批评方法。这种新的批评范式迅速在国际学界收到广泛关注。文学伦理学批评既是对传统伦理批评的复兴，更是以决意创新的勇气构建了较为系统的理论体系。文学伦理学批评旨在鼓励探讨文学和批评中的伦理价值。在过去 15 年中，学界致力于发掘文学伦理学批评的新潜能、新锋芒和新疆界。克劳德·罗森（耶鲁大学，美国）、克努特·布莱恩西沃兹威尔（奥斯陆大学，挪威）、金英敏（东国大学，韩国）、沃尔夫冈·穆勒（耶拿大学，德国）、伊戈尔·奥列格维奇·沙伊塔诺夫（俄罗斯国立大学，俄罗斯）、居里·塔尔维特（塔尔图大学，爱沙尼亚）、加林·提哈诺夫（伦敦大学玛丽女王学院，英国）、波濤刚（九州大学，日本）等八位国际知名学者通过本文追溯了文学伦理学批评的历史，评价了现状，并对未来提出期许。

关键词：文学伦理学批评；贡献；国际文学伦理学批评研究会；全球学界

作者简介：陈礼珍，杭州师范大学英语文学教授、人文社科部部长、科学研究院副院长。主要研究领域为英国文学与文化、文学伦理学批评、叙事学理论。

Chen Lizhen: As a platform for scholars all over the world, the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism, along with Zhejiang University, will host the 9th Convention of the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism in this November. The previous conventions were held in China, South Korea, Estonia, UK and Japan. This is a significant move to push forward the intellectual exchange between China and the world.

Claude Rawson (Maynard Mack Professor of English at Yale University, USA, Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, president of IAELC): The international status of Ethical Literary Criticism has been demonstrated and consolidated for some years in the conventions held in different parts of the world. I think its value lies not principally as a codified doctrine but as a body of practice that encourages scholars to engage in a primary relationship with literary texts.

Chen Lizhen: The 20th century witnessed the rise and prosperity of many critical theories. All of these theories are like different chapters in a great book of literary criticism. A new trend of critical theory is a destroyer as well as preserver, blazing new trails out of the institutionalized critical practice and providing inspiration for the generation of future theories. As a well-established critical theory, Ethical Literary Criticism becomes a famous intellectual endeavor in China and a noticeable critical trend all over the world. How do you understand the phrase “what belongs to a nation belongs to the world”?

Claude Rawson: In my view, the primary value of a good literary theory is that it

transcends theoretical discourse in favour of an unmediated approach to the full human and aesthetic content of a literary text. The ethical content of Ethical Literary Criticism lies strongly in its freedom from prescriptive or definitional straitjackets. Its rootedness in primal human myth, as described by Nie Zhenzhao's writings, is best read as a recall to heart of the matter centrality. In this sense, as well as in Nie Zhenzhao's recourse to a wide international range of primary mythic patterns, it certainly (and indeed very suggestively) belongs not to a nation but to the world.

Chen Lizhen: As president of the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism, what expectations do you have for scholars to achieve in the field of Ethical Literary Criticism in the future?

Claude Rawson: Provided the principles I have enunciated above are met with an enlightened pluralism and a sensitive empirical approach to the human documents that we call literary texts, I have the highest expectations of the success of Ethical Literary Criticism in restoring to literary study a sense of its intellectual seriousness. Nie Zhenzhao's personal activism as a promoter of international conferences and professional journals is the surest guarantor of this promise.

Chen Lizhen: As a distinguished scholar in Norway, you have published many books and papers on Henrik Ibsen. This great playwright exerted a great influence on 20th century Chinese literature. His moral seriousness and critical vigor are absorbed into the tradition of modern Chinese drama. Currently Chinese intellectual community tries to approach Henrik Ibsen from the focalization of Ethical Literary Criticism, which is defined by a self-consistent theoretical framework and innovated terms. Compared with the tradition of moral criticism in Europe, what will this critical method bring to the interpretation of this classical writer?

Knut Brynhildsvoll (Professor of North European literature at the University of Oslo, former Director of Ibsen Studies Center, vice president of IAELC): It is an interesting question. I am aware that Ibsen's plays have influenced the development of speech theater in China. Especially his social dramas have attracted much attention because of their questioning the double standards of moral behavior, exercised by people in the male population at Ibsen's time. In western countries one usually approaches moral questions with their point of departure in contemporary philosophy. Many Ibsen researchers have emphasized the affinity between Ibsen and the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard and claimed that Ibsen has brought Kierkegaard's existential philosophy on the stage. Even though Ibsen always denied having ever read Kierkegaard, Ibsen experts don't trust his words. In their opinion Ibsen is

one of the founders of the existential drama with strong moral implications. Professor Nie in his *An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* has launched a method, which evaluates literary texts from the moral point of view. Ethical Literary Criticism has so far not existed as a separate discipline of literary research. It has traditionally been an inherent part of literary texts and as such an indicator of deciding questions of good or bad. It is professor Nie's merit that he has renewed and in a consistent way made explicit how to enable ethical readings of literary texts. It will be the task of future literary research to prove how influential professor Nie's theory will be in the field of Ibsen research.

Chen Lizhen: Your paper "Self-referential Aspects of Ethical Literary Criticism" tries to take your point of departure in the contradiction "good/bad," which is adopted from moral philosophy. The self-referential components of literary representation play an important role in the formation of a "good" work of art. Ethics forms a vital perspective in literature. It can be approached, however, from many other ways. Then how should we achieve a good balance between ethical negotiations and other functions like contextual, designative and cognitive aspects in literary criticism?

Knut Brynhildsvoll: Ethical Literary Criticism is a method which regularly pays attention to the content and the figures of literary works, not that much to the composition and formal structure. The ethical attitude normally manifests itself in good and responsible actions and emphasizes the positive potentials of human life. In order to avoid the decline into the field of soap opera and Bollywood intrigues one must consider the difference between the moral and the aesthetic meaning of what is good. Today one can hardly overlook that leading authors in their books deal with unethical topics, with crises and conflicts in the field of war and warfare, ecology, economy, environment, natural catastrophes, hunger episodes etc., almost everything triggered off by men themselves. Nevertheless Ethical Literary Criticism is prepared to include such topics in a proper way. Then it is important to notice that even the most terrible incidents may be described in a good or even outstanding way. And so it makes sense to claim that the whole range of unethical literary descriptions still are subject to ethical literary analyses. Of course it is a matter that one can approach today's social conflicts and their literary forms of expression with the point of departure in several literary methods. In order to achieve a higher degree of analytical precision it may as well be advantageous when two or more analytical methods supply each other in illuminating a complex literary text.

Chen Lizhen: Many scholars in China and abroad are dedicated to creating new terms and consolidating the fundamentals of Ethical Literary Criticism. It is a great academic project of the global intellectual community, for the global intellectual community and by the global intellectual community. If we take a look at the future of Ethical Literary Criticism, what can be done to push forward the limits of its theoretical boundary?

Knut Brynhildsvoll: As far as I know, Professor Nie's theory of Ethical Literary Criticism mostly has been tested on novels and short stories. Implemented in his theory is however a lasting conflict between the civilized and the animalistic principle of the human mind, expressed and visualized through the figure of the sphinx, half man, half animal. In order to extract all dimensions of this split figure I recommend throwing a glance at the modifications of this mythology from Sophocles' Oedipus Rex to Henrik Ibsen's Peer Gynt. I imagine that it may be profitable to extend the genre perspective and include the drama as an additional study subject. The reason is obvious. The structure of the traditional drama is founded on tension. And the tension expresses itself through dialogues, in which contrasting efforts and different opinions are being exchanged. The dialogues articulate meaning through an exchange of dualistic arguments and are in a way a linguistic reflection of the sphinx's ambiguity. Thus it seems to me that Ethical Literary Criticism is a sensitive scale to measure the biodiversity of human life. The totality of human psychophysiology consists of a mixture of good and bad, of man and beast. It is impossible to recognize what is good without comparing it with what is its opposite, the absence of the good. That's one of the reasons why Ethical Literary Criticism is not only a method in literary research, but also an inspiring model for writers who want to discuss the decline of human virtues on the background of ethical values, theoretical as with moral values.

Chen Lizhen: As a distinguished member of Korean intellectual community, you came into contact with Chinese Ethical Literary Criticism and IAELC many years ago. You have facilitated the academic exchanges and cooperation between China and Korea. Ethical Literary Criticism found its way to approach Korean culture and academic research and in return benefited a lot from Korean scholars. The 5th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism was held in Dongguk University, Seoul, South Korea in 2015. It was an important move for the globalization of Chinese Ethical Literary Criticism. Korean scholars embraced the theory with enthusiasm and enriched it with the critical insight of Korean culture. Previously you mentioned that you have noticed some new advancement in the study of Ethi-

cal Literary Criticism in South Korea over the past decade.

Youngmin Kim (Distinguished Research Professor Emeritus at Dongguk University, Korea, Jack Ma Chair Professor of Ma Yun Education Fund at Hangzhou Normal University, China, Editor-in-Chief of *Journal of English Language and Literature of Korea*, vice-president of IAELC): In 2004, the concept of Ethical Literary Criticism, informed by ethical criticism in the USA, was initiated by Prof. Nie Zhenzhao in China and thereafter has achieved the currency value as theory and methodology in literature studies among Chinese scholars. The International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism (IAELC) was launched, after the 2nd International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism at Yichang in December 2012. As an international literary and cultural organization, IAELC aims to link all those working in Ethical Literary Criticism in theory and practice and to encourage the discussion of ethical value in literary creation and criticism, dealing with the critical issues and agendas concerning the value of literature.

Initiated by the establishment of the IAELC, this movement of Ethical Literary Criticism has now outreached beyond the local boundary of mainland China to the international realm after Ningbo (2013) and Shanghai (2014) Conference: Seoul (2015), Tartu (2016), London (2017), Kyushu (2018), Hangzhou (2019). In 2015, the 5th IAELC international convention, cohosted by IAELC, East-West Comparative Literature Association of Korea, Korean Philosophical Society, and Institute of Trans Media World Literature of Dongguk University, was held at two locations in South Korea: Dongguk University in Seoul (October 2-4) and Busan National University in Busan (October 5-6). Funded by the National Research Foundation and the Ministry of Education of the Korean government, this international conference marked as the beginning of the global IAELC International Conference. The conference theme was “Transnational Ethical Literary Criticism: Humanities in Korea, China, and the World.” The attendance of global literary scholars and critics, and national/ comparatist or world literature specialists, ranging from China and Korea and elsewhere was telling: 35 keynote speakers, including 26 distinguished foreign scholars who represent 20 different countries, 200 Chinese scholars from all regions of mainland China, and 200 Korean scholars. More than 300 hundred papers were read: 35 papers by the keynote speakers (8 Chinese, 7 Korean, 20 foreign scholars other than Chinese and Korean), 200 papers by Chinese scholars and 100 papers by Korean scholars were presented. Besides, 9 special sessions for specified themes, such as “Ethics and the Humanities,” “Ethics of Self and Other,” “Ethical Literary Criticism & National vs Global Literatures,” “Ethics of Drama,” “Ethics of Poetry,” “Ethical Literary Criticism,” finalized by the Round Table Discussion, created the

landmark event for authentic intellectual milieu of SYMPOSIUM on the Ethical Literary Criticism as its original meaning of “intellectual festival” signifies.

The collaborative effort of 35 distinguished keynote speakers from 6 continents provoked Korean literary scholars, critics, and comparatists to further delve into the concepts and new approaches to literature studies in the context of Ethical Literary Criticism. Since the 5th IAELC International Conference, Korean scholars began to investigate the working hypotheses and principles of Ethical Literary Criticism and to apply the methodological terms to the readings of the Western and Eastern canonical/ noncanonical comparative texts. The conference has provided the momentum for the turning point for establishing Ethical Literary Criticism in Korea. The representative papers presented by Korean scholars at the 2015 conference include: “Ethics of Image” by Youngmin Kim (Dongguk University, Seoul, Korea); “Keeping ‘Love Far Away’: Ethics for Otherness in Troubadours” by Minwoo Yoon (Yonsei Univ., Korea); “The Ethics of Causal Necessity in Greek Tragedy” by Woo Soo Park (Hankuk U of Foreign Studies, Korea); “The Motif and Ethics of Migration in Modern Japanese Literature: Focusing on Arishima Takeo” by Inseop Shin (Konkuk Univ., Korea); “When Alice Meets Nam June Paik: Homo Interactus and a Poetics of Dignitinfinity” by Kyoo Lee (City Univ. of New York, USA); “BIFF (Busan International Film Festival) and Its Vision” by Chanil Jeon (BIFF Institute, Korea); and “The Total Collection of Criticism” by Wangju Lee (Pusan National University, Korea), to name a few. Initiated by these papers, the Ethical Literary Criticism, situated in the combined context of ethics of reading and world literature, have found its niche in the field of literary studies in Korea, creating a new environment, reading the foreign/domestic materials of literary discourses from a new perspective.

The Seoul/Busan Global Conference has provoked the convergence of the ethical literary studies and the humanities at large in the major universities in Korea, including Konkuk University, Korea University, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yonsei University, and Dongguk University, in particular. In the era of the so-called 4th Industrial Revolution, these universities dispatch increasing number of researchers and Ph. D. students as delegates to the IAELC Conferences at Tartu, London, and Kyushu after they were granted with national funds from the National Research Foundation of Korea, such as Humanities Korea Project (Konkuk University), Brain Korea Project (Korea University and Yonsei University), and Global Research Network Project (Dongguk University). The research centers of each university have been challenging progressively against the high-tech oriented humanities in the era of the 4th Industrial Revolution, and has been creating the convergent

atmosphere of the humanities at large, by interlinking literature, art, history, and philosophy with digital humanities (Dongguk University) and mobility humanities (Konkuk University), although the basis of this current trend of interdisciplinarity lies in the Ethical Literary Criticism as their commitment to the cause of IAELC manifests.

Chen Lizhen: As a leading scholar in South Korea and vice president of the IAELC, you devoted yourself to the study of Ethical Literary Criticism. In your mind, what are the defining qualities and most intriguing part of the theory of Ethical Literary Criticism?

Youngmin Kim: For the past decades in the scholarly context of China, the definition of human nature has been vague and confusing under the influence of Chinese traditional moral values and the western concepts of human nature. Prof. Nie Zhenzhao in his *An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* offers a new approach to literature studies both in China and abroad. In this award-winning book selected by NSFC (National Science Foundation of China), Nie Zhenzhao provides a critique, arguing that “both Darwin and Engels failed to make a fundamental distinction between man and animals though explained where human beings have come from” (34). He then proposes that natural selection is only initiating the step to help human being find out who they are in a biological sense and that ethical selection differentiates human beings from animals. By turning to the origin myth of archetypal human beings, Adam and Eve, from the Bible, Prof. Nie’s point is that “the consequential ability acquired to tell good from evil from eating the forbidden fruit helps Adam and Eve to complete their ethical selection and become human beings not only in biological sense but also in ethical sense” (35). To Prof. Nie, the story of Adam and Eve represents the vital role of ethical selection.

In a keynote speech in 2015 Seoul/Busan IAELC Global Conference, he made a distinction between the nature of human being and human nature, defining the former succinctly as “animal instinct or natural instinct” and the latter as “the moral and ethical awareness of human being.” Further Prof. Nie conceptualizes “human nature” in three main features: 1) human nature belongs only to man; 2) human nature is acquired, not innate; and 3) human nature is shaped in certain ethical environments and perfected by moral teachings as the result of ethical selection. What Nie attempts to do is to define the human nature based upon the idea of “moral teaching” which is “the basic environment for man to achieve human nature” (Nie, “Ethical Literary Criticism” 56) .

One thing I and my Korean colleagues have found intriguing in this moral

teaching in achieving human nature is “Sphinx factor,” which represents “an exploration of the mystery of why a man is such a being” (Nie, *Introduction* 36) and “is composed of two parts—human factor and animal factor” (Nie, *Introduction* 38). In fact, Nie structurates inventive Chinese idiosyncratic representations of the psychosomatic convergence of human body and the psyche, the representations which are closely related to the German Freudian model of “aesthetics of sublimation” of the primary double tripartite id-ego-superego and conscious-preconscious-unconscious as well as to the French Lacanian politics of representation of the secondary tripartite imaginary-symbolic-real order. Nie’s representations revive the literary studies in an ethical dimension, and demonstrate “the various combinations and alternations of human factor and animal factor” which generate a variety of “ethical events and ethical conflicts” in literary works, thus conveying “different moral implications” (Nie, *Introduction* 38). Human factor equals to “ethical consciousness embodied by the human head,” while animal factor is human being’s “animal instinct, which is mainly controlled by their primitive desires” (Nie, *Introduction* 39). In this way, Sphinx Riddle represents the ethical selection in that it refers to the after-step of the natural selection for the human beings to ruminate over what they have done during the natural selection.

Chen Lizhen: On many occasions you have mentioned that we need to illuminate the working hypotheses and principles of Ethical Literary Criticism as well as to apply the methodological terms to the close/distant readings of the western and eastern canonical/ noncanonical texts. If we put Ethical Literary Criticism into the context of world literature, how can we reconcile ethics with politics in a comparative study of contemporary world literature?

Youngmin Kim: In the Proceedings of the The 5th IAELC Global Conference at Seoul/Busan in 2015, I opened my greeting remarks by introducing the concept “border” in between the inside and the outside of our mind and the body as follows:

Human beings are positioned in the conscious which is the realm of the logic and the daily life as well as in the unconscious which is structured like a language. Then, language in relation to the conscious and the unconscious constitutes the space of the self and the Other. In writing, the discourse of the self and the Other is constructed mostly in the unconscious space of the writer. As a result, the external Other in writing becomes the space within the subject, which inheres in temporality or historicity. Thus, the speaking or writing subject is always already positioned within the structure of discourse. The

tradition of discourse is the fundamental structure which regulates culture and simultaneously the order which gives unconscious impact upon the subject. Therefore, as far as the Other is situated within the self, the linguistic structure has always already existed in the form of the unconscious. The nature of the Other is structured like Moebius strip without distinctive borderline between the inside and the outside. (Kim 1)

Between two zones or regions, one has to cross across, beyond, or “through,” the line to the other side of the starting point. The line “may expand and thicken to become” regions of the boundary between race, gender, class, on the one hand and among languages, cultures, and nations, on the other hand. If one limits the scope of the boundary, these regions become distinct and separate fields of research: literature, culture, geography, and translation. Our mind and body is the interior and the exterior of the skin. Therefore, we as the reader have to look into the mind and to be outside of the mind simultaneously so that we can overlook the shape of the body which provides the structure of the mind as the container. Language is the medium to cross over the borderline of the skin freely.

In this context, aesthetics belong to the way we look at the things we see, while ethics to the way how we reflect upon both what we have seen and the way we have seen. Politics is located in the threshold or in-between. Literary texts represent the things we read and reflect. Then, how do we read and provide the criticism? In the readings of the western and eastern canonical/ noncanonical texts from the comparative/world literature, what one needs to know in this world of big data of literary texts is that we have to have some strategic understanding of such huge amount of knowledge.

I would suggest the Freudian aesthetics of sublimation, Lacanian politics of representation, and ethics of distancing as the strategical methods, for enhancing further Nie’s Ethical Literary Criticism which provides the structure and modus operandi of the ethics of reading. In fact, we need a collaborative effort to create an ethical reading community in terms of Derridian “supplementation.”

In a debate between Gayatri Spivak and David Damrosch which was delivered at The American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA) Convention in Vancouver, Canada, on April 2, 2011, Gayatri Spivak gives a voice to the death of the comparative literature as a discipline, and she simultaneously articulates in her typical supplementing way her figuring out of “the exact shape of a place that is empty in what is to be supplemented, zooming out, but not in competition with zooming in,” always “crossing the border” in the newly resurrected form of “world

literature.” In fact, in the debate, Spivak, unintentionally in a fragmentary mode, expresses the exact nature of “cultural translation” in relation to “world literature.” The keyword for her discussion is “supplementing”:

We might, then, as a globally dispersed and diversified collectivity, supplement that seemingly practical will to hold the world in a grid. I don’t mean survey courses; I mean the presuppositions of world literature. Supplementing, remember, is to figure out the exact shape of a place that is empty in what is to be supplemented, zooming out, but not in competition with zooming in. (Spivak 468)

I would argue that the rationale for the logic and perspective of this scale, hailing “the birth of a new Comparative Literature,” comes from the ethics of “cultural translation” in world literature. The wall of untranslability across languages and cultures in the networks of world literature will be left open if the reader/writer engages with the difficulties and strangeness in endurance and suffering in the collaborative act of cultural translation.

National literary space of the vernacular language is always already the bordered arena of those struggles or battles over the definition of literature, over technical or formal transformations and innovations against the external linguistic environment. What is at stake is how translators/interpreters as literary critics and scholars mediate between national languages, in particular, literary languages. Translation creates the art of “distancing” by creating a way of situating oneself aesthetically neither too near nor too far. In this regard, the image of geographic scale of world literature becomes more and more a set of distinct platforms upon which geopolitics and other social phenomena are performed. World systems theory posits the global sphere as the most important scale. Locality studies have privileged the local as the scale at which meaning or lived experience is constructed. The paradoxical positions taken on local, national, and global scales were starting points for much of the critical discourse on scale. Ethical Literary Criticism will be the major critical endeavor in the 21st century, the era of political vortex to prepare the readers/writers in the field of literature and the humanities for the pickup lines of understanding the ethical human nature.

Chen Lizhen: Germany is a great country with a bright history of philosophy. A galaxy of philosophers like Kant, Hegel and Heidegger have made significant contributions to the study of ethics. In your mind, what are the greatest differences be-

tween Chinese Ethical Literary Criticism, which is led by Professor Nie Zhenzhao, and the traditional German ethical criticism in literature?

Wolfgang G. Müller (Professor of English Literature at Friedrich-Schiller University of Jena, Germany, vice president of IAELC) : In your question you refer to the rich history of philosophy in Germany with philosophers like Kant, Hegel and Heidegger, who have made significant contributions to the theory of ethics. I will first highlight a few exemplaric positions of German philosophers which are relevant to ethics and then proceed to a definition of ethical criticism and a comparison between this kind of criticism in Germany and China. I will begin with Kant's categorical imperative (1785), which says that a human action should always be performed in accordance with the maxim that this action should qualify as being founded on a wished for universal moral law. Another Kantian principle, which is related to the categorical imperative, is the idea that human dignity is inviolable, an idea which implies freedom and free will. The dignity of man is the fundamental principle of the German constitution. At its beginning it states that human dignity is inviolable and that it is the duty of all state authority to respect and protect it. A philosophical maxim, which belongs to the whole world, Western and Eastern, is the "golden rule" of treating others as you want to be treated yourself. This ethic of reciprocity forms the key of Arthur Schopenhauer's ethics in the fourth part of his *The World as Will and Representation* (1818), which represents a counter-position to Kant's ethics of duty. Schopenhauer, who was deeply influenced by Indian philosophy, includes animals in his ethics of mercy. A provocative maxim which has profound ethical implications is Theodor W. Adorno's dictum in *Minima Moralia*, "There is no right life in a wrong one." (Adorno 43) Since dilemma situations are of great significance in ethical criticism, particularly in Chinese studies, Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz' (1646-1716) early writings on natural law can be referred to, which present a plethora of dilemma situations arising from limited saving resources in cases of emergency. We must be grateful for philosophers' clear-sightedness in their studies of the nature and varieties of ethical problems and situations. But philosophy has its limitations, since it usually has no competence transcending abstract speculation and rationalization. In philosophy insight or cognition is the result of a rational examination and analysis of fundamental issues, performed by devices such as definition, argument and deductive reasoning, while in literature insight or cognition is the result of the representation of events and conditions and feelings analogous to the real-life world of facts. For example, philosophy can define ethically charged situations such dilemmas on an abstract level, pointing out possible courses of action, while literature represents them on the experiential level

of the life of characters who find themselves in precarious or even desperate situations, inviting readers to empathize.

It is not possible to summarize the triumphal march of ethical criticism in the last decades, which began with postmodern criticisms and produced literature-oriented philosophers like Martha Nussbaum, but it is necessary to appreciate the rise of ethical criticism in China and other Asian countries, which represents a special variety of a world-wide phenomenon. As always there is no point in generalizing. It is more fruitful to choose an outstanding example, namely Shang Biwu's recent article (2018) on Ian McEwan's *Nutshell* (2016), which investigates the ethical dimension of this novel with a precision and deep-searching intensity as it seems to have been impossible in earlier criticism. This is of course the result of the author's unusual sensitivity to the moral implications of literature and of his narratological expertise, but it is also owed to a cultural climate, which is strongly influenced by the theory of Nie Zhenzhao, who maintains that literature represents humans suspended in their ways of living and decision-making between good and evil or vice and virtue and may contribute to creating a higher level of ethical consciousness and ultimately attaining a higher degree of humanity. Western and particularly German ethical criticism has not so far-reaching aims, but it is connected with Chinese endeavors in that it believes that the exploration of the ethical complexity of literary works may increase the cognitive capacities of the readers and open their eyes anew at the condition of human life (the *conditio humana*), as it is articulated at the end of Melville's *Bartleby the Scrivener*: "Ah, *Bartleby*! Ah, humanity!" (Melville 34) An earlier famous example of world literature is the moment in Dante's *Divina Commedia*, when, having heard, in the Second Circle of Hell, the touching story of the adulterous love of Francesca and Paolo, Dante sinks down in a faint.

Chen Lizhen: What to we talk about when we talk about ethics in English literature? Shakespeare, Milton, John Donne, Jane Austen, T.S. Eliot and other great writers always present a complicated and ambiguous vision of human nature. It's not easy to break away from the complication of essentialism and oversimplification. Ethical Literary Criticism should keep its distinctive characteristics and stay as an innovative and efficient method to facilitate our interpretation of literary texts.

Wolfgang G. Müller: You are right in saying that great literature sharpens our awareness of the complexity and ambiguity of human nature or, putting it more concretely, of the conflicting impulses and motives clashing in a person's mind in situations of distress, doubt and dilemma. However, it is my deep conviction that ethical criticism cannot remain at the level of content and satisfy itself with identi-

fying and analyzing the ethical substance of literary works. Staying at the content level would necessarily lead to the “oversimplification” of which you speak. If one could, for example, summarize the message of a literary work in a neat formula, the work itself would be dispensable. This is actually a danger to which many Wikipedia articles succumb. The complexity characterizing great works, which tends to be ethical complexity, is the result of art. You cannot have ethical intricacy in a text without aesthetic complexity. This is confirmed by the works of the authors you mention, William Shakespeare, John Donne, John Milton, Jane Austen and T. S. Eliot. If Nie Zhenzhao speaks of literature as an art dealing with ethics, I would relate the term art to the insoluble interdependence of art and ethics in literature, which to work out is the critic’s task.

I will briefly adduce two examples to illustrate this state of things. A crucial moment in Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* occurs when the protagonist, infuriated after having got evidence of his stepfather’s having perpetrated the murder of his father, comes upon him when he is praying. This offers a perfect opportunity for taking revenge. He draws his sword, resolved to kill him, but sheathes it again, arguing with himself that he would send his enemy’s soul to heaven when killing him during prayer. He would rather kill him during a sinful act (*in flagranti*), so that he would go hell. One could argue that here we encounter an ethically unsoiled hero who is not capable of premeditated murder. But on the other hand he curses his enemy in the most radical way, even arrogating to himself the power, which is actually God’s privilege, to send his soul to hell. Here we see the complexity and contradictoriness of his character, an intricate tangle of motives which could never be represented in philosophical discourse. To choose a less tragic example, the protagonist of Jane Austen’s *Persuasion*, Anne Elliot, faces the problem of saving her family’s hopeless financial situation by marrying the apparently impeccable heir to the family’s estate. It is her moral intuition which causes her to make the right decision and reject the suitor, who ultimately turns out to be an extremely dubious character. It is Austen’s superior art of narrative perspective which gives moral profile to the problem in question, which is again a representation of ethical issues which is beyond the reach of philosophical discourse. There is a danger in ethical criticism to primarily focus on encounters with guilt, vice, crime, hypocrisy and lying. Jane Austen’s novels manage to set out in the most unobtrusive, elegant and stylistically assured way not only social vices, but also social virtues. Her works are a triumph of the aesthetic representation of matters of deep ethical significance. This is what they have in common with Shakespeare’s comedies. Reading her novels provides the deepest aesthetic and ethical satisfaction. Studying them, makes ethical criti-

cism pure pleasure.

Chen Lizhen: Literature is closely related to aesthetics, ethics and other branches of philosophy. The XXIV World Congress of Philosophy, with the theme “Learning to be Human,” was held in Beijing, China, from August 13 to August 20, 2018. Scholars came to share their explorations on the relationship between literature and philosophy. Ethical Literary Criticism was an important part of this event. It is evident and natural to connect the theme of the World Congress of Philosophy with the fundamental judgment of Professor Nie’s moral philosophy “literature is basically an art about ethics.” In order to develop into a well-established theory, Ethical Literary Criticism needs to keep its fundamental principles and open up for new possibilities and diversity of interpretation as well.

Wolfgang G. Müller: The relation between philosophy and literature is of course a special one. In Greek antiquity and for long periods of intellectual history the two disciplines were closely connected. The phenomenon for authors to emerge both as philosophers and literary writers is not rare. Conspicuous examples are Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Benjamin Disraeli, Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre. Additionally, there are narrative works like Voltaire’s *Candide* (1759) and Diderot’s *Jacques le fataliste* (1773), which are called philosophical novels. Novels like Robert Musil’s *The Man without Qualities* (1930-1943), Sartre’s *La Nausée* (1938) and works by Jorge Luis Borges, Umberto Eco and Vladimir Nabokov, which evince a strong philosophical component, are countless. A most interesting recent author is in this respect J. M. Coetzee, whose late novels manifest the philosophical element with increasing intensity, for instance *Elizabeth Costello* (2003) and *Diary of a Bad Year* (2007). It is worth noticing that German philosophers like Peter Bieri (*Das Handwerk der Freiheit. Über die Entdeckung des eigenen Willens / The Craft of Freedom. The Discovery of One’s Own Will*, 2001) and Michael Hampe (*Die Lehren der Philosophie. Eine Kritik / The Doctrines of Philosophy. A Critique*, 2014) have set out the ethical potential of narration and tried to appropriate it to their purposes. Yet though philosophy and literature have been twins through all times and though this kinship is particularly obvious in the field of ethics, I would insist on the distinctness of these two forms of intellectual pursuit. Only if we acknowledge this distinctness, can we appreciate the special contribution literature makes to ethics. Together with the German philosopher Gottfried Gabriel (*Erkenntnis/Cognition*, 2015), I would like to distinguish two complementary types of cognition, first, cognition achieved by the rational exposition and discussion of a problem nexus of the world of facts in philosophy, and second, cognition achieved by the graphic

representation of a fictional analogue of the reality of life in literature. The attempt to establish a solid theory for Ethical Literary Criticism would be a gratifying, but problematic endeavour. One reason for its difficulty would be the fact that literature tends to be ahead of theory and theory has to follow and to adapt itself to literature. My suggestion would be that ethical criticism should be based on knowledge of ethical issues such as dilemma situations, which play an important role in Nie Zhenzhao's theory, but it should also be grounded on an intensive investigation of the aesthetic quality of the verbal work of art, for the craft of verbal art is the condition under which the ethical nature of literature comes into existence.

By way of conclusion, I would once again emphasize the close relationship between ethics in philosophy and ethics in literature. In order to elucidate this kinship it is necessary to make a distinction between moral philosophy and ethical philosophy. As distinct from moral philosophy, which is concerned with the definition and clarification of moral values and principles, ethical philosophy has, since Aristotle's *Ethics*, investigated the problematic nature of ethical terms and judgments. Literature has a greater kinship with ethics than with morality, because it lays the focus on the problematic nature of life and its ethical concerns. It does so by presenting a fictional analogue of reality in the sense of Aristotle's term *mimesis*. Literature shows us a world not as a copy of reality, but as world similar to reality, thus creating a basis for empathy and stimulating the cognitive capacity. Both philosophy and literature spell out the complexity of moral issues, the former on the abstract level of rational discourse, the latter on the experiential level of graphic representation. Dear Professor Chen Lizhen, I thank you very much for asking such good questions.

Chen Lizhen: In the 1910's, Russian Formalism came into being and shocked the world with its revolutionary judgements. It is usually taken to be the first school of modern literary criticism in the 20th century and marks the beginning of the transformation and proliferation of literary theory. Viktor Shklovsky and other critics once advocated a theory of literature that was purified and insulated from morality and ethics. In his late years Shklovsky modified his theory and conceded the omnipresent power of morality and ideology. One century later, Ethical Literary Criticism rises as a literary theory and insists to unite art and life in morality and responsibility. It holds that the value of literature lies in its function of moral teaching. What is your understanding about the ethics of literary forms and its relationship with ideology?

Igor Shaytanov (Professor at Russian State University for the Humanities, Rus-

sia, vice president of IAELC): The divorce with any ideology is most memorable from the early period of the Russian Formalism; this was how they understood their professional ethics — to be honest to their subject at hand and not to distort their research with any material supplementary towards the pure verbal matter. But it was the beginning, and the Formalist theory was practically forced to close by the interference of the outward forces just when they were ready to change and to let in new factors in building up their evolutionary picture. They did not work in ethical terms but what they did to advance the literary study must be—and is—appropriated now by many new trends. Why not in the Ethical Literary Criticism?

Chen Lizhen: Yes. Russian Formalism is really revolutionary in its fundamental principles. Its theoretical legacy is inherited by many new trends. The study of Ethical Literary Criticism is also an intellectual endeavor to enhance our understanding about the inner properties of literature itself. Have you found any new academic breakthroughs in the study of the relationship between literature and ethics in Russia over the past decade?

Igor Shaytanov: In Russia we still have not completely lived down the aftermath of the Soviet experience with its ideological prescriptions, either still skidding in its track, or breaking through by all means. For those who insist on changes and renovation there seems to be nothing they can draw on in the native tradition. They have rallied to the echo of the global poststructural and postmodern ideas unwilling to acknowledge that now these ideas also belong to the past with its non-ethical anti-humanistic turn. Ethics and humanism are still seen as the survivals from the Soviet past, the time and its intellectual atmosphere is changing though.

Chen Lizhen: In your mind, what are the contributions that Ethical Literary Criticism has brought to the global academe in the context of world literature?

Igor Shaytanov: The human can and is brought back into literature and makes the study of literature search for new techniques beyond linguistic, structural, poststructural and deconstructural poetics it had been engaged in for so long. This poetics might be positioned as the poetics of world literature in all the variety of its national and human features caught in the ethical perspective.

Chen Lizhen: Ethics has a very long tradition in many cultures and occupies a central position in our life as well as in literature. Professor Nie Zhenzhao's moral philosophy and literary criticism are characterized for his great creativity in the aspects of the fundamentals, framework and new terms. The vigor of the theory lies in

its solid theoretical foundation and openness for new possibilities. Apart from his key notions of “natural selection” and “ethical selection,” he concentrates on the exploration of the relationship between sciences, the mind and moral significance in recent years. Ethical Literary Criticism, with a theoretical appeal for negotiating tradition and contemporaneity, aims to find a new ballast for the postmodern age.

Jüri Talvet (Professor at University of Tartu, Estonia, Member of Academia Europaea, vice president of IAELC) : I very highly appreciate Professor Nie Zhenzhao’s great initiative of founding in China the International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism and the efforts the IAELC has subsequently made to promote morally orientated research in literary studies and humanities. Indeed, I fully agree with Prof. Nie Zhenzhao’s main postulate: especially since postmodernism settled in during the 1980s, the world’s academia of humanities has increasingly revealed a loss of orientation, being seduced mainly by formalist studies and sociology, it means, moving away from discussing works of literature and arts in their integrity and in their moral impact on societies.

In the depth of postmodern philosophy there has been a strong tendency towards nihilism. As the cruelest tragedies and genocides suffered by humankind along the 20th century were incited and committed by some of the worst dictatorships the world has known, postmodernism’s rejection of “ideological and political “grand narratives” is something natural and understandable. Yet, to adapt these conclusions about “grand narratives” from the sphere of ideology and politics directly to the sphere of culture and humanities would be surely a grave mistake. Creative arts and literature have always been in the forefront of resistance not only against political dictatorships, despotisms, tyrannies, autocracies, militarisms, but also against economic imperialism, which above all has been responsible for violating and destroying nature, the very basis of humankind’s existence.

The great majority of the works celebrated as the canon of world literature have always had a strong moral nucleus. They have discussed ethical issues without euphemisms in relating human rationality and brain activity to love, sexuality, search for freedom. The cult of individualistic passion, as well as rational excesses contradicting nature can both lead to social vice and be the cause of moral decadence. These relations are never simple. Naturally, to discuss these issues, art and literature must have its full freedom of expression. If they let themselves be governed by some established official ideology or cultural fashion, it is likely that their moral sensibility weakens and lets them down.

On the other hand, any kind of literary criticism can develop its theory or philosophy only departing from the experience of primary literary creativity. It should

work *a posteriori*, in respect to creativity, rather than invent models for arts and literature. Differently from the products of hard sciences and technology, the products of creative culture seldom become obsolete. Old great works of literature may sound surprisingly modern and postmodern, just because their moral nucleus has no age. What a century fails to grasp and value in a literary work of the past, may be revealed several centuries later and be appreciated by a large global public.

The great semiotic philosopher Yuri Lotman (1922-1993) who worked at my home university of Tartu, dealt in depth with these questions above all in his last works. He introduced the notion of “semiosphere.” As a large intersection zone between noo-sphere (Greek “noos” meaning reason, intellect) and biosphere, Lotman’s “semiosphere” is above all the cultural ground from which some of the greatest and most original human creativity in arts and literature has emerged. It has a lot to do with the ethical nucleus of literature, as well as with literary criticism that aims at explicating that nucleus.

Especially in alliance with comparative literary research, Ethical Literary Criticism can successfully reveal the moral significance of literary works belonging to the existing canon of world literature, as well as bring to the fore of a wider international audience important works created in languages outside the traditional centric Western cultural triangle (English-French- German).

Chen Lizhen: The 6th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism (2016) was held in collaboration with the Estonian Association of Comparative Literature (EACL) and the Institute of Cultural Research and Arts of the University of Tartu. You must have noticed some new advancement in the study of Ethical Literary Criticism in Estonia or East Europe.

Jüri Talvet: Our Tartu conference was organized conjointly by the IAELC and the Estonian Association of Comparative Literature. It was undoubtedly a success in establishing contacts between Western and Eastern literary scholars. Never before had so many Chinese and Asian scholars taken part in an international conference in Estonia (they were about 60 from China, plus at least a dozen from South-Korea). Yet we must also acknowledge the fact that only some few of our participants were able to discuss issues along the lines of the main topic of the conference – the mutual relations between comparative literature, world literature and Ethical Literary Criticism. It is not only because Ethical Literary Criticism still sounds as something new to the Western ears, but also because comparative literary and world literature research themselves have been pushed to an extremely vague zone in the Western academia. The ICLA (International Association of Comparative Litera-

ture) is still among the world's largest forums of literary scholars, but I doubt if the fashionable interdisciplinary trend has really strengthened the position of literary research, in general. On the contrary, it seems that literary scholarship has become in our days less visible than it was before the "postmodern turn."

Therefore, to fortify the position of literature by means of expanding Ethical Literary Criticism remains a fairly hard task. It faces a lot of inertia and comfortable self-complacency. Thus, for instance, it would be relatively easy to adapt to flourishing mass, genre or entertainment literature the key-notes and key-vocabulary of postmodern narratology or sociology, elaborated in France or the US. A much more serious effort and longer toil is needed to apply comparative research to world literature. For the former activity, English would be fully sufficient, whereas for the latter, relying exclusively on English would mean to voluntarily restrict one's perspective of research.

Chen Lizhen: It's important to seek harmony but not uniformity in the study of ethical literary theory or any other theory. More and more scholars gather around the theoretical ground of Ethical Literary Criticism and make new contributions to its progress. One of the central themes of ethical studies is to find a proper way to address the relationship between "self" and "other." We should pay more attention to the overlooked and silent cultures, which is in fact an ethical move in the age of worlding world literature.

Jüri Talvet: For me, the key issue for all study of literature from the point of view of ethics would be the inclusion of the "other." The great complex of ethical problematics becomes manifest only if we relate "self" to "other." As for the immanent ontology of literary creativity, in some of my recent articles I have treated *aesthetics* as its permanent, irreducible and irrefutable "infra-other." The ethical nucleus (the soul, moral core) of any literary work of value can in my opinion basically be revealed and described in the intersection area of philosophy (including its ideological aspect) and aesthetics (image quality). On the other hand, in parallel with the spread of postmodernism (but not at all overlapping with it!), feminist cultural philosophy has shown a notable rise. Both ideologically and socially, woman has been for long centuries the oppressed and (more often than not) ignored human "other." Feminist studies, thus, if ever they manage to avoid sectarianism, can strongly and vitally support the field of Ethical Literary Criticism.

Yet, from the point of view of cultural and human ecology, it would be even more important for Ethical Literary Criticism to shift its focus to the equally ignored and silenced "other" of humankind's culture — cultures of small and minori-

ty nations and ethnic nationalities. Ethical literary research should not restrict its scope to enhancing the study of these minor literatures as objects of museology, but rather to encourage them to develop their native basis of literary creativity in their mother languages. The more freely the peoples of the world can use their native languages to build up their cultures, the richer would be the spiritual content of our universe and the more chance there would be to defend and redeem life for future times.

Chen Lizhen: The 7th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism (2017) was held successfully at The People's Palace in Queen Mary University of London. The symposia are important academic platforms for scholars to exchange ideas and share their new findings. As far as ethical study in literature is concerned, you must have noticed some new developments in the intellectual community all over the world.

Galin Tihanov (George Steiner Professor of Comparative Literature, Queen Mary University of London, UK, Member of Academia Europaea): The 7th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism (2017) was a wonderful opportunity to bring together scholars of different countries and generations to discuss Ethical Literary Criticism from various intellectual perspectives. Awareness of Ethical Literary Criticism seems to be growing not just in the UK, but also in other countries in the West, and it is now important to engage younger colleagues in the vital endeavour of finding productive points of intersection between Ethical Literary Criticism and other paradigms and approaches in literary studies. The London Symposium was a continuation of the excellent work already undertaken by Professor Nie and his colleagues at previous symposia on Ethical Literary Criticism; it seems essential to me to keep the momentum going and press ahead with a shared research agenda.

Chen Lizhen: On July 31, 2015, William Baker and Shang Biwu published "Fruitful Collaborations: Ethical Literary Criticism in Chinese Academe" in *Times Literary Supplement* (15). In this article, they assert that Ethical Literary Criticism "has become one of the most vibrant and productive critical theories in China," and "has received increasing recognition from eminent scholars." Ethical Literary Criticism is rooted and influenced by traditional Chinese moral criticism. As a literary theory, it takes, however, a new look and blazes a new trail with a solid theoretical basis, a sound framework and innovative notions. In your mind, where lies the most innovative elements for Ethical Literary Criticism?

Galin Tihanov: I think Ethical Literary Criticism is a new response to the

long-standing question about the place literature occupies in the larger domain of culture, historically and structurally. To me, the most innovative aspect of Ethical Literary Criticism is its *longue durée* approach to literature, through the specific lens of cultural, social, and biological evolution. Ethical Literary Criticism could become an exciting intellectual journey through various stages of cultural history, always attentive to the question of the genesis of ethical norms and moral consciousness, and how these change over time. Ethical Literary Criticism probes into how literature captures—or perhaps even shapes—these changes. In a sense, this is the classic Marxist question: does literature merely reflect historical change, or is it instrumental, playing a role of its own, with its own dynamics, in this process?

Chen Lizhen: There is a strong and obvious impulse of moral criticism in the study of English novels. Joseph Addison, Samuel Johnson, Matthew Arnold, Henry James, D.H. Lawrence, F.R. Leavis and many other critics take morality as a key word in their understanding of the art of the novel. If we apply Chinese Ethical Literary Criticism to the study of canonical writers like Jane Austin and Charles Dickens, in what sense can we contribute to the above-mentioned tradition of moral criticism?

Galin Tihanov: Moral criticism has indeed been entrenched in traditional literary studies in England, especially in the Victorian age (you could certainly add John Ruskin to the names mentioned in the question) and during the first half of the twentieth century. It seems to me that Ethical Literary Criticism is valuable in that it seeks not just to revise moral criticism, but to modernise and “update” it for our own time. Think, for example, of the possible alliance between the evolutionary dimension that is so clearly articulated in Ethical Literary Criticism, on the one hand, and the current work in cognitive linguistics and cognitive literary studies, on the other. What is more, Ethical Literary Criticism, despite its emphasis on written texts, is capable of surveying the entire domain of verbal creativity, both modern and premodern (including oral culture, i.e. folklore), seeking to identify the specific place ethics and morality occupy in it. I thus think that Ethical Literary Criticism may have potentially useful things to say not just about the literature of Samuel Johnson’s or Arnold’s or Leavis’s age, but also about earlier (and later) works.

Chen Lizhen: Many scholars in China came to know you by reading your correspondences with Professor Nie Zhenzhao on the issue of Ethical Literary Criticism. You emphasized the importance of interdisciplinary study of Ethical Literary Crit-

icism. There is no doubt that we should affiliate Ethical Literary Criticism with Feminism, Postcolonialism, Postmodernism, Cultural Studies and other theories. The 8th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism (2018) was held at Kitakyushu International Conference Center, Fukuoka, Japan. Interdisciplinary study of Ethical Literary Criticism was an important theme of this symposium. In the context of interdisciplinary study, do you think Ethical Literary Criticism is able to have imminent impact on the study of ethics and literature in Japan?

Tsuyoshi Namigata (Professor at Kyushu University, Japan): Professor Nie Zhenzhao firstly advocated the concept of Ethical Literary Criticism in 2004. Since then, it has been widely accepted and developed among Chinese scholars as theory and methodology in literature studies, for understanding the relationship between human and human, between human and society, and between human and nature in literary works from the ethical standpoint, as well as analyzing the ethical choices of characters, and the changes of ethical identity when they face with the different ethical environments. It was only in recent years that I became involved myself, especially when I started preparations in Kitakyushu City as the organizer of the 8th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism in 2018.

We can know the outline of its theory through Prof. Nie's book *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* (Peking University Press, 2014), and the academic journals such as *Foreign Literary Studies*, *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*, *Forum for World Literature Studies*. More than 10 years have passed since the theory was proposed, and I believe that its basics of theory have been steadily formed. At the symposium held in July 2018, however, literary researchers from not only China, South Korea, and Japan, but also European and American countries joined in the active discussions on Ethical Literary Criticism, which indicated me their passions to continue exploring new topics and refining the theory. I understand this interview is part of such ambitious effort.

Your question concerns my report on the symposium, "Introducing the Theory: Dialogues with Ethical Literary Criticism." I argued that Ethical Literary Criticism needs to be further discussed with current theories of literary criticism, postcolonial criticism, gender criticism, cultural studies, etc. Then I was asked what theory we should consider at first. In order to answer this question, I would like to move forward with discussions over the characteristics of Ethical Literary Criticism, based on the introduction summarized by Doctor Jie Ren, who supported the management of the symposium in Kitakyushu City.

Ethical Literary Criticism is a method of critique to read, analyze, and interpret literature works from the ethical point of view, emphasizing the ethical value

of literature and its teaching functions. It focuses on the following five points. First, what kind of morality did the authors have and how did they express it in their works? Second, what is the relationship between ethical norm in the real world and ethical norm extracted from the text? Thirdly, how did the ethical norm of the text affect readers and society? Fourth, how did the ethical tendencies of the author affect other authors and their works? Fifth, how can the relationship between literature and society and between literature and authors be concluded from the ethical point of view, taking into account the authors' morality and the ethical characteristics of their works?

According to Dr. Ren, Ethical Literary Criticism does not merely criticize literature from the ethical point of view, but also develops criticism from historical materialism, and when analyzing ethical issues, it starts from the viewpoint of historical materialism and finds the ethical value of a work according to the moral code which was in use at that time, instead of following the moral code of today. This viewpoint is in common with the cultural materialism that Raymond Williams and others insisted. Furthermore, in a sense, it is meaningful to once again deepen discussions on postcolonial criticism or gender criticism that point out political correctness from a today's perspective. In particular, when it comes to modern Japanese literature, the problem still remains how to evaluate the attitudes of the Japanese writers ranging from the Meiji and Taisho periods as the spread of imperialism to the latter half of 1930s as the war time, and then to the period of reconstruction after W.W.II. I would like to understand the differences and commonalities between criticism from the perspective of postcolonial theory and criticism from the perspective of ethics.

Chen Lizhen: Ethical Literary Criticism takes “ethical selection” and “ethical choice” as crucial actions to make human being an ethical and social existence. It is often associated with the notion of “ethical predicament.” We can apply these terms to the study of Japanese literature. Will it shed some new light on the interpretation of your canonical literature like *The Tale of Genji*?

Tsuyoshi Namigata: Thank you for asking this thought-provoking question. In relation to this point, there was also the question of what works of Japanese literature are suitable for analysis in Ethical Literary Criticism. This is a very difficult question, needless to say, because there are so many literary works also in Japan, but if I have to point out, one of them is *Takeaki ENOMOTO* (1964), a long novel by Kobo ABE (1924 -1993). In this novel, discussions on “loyalty” and “conversion” concerning Takeaki ENOMOTO, who existed as a political figure from the end of

Edo period to Meiji period, are elaborately conducted. What can we say from an ethical point of view when we relate this issue to actual history or to the situation in Japan in the 1960s? As a long-time researcher of the author, Kobo ABE, I am concerned about this. You mentioned classical works such as *The Tale of Genji*, so if we broaden our viewpoint, we can say that both *The Tale of Genji* which portrays courtly romance, and *The Tale of Heike* which portrays the political rise and fall of the Taira family, can be discussed in Ethical Literary Criticism. Other works that gained popularity in the Edo period, such as *Koshoku Ichidai Otoko* (*The Life of an Amorous Man*) or *Koshoku Gonin Onna* (*The Lives of Five Amorous Women*) by Saikaku IHARA, may also show us the historical unique style of ethics on love affairs which are different from today's literary works, so I think these can be the good subjects for analysis.

Although it may be out of the center of theoretical consideration, Ethical Literary Criticism emphasizes the two aspects of human factor and animal factor. In this regard, Ethical Literary Criticism is interpreted as an attempt to analyze literary works in which the characters confront the “human being” in which reason and desire coexist, and in which they depict conflicts and dramas resulting from such co-existence. If that is the case, I believe that the above works can be considered in the sense that the characters face the possibility and difficulty of selecting their ethical identity, and that they make us think about “humanity.”

Chen Lizhen: Do you have a vision for the future of Ethical Literary Criticism? What should be done to keep it up-to-date and vibrant in the post-theory era?

Tsuyoshi Namigata: You asked for some direction or issue on the future of Ethical Literary Criticism. It is hard for me to answer this question immediately, but since “light novels” have become established and it is not unusual for animated films to be adapted into novels in Japan, I would like to see Ethical Literary Criticism applied not only to literary works that do not fall under the category of the “pure literature” or “canon” in Japan, but also to animated films and other contemporary visual works. Thank you very much for your good questions.

Chen Lizhen: Many thanks to all of you, my dear professors, for your kindness and wonderful answers.

Works Cited

Adorno, Theodor W. *Gesammelte Schriften* 4. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1997.

Baker, William and Shang Biwu. “Fruitful Collaborations: Ethical Literary Criticism in Chinese Aca-

deme." Times Literary Supplement 07. 31(2015): 14-15.

Melville, Herman. "Bartleby the Scrivener." *The Texts of Melville's Short Novels*. Ed. Dan McCall. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 2002. 3-34.

Nie Zhenzhao. *An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.

—. "Ethical Literary Criticism: On Human Nature." *Proceedings of 2015 International Association of Ethical Literary Criticism (IAELC): The 5th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism in Seoul/Busan*. 2015. 56.

Kim, Youngmin. "Ethical Literary Criticism and Literature: Greetings from Chair of 2015 IAELC-Seoul Organizing Committee." *Proceedings of 2015 International Association of Ethical Literary Criticism (IAELC): The 5th International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism in Seoul/Busan*. 2015. 1-2.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Comparative Literature/World Literature: A Discussion with Gayatri Chakravorty." *Comparative Literature Studies* 4 (2011): 455-485.

On the Theatricality of Historical Narrative and the Heroism of the Ordinary People in Thomas Carlyle's *The French Revolution*

Wang Songlin & Jooyoung Kim

Abstract: This essay discusses how narrative theatricality contributes to exposing the heroism of the ordinary people in Thomas Carlyle's *The French Revolution: A History* (1837). Contrary to the traditional grand narrative of history characterized by a linear, systematic and analytic narrative *The French Revolution* re-imagines and enacts history by its distinct traits of narrative theatricality. For Carlyle, historical writing should always take into account the perspective of individuals under consideration, which explains why his focus on historical events of the Revolution is laid not exclusively on any one single and/or dominant group. Instead, he employs a narrative technique that attempts to present the multi-facets of the same event by switching narrative voice from the third person to the first person plural. In this way, Carlyle adds immediacy to the (his)story and dramatizes the performance of the heroism of the ordinary people in the French Revolution. This unusual shifting of multi-perspective narrative augments the simultaneous panorama of history and foregrounds the heroic power of the masses or mobs in Revolution in rewriting history under certain political and social conditions, forming a sharp contrast to Carlyle's former assertion of the dominant power of the aristocratic or elite hero in shaping history. In so doing, the narrative theatricality enhances the effectiveness of the heroism of the common individuals in the Revolution. Indeed, by histrionically engaging the readers into the scenes of the Revolution, Carlyle intends both to celebrate (ambivalently) the coming of democracy and to warn the Victorian aristocracy of the danger of social anarchy that they might have confronted with.

Key words: Carlyle; historical narrative; theatricality; heroism of ordinary people; *The French Revolution*

Authors: Wang Songlin is currently Research Professor of the Academy of Mobility Humanities, Konkuk University, Korea. His research interest includes 19th century English literature, comparative literature and cultural criticism (Email: slwwilliam@126.cm); Jooyoung Kim(corresponding author) is an Assistant

Professor and deputy-director at the Academy of Mobility Humanities, Konkuk University, Korea. Her research interests are Japanese literature, Diaspora, multicultural studies, and mobility humanities (Email: jooyoki@konkuk.ac.kr).

标题：论卡莱尔《法国革命》历史叙事的戏剧性及平民英雄主义

内容摘要：本文以卡莱尔的《法国革命》为例，探讨卡莱尔历史叙事的戏剧性及其与平民英雄主义之关联。传统的宏大历史叙事遵循的是线性的、系统的、分析的叙事方式，卡莱尔在写作《法国革命》时摒弃了这一传统的历史写作范式，他对法国革命进行了重构和重现，他的历史叙事呈现出强烈戏剧性特征。对于卡莱尔来说，历史的书写必须纳入个体的视角。因此，他的历史叙事视角并不仅仅聚焦在某一单一的或主导的群体上。相反，他从多个视角来呈现同一历史事件的不同侧面。《法国革命》的叙事声音会不断地从第三人称转换为第一人称复数，这一手法不仅凸显了（历史）故事的现场感，而且还戏剧性地将读者置身于历史场景，并藉此呈现普通民众的英雄主义行为。这种视角的转换一方面放大了历史的共时全景画面，另一方面也预示了革命中的群众（或群氓）亦可具有英雄的力量并在一定的政治和社会条件下改写人类的历史，而这与卡莱尔之前主张的历史是由贵族（精英）英雄创造的观点形成了反差。由此看来，《法国革命》中历史叙事的戏剧性手法有效地凸显了普通个体的英雄主义。事实上，卡莱尔将读者戏剧性地置身于法国大革命的场景中，表达了一种矛盾心态：他既欢呼民主的到来又担心维多利亚时代的贵族可能陷入像法国大革命那样的混乱和危险之中。

关键词：卡莱尔、历史叙事、戏剧性、平民英雄主义、《法国革命》

作者简介：王松林现为韩国建国大学移动人文研究院研究员，学术兴趣为十九世纪英国文学、比较文学和文化批评；金周英（通讯作者）系韩国建国大学移动人文研究院副教授兼副所长，学术兴趣为日本文学、流散文学、多元文化研究和流动人文研究。

Thomas Carlyle (1795-1881) was a well-known Victorian author. He was also highly controversial, paradoxically regarded as “sage and impious, a moral leader, a moral desperado, a radical, a conservative, a Christian.”¹ Contradictory images of Thomas Carlyle were frequently found in the biographies about him and even up to this century Carlyle is still far from being properly understood. Apart from experts in Victorian literature and culture, not many people refer to Thomas Carlyle as a literary and cultural critic. He is in the mind of many professional experts of history a fictional writer instead of a historian in the strict academic sense, but to many

1 See Ian Campbell, “Thomas Carlyle” <<https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poets/thomas-carlyle>>.

serious fictional writers, he was more of a historian than a novelist. Yet, Thomas Carlyle was undoubtedly an enormous figure in the nineteenth-century intellectual world, as his writings set the terms for an whole Victorian generation and more significantly he was a prophet of the problems in the process of urbanization, democracy and mass culture of the modern world , west and east.

I

Most scholars of English literature tend to take the 19th century simply as a period of having no drama in England, at least from Richard Sheridan to Bernard Shaw. However, this could be a misconception, since we find most of the popular novelists of the 19th century wrote plays, novelists such as Walter Scott, William Makepeace Thackeray, Charles Dickens, George Eliot and so on. Despite the fact that the period suffered from an obvious decline of the theatre, the frequent practices of the novelists' play-writing inevitably left theatrical traces on their novels. As David Kurnick points out, many scholars have "catalogued the thematic and stylistic borrowings that obtained between theatrical and narrative arts in the period" (Kurnick 307). The 19th century novel, as Joseph Litvak correctly argues, shifts from "theater to theatricality" (332) , demonstrating that the theatre can "survive and flourish in a less conspicuous form, reaching into the most unlikely recesses of text" (Litvak 332). Therefore, it would be problematic or contradictory if we make a simple dichotomy between theatre and novel in the 19th century English literature, since theatrical elements were implanted within and interwoven with the novels of this period. However, there were obvious difference and contradictions between the genres of novel and drama, the former demanding a relatively private and subjective reading activity while the latter a more public and sympathetic visual activity. Kurnick (2012) suggests that "perhaps the most important English novelistic meditation on these contradiction was written in German" (307) by Jonhann Wolfan von Goethe, whose *Whilhelm Meisters's Apprenticeship* (1795-96) reached the English readers through Thomas Carlyle's translation in 1824. Kurnick further argues that the novel is significant in literary history for at least two reasons: firstly it was the first example of the *Bildungsroman* that serves as "a pivot between the picaresque fiction of the 18th century and the introspective novels of the 19th century" (307); secondly as a romantic novel *Whilhelm Meister* was also "a meditation on the fact and the fantasy of the theatre" (307). Goethe's first version of the story was about the young man Whilhelm who is fascinated with a collection of marionettes , tracks his attempts to write plays while erotically obsessed with the actress Mariana, and ends with his joining a

professional theatrical troupe, all actions closely related with the theater. Kurnick's observation is right since a glimpse of the opening of the novel is evident enough to show its theatrical concerns. The story begins with the servant old Barbara waiting for her beautiful mistress Mariana who acts as a young officer in the play: "The play was late in breaking up: old Barbara went more than once to the window, and listened for the sound of carriages. She was waiting for Mariana, her pretty mistress, who had that night, in the afterpiece, been acting the part of a young officer, to the no small delight of the public" (Goethe 1). In Goethe's final version of the story he refashioned it as the *Apprenticeship* and added a latter section in which Wilhelm gives up the theatre and starts his journey with hope for a bright future and a sense of social obligation, dedicating himself to what Carlyle in his translator's introduction called "the greatest of all art—the art of life" (Carlyle, "Translator's Preface" xiii-xiv). Carlyle's translation of *Wilhelm Meisters's Apprenticeship* would later become a source of inspiration for his writing of the half-autobiographical novel *Sartor Resartus* as well as the historical book *The French Revolution: A History*, both to more or less extent stylistically possessing evident features of theatricality.

While the critical heritage of Victorian studies has shown enormous scholarly interest in the "theatricality" of Victorian fiction, this paper will expand that focus to include Carlyle's historical writing. Like his novelistic counterparts, Thomas Carlyle integrated pictorial and theatrical modes of representation into his historical writings despite of many historians' complain and denial of such a mode of historical narrative. In *The French Revolution* and *Past and Present*, most particularly, Carlyle employed the mode of theatrical narrative in history writing as the surest means of providing his readers with the lively and enacted history that he promised them in his essays such as "Thoughts on History" and "On History Again." For Carlyle, the traditional mode of grand narrative of history characterized by purely linear and seemingly logical narrative was dead and mechanically stereotyped, while any enacted history "alive, solid, and corporeal and inevitably theatrical one" (Schoch 34). What, then, basically gives rise to Carlyle's ideas of theatricality in his narrative of history? And how does narrative theatricality contribute to dramatizing the performance of the the Heroism of the Ordinary People in the French Revolution?

II

Although it would be difficult to reach a universal agreement concerning the definition, the term "theatricality" could be simply defined as related to the theatre,

or to the performance (dramatic presentations) .However,some ambiguities should be clarified when “theatricality” is applied in this context to illustrate Carlyle’s historical writing. Besides its technological relations to the theatre, another point of discussion here refers to the mixed quality of historical narrative as a prose genre which imitates the performance of the theatre. Lepaludier suggests that when the dramatic elements of historical writing surpass the narrative elements the atmosphere of a certain condition of theatre will be created and “the effects of theatricality will thus be evoked” (18). As Lepaludier rightly notes, when historical writing blends the materials of history and those of drama, it becomes “a sort of versatile hybrid form whose powers should be examined” (Lepaludier 18).

However, theatricality as a critical term still remains controversial. In their co-edited book *Theatricality* (2003) , Tracy C. Davis and Thomas Postlewait discuss several distinct concepts, among them mimesis, antitheatricalism, *theatrum mundi* (“all the world’s a stage”), and ritual, that help to understand the meaning of theatricality. They maintain that these concepts, although related to the term, still fail to define the idea of theatricality. According to Davis and Postlewait, the idea of theatricality seems not to have being systematically approached. They assert that “the idea of theatricality has achieved an extraordinary range of meanings, making it everything from an act to an attitude, a style to a semiotic system, a medium to a message” (Davis &Postlewait 1). Davis and Postlewait question “the defenses and celebrations” (12) that some practitioners and theorists have presented for theatricality, on the base that their concerns are largely on one ideal spectator while ignoring the idiosyncratic manner in which each individual spectator perceives a performance. That is to say, when we are talking about “theatricality” or the stage and the audience (spectator), most of us do not take into account the perspective of individual spectator, hence a failure to achieve a multi-perspective on different facets of the world . In this light, theatricality seems to “stem from the spectator’s awareness of a theatrical intention addressed to him” (Feral 98-99). Davis and Postlewait argue that “both the performer and the spectator are complicit in the mimesis” (6).To illustrate this opinion, Davis focuses on Thomas Carlyle’s notion of theatricality in historical writing and examines “the political and social dimensions of theatricality in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries.”¹

The term “theatricality” was coined by Thomas Carlyle in 1837 to describe the appropriate stance of the historian to observe historical events. According to Sandey Fitzgerald (2015), Carlyle regarded the historian as the “Eye of History”

1 See Elena Siemens, “Theatricality” (review) <<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/218791/summary>>.

whose task was to place momentous events into historical contexts. Theatricality was thus a “mode of perception” specifically to do with the observation of others “under conditions in which the obligation to feel for other predicament was waived in the interests of gaining a better view” (Fitzgerald 31). Fitzgerald suggests that similar conditions could be found both inside or outside the theatre, “although the dependence of the theatre on sympathy for its impact suggests that Carlyle did not see the concept as a theater term” (Fitzgerald 32). But I would argue that Fitzgerald’s understanding of Carlyle’s employment of theatrical techniques could be problematic in that Carlyle’s theatricality, at least in *French Revolution*, is a perception similar to that of the theater which invites both the neutral stance and the sympathetic involvement of the narrator, or in other words, a detached engagement of the audience/ reader. Gullian Russel, in her book *Women, Sociability and Theatre in Georgian London* (2010) endorses Davis’ opinion that Carlyle’s “theatricality” is an anticipation of Brecht’s alienation effect in “meaning a capacity for the reflexivity that is in the concomitant of sympathy and essential for the functioning of public sphere”(Russel 14). In reading *The French Revolution*, as in watching a play in the theatre, we should be able to identify or sympathize with the characters, meanwhile we also need to distance or estrange ourselves in order to recognize our own theatricality “in order to make a space for political and social change”(Russell 14).

Traditionally, critics tend to treat fiction as a mixed narrative mode, a mode which blends the narrative and the dramatic forms, as is evident in many passages of narrative fiction. However, historical writings are supposed to be chronological, documentary, impersonal, analytical and of course not dramatic nor emotional. It is therefore academically inappropriate for historians to allow any imaginative or lyrical element in historical writing. However, when Thomas Carlyle sat down in 1834 to write *The French Revolution*, he challenged the traditional mode of historical narrative by incorporating imagination into his writings. *The French Revolution* thus turned out to be a controversial but innovative book of history filled with elements of theatricality.

III

In September 1834, when Carlyle was writing the first two pages of *The French Revolution*, he wrote to his brother Jack that he was facing the trouble of creating a new style for his book and thinking as if he was writing “an Epic Poem of Revolution.”¹ When *The French Revolution* was published in 1837, Carlyle’s friend

1 See *The Carlyle Letters On Line*, Duke-Edinburgh edition of *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle* <<http://carlyleletters.dukejournals.org/>>.

J.S. Muller soon hailed it as a “great epic”. Today most scholars would still take Carlyle's *The French Revolution* as an epic mainly for the passionate performance of the characters and the dramatic scenario he depicts in the book. However, Carlyle had previously not regarded history as epic, not even as any other form of literature. When he was young he showed great enthusiasm for history, as his Calvinist family and his utilitarian culture had a strong bias against fiction or literature. In the early 1820s, in a letter to his brother he refused to include history as a literary form, distinguishing Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* from “general literature.”¹ It was not until after his intellectual encounter with Goethe and Schiller in 1822 that he began to turn to literature for inspiration and by 1830, when he wrote “Thoughts on History” he had begun to consider historian an artist and history an art, an essential part of literature. His second essay (now known as “On History Again”) went further to argue that history was the primary form of knowledge, which “is the only study, and includes all others whatsoever” (Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 191). Since the 1830s, Carlyle no longer regarded history as a genre different from fiction or literature. Instead history is to him the fundamental literary form. As Bossche correctly points out, by the time Carlyle decided to write *The French Revolution*, he “considered history a branch of ‘literature’ rather than an academic discipline” (qtd. Kerry and Hill 22). Carlyle's view of history as a literary genre is crucial for us to evaluate his narrative theatricality in historical writings.

In Carlyle's view of history as a literary genre, the narrator of history and the reader are inextricably linked, as for Carlyle history is only valuable and only comprehensible when one is able to “read [oneself] into it ... make himself at home, and acquainted in that repulsive foreign century” (Thomas Carlyle: “Baillie the Covenantanter” 237-238). Indeed, the narrator of *The French Revolution* is quite like the Editor of *Sartor Resartus*, who pieces together the fragments and episodes of individual history in a framework. Carlyle did not write *The French Revolution* as a factual chronology of political events but as a group of symbolic episodes through which the narrator and the reader discover the meaning of their own age together with the historical characters under examination. For this purpose, Carlyle designed a unique historical narrator who speaks in the first person and present tense, represents the voices of the historical actors, and dramatically creates an epic of the Revolution. Carlyle wrote a long passage in “Thoughts on History” explaining his philosophy of historical narrative, arguing that there is a “fatal discrepancy between our manner of observing these [passing things], and their manner of occurring”

1 The Carlyle Letters On Line, Duke-Edinburgh edition of *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle* <<http://carlyleletters.dukejournals.org/>>.

(Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 249), as even the most gifted man can observe and record only the series of his own impressions. Carlyle insists that historical events are often “simultaneous” and appear in synchronized groups instead of analytical and chronological series. Carlyle questions the traditional mode of historical narrative which is based on cause-and-effect logic:

It is not in acted, as it is in written History; actual events are nowise so simply related to each other as parent and offspring are; every single event is the offspring not of one, but of all other events prior to contemporaneous, and will in its turn combine with all others to give birth to new: it is an ever-living, ever-working Chaos of Being, wherein shape after shape bodies itself forth from innumerable elements. And this Chaos, boundless as the habitation and duration of man, unfathomable as the soul and destiny of man, is what the historian will depict, and scientifically gauge, we may say, by threading it with single lines of a few ells in length! For as all action is, by nature, to be figures as extended in breadth and in depth, as well as in length; that is to say, is based on Passion and Mystery, if we investigate its origin; and spreads abroad on all hands, modifying and all Narrative is, by its nature, of only one dimension; only travels forward toward one, or toward successive points: Narrative is linear, Action is solid, modified; as well as advances toward completion. (Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 250)

Although Carlyle’s philosophy of history exhibits somewhat Romantic mysticism, it may well explain Carlyle’s choice of shifting multi-perspective narrative to enact the history. With such concept of history, Carlyle employs a narrative technique that attempts to present the multi-facets of the same event by switching narrative voice from the third person to the first person plural. In this way, Carlyle adds immediacy to the (his) story and dramatizes the performance of the heroism of the ordinary people in the French Revolution.

IV

In writing *The French Revolution: A History*, Carlyle went beyond a mere chronicle of the series of events to “engage the readers to smell the blood spilling from guillotines, to taste the fear in the streets of Paris during the Terror, to experience the decadence of the Bourbon monarchy, to observe the sartorial cavalcade when

the Estates-General meets for the first time since 1614.”¹ In order to accomplish his task of exposing the many simultaneous aspects of historical events, he employed the same mode of narrative by novelists—shifting point of view, imagery, and impressive details. Consequently, what we read from Carlyle was not a dry linear account of the French Revolution, but a brilliant pastiche of episodes alive with passion and performance, which set a new style of storytelling for the Victorian writers.

Filled with the imaginative qualities of lyrical writings, *The French Revolution* is, of course, an unconventional work of history. Writing more than four decades after the French Revolution, Carlyle might have enough materials to reconstruct what had happened. Yet, despite rich historical memos and reliable documents, Carlyle abandoned the conventional mode of historical narration represented by Edward Gibbon's *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, a masterpiece approaching history objectively and chronologically. Carlyle did not expect us to be a passive audience as Gibbon obviously did. What Carlyle did in writing *The French Revolution* was to invite us to wander through the events with him, experiencing the historic scenes as they were happening. In so doing, Carlyle's book captured the rage of the revolution, its dramatic power and its most memorable details. By dramatizing the details of history, he believes a historian would be free from the restraint of seeing only part of the historic events and take a panoramic command of the simultaneous happenings which conventional historians might fail to conceive. The following excerpt from *The French Revolution* juxtaposes the details of the stormy terror in Bastille and the peaceful scenery in the countryside with the dancing party in the palace, creating an ironic and inharmonious picture:

Rigorous de Launay has died; crying out, “O friends, kill me fast!” Merciful de Losme must die; though Gratitude embraces him, in this fearful hour, and will die for him; it avails not. Brothers, your wrath is cruel! Your Place de Greve is become a Throat of the Tiger; full of mere fierce bellowings, and thirst of blood. One other officer is massacred; one other Invalide is hanged on the Lamp-iron: with difficulty, with generous perseverance, the Gardes Francaises will save the rest. Provost Flesselles stricken long since with the paleness of death, must descend from his seat, ‘to be judged at the

1 Meredith Hindley, “The Voracious Pen of Thomas Carlyle,” *HUMANITIES*, March/April 2009, Volume 30, Number 2. <<https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2009/marchapril/feature/the-voracious-pen-thomas-carlyle>>

Palais Royal:—alas, to be shot dead, by an unknown hand, at the turning of the first street!

O evening sun of July, how, at this hour, thy beams fall slant on reapers amid peaceful woody fields; on old women spinning in cottages; on ships far out in the silent main; on Balls at the Orangerie of Versailles, where high-rouged Dames of the Palace are even now dancing with double-jacketted Hussar-Officers;—and also on this roaring Hell porch of a Hotel-de-Ville! Babel Tower, with the confusion of tongues, were not Bedlam added with the conflagration of thoughts, was no type of it. (Carlyle, *The French Revolution* 191-192)

Here, Carlyle's narrative intention was obvious: he wanted to show us that the riot and terror in Bastille co-existed paradoxically with the peace of everyday life that and that a historian should keep an eye for all that is happening simultaneously. Observing what perspectives a historian should adopt, Le Quesne points out, "historical events should be perceived and understood in the distance view of the transition from old era to a new one" (74-75). Similarly, in "Thoughts on History," Carlyle highlights the significance of seeing the "wholeness" of history. He makes a distinction between the "Artist in History" and the "Artisan in History," the former, according to him, has an eye and feeling for the Whole, the latter are men who labor mechanically in a department, without an eye for the Whole. Carlyle criticizes the "Artisan in History," arguing that

Historian, who examines some special aspect of History; and from his or that combination of circumstances, political, moral, economical, and the issues it has led to, infers that such and such properties belong to human society, and that the like circumstances will produce the like issue; which inference, if other trials confirm it, must be held true and practically valuable. He is wrong only, and an artisan, when he fancies that these properties, discovered or discoverable, exhaust the matter; and sees not, at every step, that it is inexhaustible. (Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 252)

The combination of the first person narrative account and commentary runs throughout the book as well, allowing Carlyle to involve us into the historical scenes. The description of the storming of the Bastille is a best example of theatricality characterized by action and passion:

A slight sputter; — which has *kindled* the too combustible chaos; made it a roaring fire—chaos! Bursts forth Insurrection, at sight of its own blood (for there were deaths by that sputter—of fire), into endless rolling explosion of musketry, distraction, execration;—and over head, from the Fortress, let one great gun, with its grape-shot, go booming, to show what **we could** do. (Carlyle, *The French Revolution* 185)

Carlyle uses the third person to describe the scene and action, then switches to the first person plural as if he and his readers were joining the mob as it takes the Bastille. Carlyle's use of present tense and fragmentary sentences to describe the sequence of events lends an almost journalistic quality to his work. He is in the moment, recording the scene as it happens, breathing energy and emotion into history. The above passage also reveals Carlyle's most distinctive deviation from the tradition in that he was well aware of the subjectivity in re-writing a history of his own imagination and of the meaning that readers should be brought into the texts with their act of reading. In *The French revolution* he clearly indicates that "...in every object there is inexhaustible meaning; the eye sees in it what the eye brings means of seeing" (Carlyle 5).

It deserves notice that in his other writings, Carlyle questioned the ability of common people to organize themselves, believing they need to have order imposed on them. However, in *The French Revolution*, Carlyle time and again praises the power of the mass or mob:

The French mob, again, is among the liveliest phenomena of our world. So rapid, audacious; so clear-sighted, inventive, prompt to seize the moment; instinct with life to its finger-ends! That talent, were there no other, of spontaneously standing in queue, distinguishes, as we said, the French People from all Peoples, ancient and modern. (Carlyle 246)

Evidently, there would be no French Revolution without the French people questioning the monarchy and taking action. Here Carlyle turns to confirm his view that "hero-worship was now synonymous with theatricality and chimeras" (Sorensen 5). Carlyle stressed the role of the individual of the mass in history-making, as he argues in "Thoughts on History" that "in a certain sense all men are historians" (Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 244) and that "our very speech is curiously historical" (Carlyle, *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays* 245). By focusing on the mob and what happens in the streets to everyday people and showing the

actions of ordinary people through theatrical narrative, Carlyle demonstrated that the stage of history could be dominated by the mob or mass if the king and parliament were ignorant of the poverty and sufferings of the common people.

IV

As a matter of fact, Carlyle had been to France (briefly, in 1824). So his historical narrative of the French Revolution was not all imagination, but partly memory. Also worth mentioning is that Carlyle grew up in wartime with Napoleon a constant threat, a threat that would have led to chaos in Britain if Napoleon had invaded: Carlyle's lifelong wish for order would have regarded this as absolutely unbearable. So, to write in 1834-1837 with Napoleonic wars still alive in the memory of the English people and with the Peterloo riots of 1819 as well as the radical riots of the 1820s which culminated in the Reform Acts of 1832 (England) and 1833 (Scotland) set a strong background to his view of society, history and war based on his own lifetime experience.

Therefore, the French Revolution in Carlyle's theatrical narrative was a history in action. Carlyle brought the conflict vividly to life for an audience who, in 1837, still kept in mind the uncomfortable anarchy of Napoleonic war or Reform disturbance in Britain. The narrative power of Carlyle as a historian as well as a man of letters was not just to recreate the past but also to use the past to alarm the present and to warn the king or the government of the danger of injustice and chaos in a society.

The theatrical narrative of Carlyle's historical writing constitutes a very rewarding experience as it invites the reader to "explore the borderline between narrative and drama" (Lepaludier 22). The reader may thus experience an "intertextual and intergeneric journey" (Lepaludier 22). The "in-between" generic position allows a view which throws a light on both genres. Indeed, Carlyle's historical narrative provides added effects or a greater significance when combined with a theatrical scene. What is more, by histrionically engaging the readers into French Revolution, Carlyle adds immediacy to the (his)story and foregrounds the heroic power of the ordinary people in Revolution in rewriting history, forming a sharp contrast to his former assertion of the dominant power of the elite hero in shaping history. In so doing, the narrative theatricality enhances the effectiveness of the heroism of the common individuals in the Revolution. Indeed, by histrionically engaging the readers into the scenes of French Revolution, Carlyle intends both to celebrate (ambivalently) the coming of Democracy and to warn the Victorian Aristocracy of the danger of social anarchy that they might have confronted with.

Works Cited

- Bossche, Chris R. Vanden. *Carlyle and the Search for Authority*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1991.
- Campbell, Ian. *Thomas Carlyle*. Edinburgh: The Saltire Society, 1993.
- . "Thomas Carlyle." Accessible at: <<https://www.poetryfoundation.org/poets/thomas-carlyle>>.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *Critical and Miscellaneous Essays, Vol. II*, Boston: Jame Munroe and Company, 1839.
- . *The French Revolution: A History*. New York: Wilkey and Putnam, 1846.
- . *On Heroes, Hero-worship, and the Heroic in History*. Ed. David R. Sorensen and Brent E. Kinser. New Haven: Yale UP, 2013.
- . "Baillie the Covenanter" in Thomas Carlyle. *The Historical Essays*. Ed. Chris Vanden Bossche. Berkley: U of California P, 2002.
- . "Translator's Preface" (1824) to the first edition of Jonhann Wolfan von Goethe: *Whilhelm Meisters's Apprenticeship and Travels*. Trans. Thomas Carlyle. London: Chapman, Hall and Strand, 1824, 1839 (Revised Edition) .
- . *The Carlyle Letters On Line* (Duke-Edinburgh edition of *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. Accessible at: <<http://carlyleletters.dukejournals.org/>>.
- Davis, Tracy C. and Thomas Postlewait. Ed. *Theatricality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Feral, Josette. "Theatricality: The Specificity of Theatrical Language." *SubStance: A Review of Theory and Literary criticism* , Vol. 31, No. 2/3 (2002): 94-108.
- Fitzgerald, Sandey. *Spectators in the Field of Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Goethe, Jonhann Wolfan von. *Whilhelm Meisters's Apprenticeship and Travels*. Trans. Thomas Carlyle. London: Chapman, Hall and Strand, 1824, 1839 (Revised Edition) .
- Hindley, Meredith. "The Voracious Pen of Thomas Carlyle." *HUMANITIES*, March/April 2009, Volume 30, Number 2. Accessible at: <<https://www.neh.gov/humanities/2009/marchapril/feature/the-voracious-pen-thomas-carlyle>>.
- Kerry, Paul E. & Marylu Hill. *Thomas Carlyle Resartus: Reappraising Carlyle's Contribution to the Philosophy of History, Political Theory and Cultural Criticism*. Madison: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2010.
- Kurnick, David. "Theatricality and the Novel." *The Nineteenth Century Novel: 1820-1880 Vol. III*. Eds. John Kucich and Jenny Bourne Taylord. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012. 307-321.
- Lepaludier, Laurent. "Theatricality in the Short Story: Staging the Word?" *Journal of the Short Story in English* 51 (Autumn 2008): 17-28.
- Litvak, Joseph. "The Infection of Acting: Theatricals and Theatricality in *Mansfield Park*." *ELH* 53 (Summer 1986): 331-355 .
- Quesne, L. Le. *Carlyle*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Russell, Gullian. *Women, Sociability and Theatre in Georgian London*. Cambridge: CUP, 2010.
- Schoch, Richard W. "We Do Nothing but Enact History": Thomas Carlyle Stages the Past. *Nineteenth Century Literature*, Vol. 54 No. 1 (Summer 1999): 27-52 .
- Siemens, Elena. "Theatricality" (review). Accessible at: <<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/218791/summary>>.
- Sorensen, David R. "Introduction." Thomas Carlyle. *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. Ed. David R. Sorensen and Brent E. Kinser. Newhaven: Yale UP, 2013.

The Ecological Value of Georgic Ethic and Its Contemporary Adaptations: A Case Study of Ted Hughes's Georgic Poetry

Chen Hong

Abstract: The georgic that originates from the great Roman poet Virgil and has become a special stream of tradition both within and apart from the pastoral tends to be regarded with suspicion or neglected altogether by ecocritics due to its positioning of human beings in what Ken Hiltner describes as “an active, aggressive posture toward the earth.” But other critics such as David Fairer strongly argue for georgic’s “green credentials” by emphasizing its recognition of natural laws and its commitment to the cooperation principle in human relationship with nature. To the author of this paper, this commitment is basically a moral attitude and a yet-to-be-recognized part of georgic ethic. The present paper therefore is to start from where Fairer has left off to stress the ecological value of georgic ethic and, with the example of contemporary English farmer-poet Ted Hughes’s georgic *Moortown Diary*, to show what changes the environmentally-conscious poet has brought to ethics derived from classical georgics.

Key words: georgic; georgic ethic; agricultural modernization; Ted Hughes

Author: **Chen Hong** is Professor of English in School of Humanities at Shanghai Normal University, member of Innovative Team of High-Level Program in Comparative Literature and World Literature at Shanghai Normal University (Shanghai 200234, China), where she specializes in English poetry since the Romantic period. Her research interest also includes contemporary Chinese environmental literature (Email: lilychen@shnu.edu.cn).

标题: 农事伦理的生态价值及其当代变化: 以特德·休斯的农事诗为例

摘要: 农事诗是源自伟大的古罗马诗人维吉尔的一个特殊的文学传统, 常归于田园诗而实际又有别于它。由于农事诗被认为是把人类置于“一个与土地积极对抗的姿态”当中, 一直受到生态批评学者的批评和轻视, 但另有一些学者如大卫·费尔罗基于农事诗中所表达的对于自然规律的接受以及人与自然之间合作关系的坚持, 提出农事诗的“绿色证书”这一观点。在本文作者看来, 农事诗坚持人与自然合作, 即是坚持以一种道德的态度与自然相处,

实际构成农事伦理中有待被认可的生态维度。因此本文将以费尔罗对于农事诗的生态维度的发现为基础,进一步探讨农事伦理的生态意义,并以英国当代诗人特德·休斯的农事诗《摩尔镇日记》为例,展现诗人如何以其现代环境意识给古老的农事伦理注入新的力量。

关键词: 农事诗; 农事伦理; 农业现代化; 特德·休斯

作者简介: 陈红, 上海师范大学人文学院教授, 上海师范大学高水平计划比较文学与世界文学创新团队成员, 重点研究英国浪漫主义时期以来的诗歌, 以及当代中国环境文学。本文为国家社科基金一般项目“英国自然诗歌传统与当代生态诗歌的兴起研究”(16BWW039)的阶段性成果。

The georgic as poetry that deals with agriculture in general, and teaches farming skills or describes farming practices in particular, is regarded with suspicion by critics who observe it from environmental perspectives due to its positioning of human beings in “an active, aggressive posture toward the earth” (Hiltner 162). Indeed, agriculture itself viewed this way is an exploitation of the earth’s resources for human ends and therefore seems to run counter to ecological principles. But this way of viewing agriculture and the georgic has a purist insistence on the value of an uncultivated nature at its roots. It explains a general preference of pastoral to georgic among ecocritics who cherish much the “myth of [the] ‘unspoiled’” generated by the former’s representation of a simple and “natural” state of existence, a so-called “pastoral hedonism,” that is more likely to be experienced by a shepherd than a farmer (Buell 52, 41). But as David Fairer has rightly pointed out in the wake of Daniel Botkin in *Disordant Harmonies* and Timothy Morton in *Ecology without Nature* among others, “the image of a constant, normative Nature” is an idealization of nature actually involved in an endlessly changing process, and therefore the Romantics’ invention of nature as a transcendental and spiritual entity should be discarded in order to embrace a truly ecological thinking about man’s “proper relationship with the earth and its life forms”¹. Through his examination of the eighteenth-century English georgics, Fairer strongly argues for georgic’s commitment to ecology on the ground of its recognition of time and flux inherent in nature, its respect for natural forces that are not always knowable or supportive to humans, and its readiness to work with the forces in a most empirical manner on a local basis.

Fairer’s observation of georgic’s “green credentials” is also applicable to the much-biased georgic ethics (215), though he does not link up georgic’s ecological

1 The first quotation in this sentence is from David Fairer, p.207. The second quotation is originally from Timothy Morton, p.2 and quoted by David Fairer on p.207.

and ethical dimensions in his study. This paper is to start from where Fairer has left off to stress the ecological value of georgic ethic and, with the example of contemporary English farmer-poet Ted Hughes's georgic, *Moortown Diary*, to show what changes the environmentally-conscious poet has brought to ethics derived from classical georgics. An examination of the connection and distinction between georgic ethic, agriculture ethic and ecological ethic is to be carried out in the first place before the paper uses the concepts to analyze Hughes's case.

Georgic Ethic, Agriculture Ethic, and Ecological Ethic

The earliest expressions of ethics concerning agricultural practices appeared in Greece of the 8th B. C. in Hesiod's *Works and Days*. A collection of miscellaneous poems on subjects of farming, morality and country life, it emphasizes repeatedly the moral correctness of being industrious rather than being idle, as is explicit in the following lines: "Through work men grow rich in flocks and substance, and working they are much better loved by the immortals. Work is no disgrace: it is idleness which is a disgrace"¹. Later, the great Roman poet Virgil wrote *Eclogues* and *Georgics*, establishing the genre of both pastoral and georgic, in the latter of which he continued Hesiod's moral appraisal of hard working. In fact, both Hesiod and Virgil attributed man's obliged toil to his fall from the Golden Age into the Iron Age, an ill fate ordained by gods which the ancient poets accepted with graceful doggedness. Since then hard work has remained a key element in georgics, whether praised, often by the gentleman-poet or gentleman-farmer-poet, or grudging, understandably by the laborer-poet who began to write between the end of the seventeenth century and the middle eighteenth century. Attitude towards labor is one class-specific dimension of the georgic ethic, which has yet another, more general dimension: the ecological dimension.

Conceptions of nature that might have influenced georgic ethic change over time and are too broad a topic to deal with in this paper. As far as ancient georgic is concerned, nature manifests its power in incessant changes and often unpredictable outbreaks of disasters. Therefore, Hesiod teaches the importance of observing seasonal changes and doing farm work accordingly, and Virgil stresses even more forcefully the obligation of respecting nature, which has laid the "laws and eternal covenants on certain lands"². Yet Virgil's attention to particulars of farm skills,

1 The quotation is from a prose translation of the collection by H. G. Evelyn-White, Book Six "On Justice and Good Conduct", Section 294. Refer to <<https://www.theoi.com/Text/Hesiod-WorksDays.html>>.

2 The quotation is from a prose translation of *Georgics* by H. R. Fairclough, Book 1, Section 43. Refer to <<https://www.theoi.com/Text/VirgilGeorgics1.html>>.

especially his urge to “husbandman” to “doff [the] wild spirit” of “native forces” by putting them “under constant tillage”¹, often seems to reveal to critics including John Barrell his conception of nature as “hostile to [human beings], and so needing to be subdued by work” (qtd in Fairer 217). But I would agree with Fairer to argue that the recognition made by Virgil and his eighteenth-century followers of the uncertainty of natural forces only leads them to the most important principle, the “Co-operation” principle, in human’s dealing with nature (Fairer 205). In other words, georgic does not distinguish itself from pastoral by being oppositional to nature, but by “challeng[ing] the binaries” between human and nature, or nature and culture (Fairer 209). “To work with the forces of nature” is not only a piece of practical advice offered by Virgil and his imitators for farming, though georgic is marked indeed by its practicability (Fairer 210), but also, in my opinion, a moral requirement for all those involved in agriculture.

The georgic ethic derived from Virgil rests on a compromised working relationship between human and nature and is thus in conflict with the idealistic or radical ecological ethic that tends to propose “let the earth be.” Wendell Berry once cautioned against such an attitude typically taken in wilderness conservation. He said:

The conservationist congratulated himself, on the one hand, for his awareness of the severity of human influence on the natural world. On the other hand, in his own contact with that world, he can think of nothing but to efface himself—to leave it *just* the way it is. (29)

While acknowledging the ecological and cultural value of wilderness conservation, Berry didn’t think it right to exclude human from nature. To him, that “leave it *just* the way it is” mentality covers a deep misanthropy, or what Berry describes as “self-deprecation,” that is of no use to improve either the human condition or nature’s (30). When Nie Zhenzhao, founder of Chinese ethical literary criticism, points out that the proposal of nature-centrism to replace anthropocentrism actually implies a refusal to recognize human responsibility towards nature, he is sharing with Berry an explicit criticism of human-nature demarcation, as well as a deep concern about the ethical and moral obligation of human beings as the caretaker of nature.

Berry proposed “kindly use” of the land to “dissolve the boundaries that

1 The quotation is from a prose translation of *Georgics* by H. R. Fairclough, Book 2, Section 47. Refer to <<https://www.theoi.com/Text/VirgilGeorgics1.html>>.

divide people from the land and its care” (30). Berry as a farmer was deeply concerned about agriculture as one most widespread kind of land use, and his moral consideration about “kindly use” is his version of georgic ethic that accords with Aldo Leopold’s land ethic. When Berry said “We can only have agriculture within nature,” he meant the same as Leopold who, upon accepting “the alteration, management, and use of [natural] ‘resources’” within land ethic, also claimed for “their right to continued existence, and at least in spots, their continued existence in a natural state” (312). Both Leopold’s vision of an inclusive land-community and Berry’s idea of a “durable” and “unified” agricultural system share with Virgilian georgic an important moral attitude that “encourages an awareness of how natural needs and human ones are interdependent” (Berry 46; Fairer 210).

Writing in the post-war years in America, Leopold expressed deep moral concern over various modern ills of agriculture, which he diagnosed to be rooted in the farmer’s deliberate choice to place his own economic interests above interests of the land-community (318). Berry’s indignation towards the so-called agricultural “progress” is even more obvious as he explicitly attributed it to a “moral ignorance” (48). It was owing to the persistent pleas for moral consideration within modern agriculture made by Leopold, Berry, and many others that agricultural ethic came into being in the midst of the environmental movement triggered by Rachael Carson’s *Silent Spring*. From the very beginning, agricultural ethic as a modern invention differs from ancient georgic ethic for it arose out of “value conflicts and lack of social responsibility in agricultural practices, as well as frequent outbreaks of public events concerning environmental pollution and food security” (Qi & Ren 110). According to Qi Wentao and Ren Jizhou, agricultural ethic covers a wide range of topics including “human’s relation to the land in agriculture, security and health of agricultural products, welfare of farm animals, agricultural resources and environmental ethics, and living quality and social status of farmers (Qi & Ren 109). This conception of agricultural ethic contains georgic ethic as an indispensable part, which focuses on the value and proper ways of farming, while at the same time putting a much stronger emphasis than georgic ethic on human responsibility towards the environment or, rather, expressing a more urgent need to curb modern agriculture’s tendency to destroy the environment. From an ecological point of view, agricultural ethic seems a better moral equipment than georgic ethic to guide agricultural practices of the present. While accepting this view, the present paper is to show with the example of Ted Hughes that georgic ethic, either on its own or as part of agricultural ethic, is especially important as a moral principle for individuals involved in agricultural production.

The Ethical World within *Moortown Diary*

Hughes's *Moortown Diary* was written during 1973 and 1976, in the middle of the late Poet Laureate's long literary career, and published separately with the present title in 1989. Poems in this collection are supposed to be "casual journal notes" of interesting things happening on Moortown, a farm in North Devon which the poet bought in 1973 and where he started raising cattle with his wife Carol and his father-in-law Jack Orchard until the latter's death in 1976 (Hughes, *Moortown* xi). Of the total thirty four poems that cover various aspects of farm life, more than three quarters, twenty six poems to be exact, directly deal with farm work, with another three poems about the weather, which is also an important concern in doing farm work. Reading these twenty nine georgic poems of Hughes against the Virgilian tradition reveals an obvious difference in thematic concern, that there is far more attention paid to the nonhuman elements, especially animals, by Hughes than by Virgil and his imitators. In fact, Hughes's georgic poems comprise two groups with different focuses on cattle and on farmer respectively. In terms of the number of poems involved, the former group with a total of twenty one poems is predominant and thus forms a distinctive contrast with Virgilian georgics in which animals are always peripheral. But Hughes's attention to farm animals, especially their sufferings, brings out an underlying theme also often found in Virgil and his likes: the theme of "working with the forces of nature."

In Hughes's poems, nature is an irresistible power that all animals have to abide by in order to live or to die, with much difficulty or even great ordeal. Therefore, we see a not-yet-born lamb beheaded by the farmer-poet in order to save its mother in the poem "February 17th," and the deaths of newborns in "Struggle," "Sheep, I-II," and "Orf." Moreover, the poet regards nature as a power that works on humans, animals, and the land all alike, a power that farmers have to accept just like their cattle do. A typical expression of such a deep awareness of human limitation in the face of nature is found in the poem "Little Red Twin," where a newborn calf bearing the name in the title is found nearly dead after getting stuck between bars and being exposed to the sun for eight hours when she is still sick from drinking too much milk. Having fed her some glucose water, "We leave her / To her ancestors, who should have prepared her / For worse than this" (Hughes, *Moortown* 44). The poet knows well that in a case like this, there is nothing better to do than leave the calf at the mercy of nature. A similar attitude is expressed in another poem "Birth of Rainbow" by the poet, who, having seen a calf being born in the biting cold wind which then turned suddenly into a hail, decided to "[get] to

cover. / Left to God the calf and his mother” (Hughes, *Moortown* 36). In these two poems, the forces of nature take the form of natural instincts that each natural being inherits from its ancestry or the form of severe weather ordained by God. In abiding by the predominant and yet ever changing natural forces in what Fairer describes as an “endlessly varied process” (209), humans and animals in Hughes’s poems share fate with each other. So like Virgil, Hughes’s respect for nature is reflected in his willingness to compromise with the natural forces in a most practical manner on a daily basis. But unlike Virgil, his compromise, which is also his effort to break down the binaries between man and nature or nature and culture, is achieved through his recognition of a shared fate between humans and animals.

If “to work with the forces of nature” is more than a practical lesson for the ancients, that it is also a moral requirement for those who believed in the power of deities behind the mysterious natural forces, it has become a moral constraint for modern people who have gradually lost their nature-inspired awe till it is finally replaced by a confidence in human technology to control nature. This is a situation that Hughes was facing in the second half of the twentieth century. Apparently the poet chose to follow the ancients by trusting nature.

Beside those cattle poems, *Moortown* has another group of poems, eight in number, about humans in work. Of this group, the final six poems are all descriptions of Jack Orchard, who had been a farmer himself long before he took up the day-to-day administration of his son-in-law’s farm. Hughes loved the man for “his unique archaic personality” (Hughes, *Letters* 376), which, as the poems show, is a praise of him who followed traditional values of an agrarian society such as hard-working, and who insisted stubbornly on using old farming skills and hand labor as an honest and reliable way of running the farm. In Hughes’s remembrance of the working moments of the old farmer, he marvels again and again at the man’s “reckless” use of his strength, “with as little regard / As old iron tools,” as if he was “using [his] life up” (*Moortown* 58, 59, 55). A deep appreciation of the man’s devotion to work underlies the remorseful and mournful tone of the poems.

Different from the other five, the first poem of the group, “The Day He Died,” presents an imaginary picture of the farm land and animals in reaction to the old man’s death, as follows:

The trustful cattle, with frost on their backs,
Waiting for hay, waiting for warmth,
Stand in a new emptiness.

From now on the land
 Will have to manage without him.
 But it hesitates, in this slow realization of light,
 Childlike, too naked, in a frail sun,
 With roots cut
 And a great blank in its memory. (*Moortown* 54)

The use of anthropomorphism makes this poem distinct from the rest of the book highly realistic in language, yet it brings out most effectively the affectionate bond between the man and the land and whatever on it that is in his care. Edward Hadley associates Jack Orchard with “the shepherd figure” in pastoral, “[whose] oneness with nature ensures his return to the fold when he dies” (76). Hadley has grasped Hughes’s vision of human as part of nature, which not only legitimizes his working with the land, but also obligates his taking care of it. Terry Gifford’s appreciative remark of the book as “a remarkable work of personal responsibility for livestock and land that is infused with a deep understanding of living with birth and death, with weather and landscape, with the forces of the seasons in poetry that has a deceptive ease of expression” also stresses a moral attitude which the book expresses mainly through the figure of Orchard and which shares a lot with Virgilian georgic ethic (51). But how to explain Hughes’s insistence on traditional farming and its ethics in his supposedly realistic record of his own farming practices despite the inevitable modern changes in agriculture and the rural world as a whole? Yvonne Reddick’s comment on *Moortown Diary*, that the poems “celebrate environmentally conscious agricultural labour, while lamenting the decline of such farming practices” (185), seems to offer a clue to the question that is worth investigating.

Ethical Deficiency outside *Moortown Diary*

Moortown Diary was written in a time when agricultural modernization, which had begun since the outbreak of the Second World War, reached its peak in Britain. Small-scale farming that relied heavily on hand labor soon lost its footing in this unprecedented campaign featured by the government’s forceful intervention with policies such as the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), by a wide use of machines, chemicals and other “advanced” technology in farming, and, most importantly, by a profit-oriented value judgment based on the sole criterion of efficiency. In his book *The Countryside in Question* published in 1988, Howard Newby asserted that British farming had, within four decades after the war, “moved decisively from agriculture to agribusiness” (6). He mentioned a number of mod-

ern technological inventions related to animal farming in this book and an earlier one, *Social Change in Rural England* published in 1979, including battery farming, zero grazing and artificial insemination (*Social* 19). All these measures taken for the purpose of “intensive livestock production” had come into use in animal farms throughout Britain in the early and middle seventieth when Hughes was running his farm, and had remained in application well into the ninetieth (*Countryside* 10). In fact, the industrialization of agriculture had caused not only severe damage to the environment, which Rachael Carson’s *Silent Spring* exposes, but also serious harm to animals in animal farms, which Peter Singer’s *Animal Liberation* testifies. Laments about the loss of traditional rural community make it clear that victims of this mindless campaign for “progress” include humans as well as the non-humans¹. It was under these circumstances that agricultural ethics came into being. It was also against this general background that Hughes composed his farm poems. The difference between the world inside Hughes’s poems and the one outside is more than obvious and makes one wonder about the practical and artistic choices the poet must have made and their significance.

In the preface to the 1989 edition of *Moortown Diary*, Hughes described the appalling changes he had observed happening to “the ancient farming community” in North Devon, where his farm was, between the years of his farming and the year the book was published (vii). Looking back at what he had gone through as one of the younger generation “who were plunged into the financial nightmares, the technological revolutions and international market madness that have devastated farmers, farms and farming ever since,” Hughes confessed his own initial excitement about “some of the novelties” under the influence of *Farmer’s Weekly* propagating “for new chemicals, new machinery, more chemicals, new methods, different chemicals, new gimmicks, new short-cuts, every possible new way of wringing that critical extra per cent out of the acreage and the animals” (viii-ix). The poet had obviously fully grasped the disastrous effect of the on-going, profit-oriented agricultural revolution on the English countryside and its farming tradition by the time he wrote the preface. But in fact this realization had come to him much earlier when he was still running the farm, as we see in the following:

1 Newby discussed various changes of the English rural community in his major works including the two aforementioned books. Other works that cover the topic include W. E. Tate’s *The English Village Community* (Gollancz, 1967), Rowland Parker’s *The Common Stream* (Paladin, 1976), John Bowers and Paul Cheshire’s *Agriculture, the Countryside and Land Use* (Methuen, 1983), and John Blunden and Nigel Curry’s edited book titled *The Changing Countryside* (Croom Helm, 1985), to mention a few.

Within a very short time the last vestige of grandeur in the real work had vanished, the product itself had become a weirdly scandalous, unwanted surplus, the livestock a danger to public health (and nobody knew better than the farmer what he pumped into them), the very soil a kind of poison, the rivers sewers. [. . .]. A sharp nose for these things soon enlightened us, and we settled into the old-fashioned routine of running a suckler herd of beef cows, a flock of breeding ewes, and keeping everything going on bailer twine. (*Moortown* ix)

As a faithful reader of Rachael Carson in as early as the late 1950s and one of the earliest proponents of environmentalism in some of his own early poems, Hughes soon came to realize the environmental consequences and food security problems caused by indiscriminate and irresponsible use of chemicals in animal farming. Reddick's research into the writing process of *Moortown Diary* confirms that the poet at certain point "opted for a traditional way of farming: a herd of beef cattle and a flock of sheep" and that "[the] livestock were free range and the land was free from damaging chemicals" (189-190). From Hughes's own experience as an individual farmer, he knew simply too well that the choice every farmer had to make between the relatively harder and less efficient traditional way of farming and modern, high-efficiency and high-profit farming was more of a moral choice than an economic one. To Hughes, the choice of the latter, which he described as "a jittery, demoralized, industrial servitude" (*Moortown* ix), means a deliberate abandonment of the sense of safety that traditional farming and its products tend to give to its customers, as well as that of an important sense of respect from "the real work" of the once self-reliant farmers. It is obvious here that doing "the real work" is considered by Hughes as one necessary way to contribute positively to public health and the environment.

Hughes had made his own moral choice in the end, but why didn't he share this part of his farming experiences with the reader through his farming poetry? He only told the reader that the modernization of farming he had observed and participated in once himself was "no part of what [he] recorded" in *Moortown Diary*, or it was "only a small, indirect part" of it (*Moortown* viii-ix), but gave no explanation for this artistic choice of his except that, in setting down the "improvised verses," he was trying to "[exclude] everything else that might be pressing to interfere with the watching eye" (*Moortown* x). The poet attempted to show the peculiarity of his farming poems which were supposed to be a faithful and timely record of what he was seeing with his naked eyes only, but ended up revealing the partiality of his

writing materials exclusive of both visible and invisible changes of the North Devon countryside under the pressure of agricultural modernization. To figure out the reason behind the poet's exclusion or evasion, one must know exactly what he had evaded. This task is made possible by the existence of another farming diary titled *All around the Year*. Written by an agriculture educator named Michael Morpurgo probably during 1973 and 1976¹, the same period as Hughes was running his farm, the book records his daily observation of a family farm owned by John Walter, who was actually a neighbor of Hughes at Moortown. There is even an episode in the book about Hughes's offer of help to the Walter's in need of hay. The book as such makes possible a close examination of the gap between the inner and outer worlds of *Moortown Diary*.

As a daily record of the work routine of Walter's farm, *All around the Year* mentions some new technologies used to increase production, often at the cost of the animal's natural needs and health, such as the use of various kinds of artificial synthetic feed to increase milk yields or to increase the frequency of "coming to season" and that of calving, and the predominant use of artificial insemination for selective breeding under the strong push of the market. Other practices that are harmful to the land and the environment are mentioned as well, such as spreading nitrogen to bring on the grass in the pasture and spraying, and emptying the slurry pit to an unidentified somewhere. None of these technologies or practices that were common at the time and were likely to be adopted by Hughes as well in his early period of farming are traceable in *Moortown Diary*.

Hughes's evasion of various economic pressures that each farmer of his time had to face is often subtle, which we can see through the different ways of referring to the cattle in the two books. By only using general and common terms, such as "sheep," "lamb," "ram," "ewe," "cow," "calf," "bull," "bullock," "cattle," and terms showing genetic relationship such as "mother," "baby," "sister" and "twin," Hughes made it clear that he had no intention to show either his professionalism or his economic consideration as farmer in his poems. In contrast, Morpurgo often used names for individual animals and mentioned their breeds. There are also detailed explanations about the characteristics of different breeds as well as their uses and market value. Foreign breeds are said to be popular because of their high yields of milk or beef. Though Hughes confessed in the preface that he and his wife once "lusted after the exotic, foreign breeds that poured into England during the

1 *All around the Year* was published in 1979. The author did not give any clue to the exact year when he kept the diary. But judged from the author's mentioning of the contact between the Walter's and the Hughes's, the year must fall between 1973 and 1976 when Hughes was running his farm.

1970s”(Moortown ix), he didn’t express such profit-driven interest in any of his poems. And though Hughes’s farm mainly reared beef cattle and sheep, neither the phase “beef cattle” nor its synonym “steer,” the latter of which is found in Morpurgo’s book and defined as “castrated males reared for beef” (*All* 99), appears once in *Moortown Diary*.

While Hughes’s conscientious turn to traditional farming, probably taking place before May of 1974, is recognized¹, his evasion of much of the reality in his farming practices, including his early foolish attempts to catch up with the new wave and the difficulties he must have encountered later in sticking to farming traditions, remains an indisputable fact that still awaits explanation.

Hughes’s Georgic as His Ethical Choice

Hughes’s resistance against the agricultural modernization campaign of Britain was mainly a result of his ethical concern about the environment. Hughes first became aware of ecological issues and conservations during his visit to America between 1957 and 1959. His reading of Rachael Carson’s books about sea pollution ended up in his writing poems such as “Fourth of July” and “Mayday on Holderness” in this period to expose water pollution caused by domestic and industrial refuse and nuclear waste. When he began “talking of the perils of factory farming and of additives to foods” to his friends upon returning from America, he was one of the first few persons in U. K. of the time who had such an environmental consciousness². In the opinion of Keith Sagar, his review of Max Nicholson’s *The Environmental Revolution* in 1970 marks a turning point in his life and career in terms of his environmental engagement, as “environmental and ecological concerns came to figure more and more centrally both in his poems and in his life” (qtd. in Gifford, *Ted Hughes* 142).

Sagar’s observation about Hughes’s increased environmental engagement since 1970 is correct, though it does not apply to the poet in composing *Moortown Diary*. As an individual farmer at the time, Hughes felt powerless in the face of the almost unstoppable move towards agricultural modernization, which was basically run on principles opposite of agricultural ethics. Therefore, as he chose to stick to

1 Neither the poet nor any Hughes scholar has given a specific date for the change. One clue comes from a note for the poem “She Has Come to Pass” written on May 30, 1974, in which Hughes explained that he and his wife had “recoiled from the charms of foreign cattle breeds” at the time (*Moortown* 63). We may then assume that Hughes’s change or at least partial change must have taken place before the date.

2 His old university friend Daniel Huws remembers Hughes as one of the earliest environmentalists in U. K. in an unpublished essay, “Memories of Ted Hughes 1952-63”, written in 2007 (qtd. in Gifford, 14). The quotation is also from this essay.

traditional farming by following georgic ethic that emphasizes the value of honest work and hard labor, or “the real work” as Hughes calls it, and the importance of following nature, he described farming practices adhering to the same ethic in his farming poetry. Instead of using his poetry as a mirror of the outside reality, Hughes is actually expressing “a new pastoral ideal” that rests on a deep faith in the power of nature as well as in the mutual, working relationship between human and nature¹.

Hughes’s pastoral ideal is traceable in the aforementioned review he wrote for Nicholson’s *The Environmental Revolution*. After showing admiration for Nicholson, who remained optimistic about the future of Conservation despite the many oppositions and failures it had encountered, Hughes expressed his confidence in “the re-emergence of Nature as the Great Goddess of mankind, and Mother of all life” (*Winter Pollen* 133). Moreover, he ended the essay with the conviction: “If Westernized civilized man, the evolutionary error, is still open to correction, presumably she will correct him. If he is not open enough, she will still make the attempt” (*Winter Pollen* 135). It is clear that Hughes trusted the power of the Goddess of Nature to nurture and guide all life, just as he trusted human capability to re-establish a balanced relationship with nature through their own effort. It is also clear that the poet regarded it as a moral obligation on both sides for humans to correct themselves and for nature to guide them through.

Hughes’s trustful and hopeful attitude expressed in the Nicholson review grew out of his unrelenting and life-long exploration into the power of nature since the beginning of his writing career in the 1950s. Nature in Hughes’s conception exists inside as well as outside the human. In his early period, he was both admirable for and skeptical about the force of nature, which often appears in his poetry in the form of wild predatory animals in opposition to humans or human rationality. Seeing these animals as driven by an irrational life impulse that could be both creative and destructive, the poet at the time could not fully accept its free flow in either the outer nature or inner human nature. This impulse is the Goddess of Nature, who is, as Hughes describes it, “the goddess of natural law and of love [and] the goddess of all sensation and organic life” (*Winter Pollen* 110). With this inner confusion, the poet began his psychological explorations or “adventures” into the mystical world of nature in a series of his mythical poetry written in the 60s and 70s (Hughes, *Wodwo* 9), hoping that he could eventually drop his inner defense against the nat-

1 I propose the argument in my paper “The Post-Pastoral Vision in *Moortown Diary*”, that Hughes held a “pastoral ideal” that is “new” if considered in the context of English pastoral tradition. And the tradition I examine in that paper includes georgic as one sub-genre under the general category of pastoral poetry dealing with the subject of rural life.

ural impulse to embrace the goddess. Works such as *Gaudete*, *Crow*, and *Cave Birds* are all parts of the attempts he made for that purpose. By the time he wrote the essay “Myth and Education” in 1976, in which he analyzed the split of the inner and outer worlds of humans, or “the story of the mind exiled from Nature,” in the course of western civilization and saw the use of myths and folklores in literature as the best way to link up the two worlds (*Winter Pollen* 129), he seemed to have achieved his desired reconciliation with the goddess. Moreover, he thought it important to teach in schools, again best through myths and folklores, “a proper knowledge of the sacred wholeness of Nature, and a proper alignment of our behaviour within her laws” (*Winter Pollen* 131). Sagar understands that knowledge as something essential that Hughes’s Adam in *Adam and the Sacred Nine* has to learn after the fall about “how to live” and “how to relate to ‘all this’—the elements and flora and fauna of his given world.” In fact, Sagar observes *Adam and the Sacred Nine*, which was published in 1979 as part of *Moortown* together with the poems later collected into *Moortown Diary*, as Hughes’s attempt “to universalize by turning into myth what Hughes had learnt as a farmer” (197).

Hughes’s pastoral ideal expresses an abstract state of harmony between human and nature that may exist independent of the countryside or even independent of the outside nature. With the Goddess of Nature as its central tenet, it implies an ethic larger than and yet fundamental to agricultural ethic and georgic ethic. Though abstract, Hughes’s pastoral ideal provided him with a vision and spiritual strength that eventually brought him onto the right path in doing his actual farm work. It was owing to his faith in the Goddess that Hughes was able to see a deeper truth about the laws of nature underneath the surface of the reality of agricultural modernization. This is the truth that ancient Greeks and Romans had learnt and shared in their georgics, and the truth whose real significance was grasped by Hughes the modern farmer after overcoming his own initial confusion. Hughes saw modern agriculture as basically an attempt to disrupt natural laws, which, as he realized through his reading and farming, had brought severe harm to farm animals and irreversible damage to the environment. He knew that punishment from the Goddess was inevitable and due to come soon. Therefore he asserted the power of nature in his georgics in a way that outdid Virgil and his early followers who had never experienced what he did. And his assertion has both a moral implication and an ecological significance, for not only humans are obliged to respect nature and to obey her laws, they can also alleviate their burden on the planet by taking up their responsibility towards the land, animals, and the whole of the environment.

Works Cited:

- Berry, Wendell. *The Unsettling of America: Culture and Agriculture*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books, 1977.
- Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1995.
- Chen, Hong. "The Post-Pastoral Vision in *Moortown Diary*: Ted Hughes's Agricultural Practice and Pastoral Ideal." *Foreign Literature Review*. 128.4 (2018): 167-185.
- Fairer, David. "'Where Fuming Trees Refresh the Thirsty Air': The World of Eco-Georgic." *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 40.1 (2011): 201-218.
- Gifford, Terry. *Ted Hughes*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Hadley, Edward. *The Elegies of Ted Hughes*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Hiltner, Ken. *What Else is Pastoral? Renaissance Literature and the Environment*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2011.
- Hughes, Ted. *Letter of Ted Hughes*. Selected and edited by Christopher Reid. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.
- . *Moortown Diary*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.
- . *Winter Pollen: Occasional Prose*. New York: Picador USA, 1995.
- . *Wodwo*. London: Faber and Faber, 1971.
- Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand Country Almanac*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, 2010.
- Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2007.
- Newby, Howard. *The Countryside in Question*. London: Hutchinson, 1988.
- . *Social Change in Rural England*. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 1979.
- Qi, Wentao & Ren Jizhou, "Agriculture Ethics: An Academic Field to be Explored." *Studies in Ethics* 5 (2014): 109-115.
- Sagar, Keith. *Ted Hughes and Nature: "Terror and Exultation."* Peterborough, England: Fastprinting, 2009.

Anxiety of Belonging and “New World Order”: Caryl Phillips’s Postcolonial Narrative of Transatlantic Diaspora

Xu Bin & Liu Peng

Abstract: This paper argues that Caryl Phillips’ postcolonial narrative not only presents a moral inquiry on racism rooted in economic inequality as a result of the transatlantic slave trade but also calls for the establishment of a new world order of ethical justice and racial equality. According to Caryl Phillips there are three preconditions for the establishment of the new world order: 1. Anglo-Americans’ recognition of their crimes against black slaves and black citizens; 2. Anglo-Americans’ acknowledgement of African diasporans’ contributions to the development of Anglo-American societies; 3. Anglo-Americans’ realization of the shared (diasporan) history and fate with the blacks. The respect for the shared history and fate will help to relieve people of both races, especially the white, of their anxiety of belonging and sense of home insecurity.

Key words: Caryl Phillips; postcolonial narrative of transatlantic diaspora; new world order; anxiety of belonging

Authors: Xu Bin is Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Northeast Normal University; **Corresponding author:** Liu Peng is Ph.d student in the School of Foreign Languages at Central China Normal University and Lecturer in the School of Software at Dalian University of Foreign Languages (Email: haihongjiji@163.com).

标题: 归属焦虑与“世界新秩序”: 卡里尔·菲利普斯跨大西洋流散的后殖民叙事

内容摘要: 本文认为卡里尔·菲利普斯的后殖民叙事不仅是对由跨大西洋奴隶贸易所引发的经济不公以及植根其中的种族主义的伦理问询, 还是对建立以伦理正义和种族平等为内核的世界新秩序的呼吁。菲利普斯认为世界新秩序的建立需要三个前提条件: 1、英美社会对黑奴和黑人公民所犯罪行的承认; 2、英美社会对非裔流散者为英美社会发展所做贡献的认可; 3、英美社会对与黑人共享(流散)历史和命运的认同, 对共享历史和命运的尊重能帮助白人在内的不同种族人群消除归属焦虑与家园不安感。

作者简介：徐彬，东北师范大学外国语学院教授；刘鹏，华中师范大学外国语学院博士在读，大连外国语大学软件学院讲师。本文系国家社科基金一般项目“帝国文化霸权视域下的现当代英国流散文学研究”【项目编号：18BWW092】的阶段性成果。

T. B. Millar argues “A new world order is not a new concept. In modern times it goes back at least to the 1815 Congress of Vienna following the Napoleonic wars when the victorious great powers plus subsequently the defeated enemy set up the Concert of Europe to manage international relations on the continent, in what came to be referred to as a ‘balance of power’” (Millar 7). The new world order proclaimed by the United Nations and later by President George Bush is still about victors’ redistribution of power, synonymous with “balance of power.” The new world order intends to protect the political, economical and cultural interests of the West or America to be specific as Millar argues “It is an order in which the United States is meritoriously the sole superpower, but is not the police man nor the social worker of the world” (8).

Different from the 1815 Congress of Vienna, United Nations and Mr. Bush, Caryl Phillips strongly suggests “a new world order” of ethical justice and racial equality that involves a reexamination of the causal relationship between the historical transatlantic slave trade and white people’s racism and autism in present Anglo-American society. According to Caryl Phillips the discrimination between “the white self” and “the black other” is not only an isolation of the black other but also an autistic containment, reduction and destruction of the white self. Caryl Phillips intends to argue that a world order not based on ethical inquiries of injustices in interracial relations is not new but a repetition of an old world order of racial oppression and quasi-colonization.

In “Home: The Territorial Core” Porteous contends that “Home provides both the individual and the small primary group known as the family with all three territorial satisfactions [identity, security, stimulation]” (qtd. in George 21), home defines one’s identity and provides people with a sense of security and a stimulation of life. Home insecurity entails homelessness, loss of identity and confusion of life. Phillips argues that in transatlantic slave trade as far as diasporan blacks and whites are concerned “home” for them is a heterotopia, a metaphysical space that exists in memory, history and fiction. Phillips not only reveals the reasons for diasporan blacks’ and whites’ home insecurity but also discusses the possibilities and difficulties in building postcolonial multi-racial cultures and communities in order to exorcise “The High Anxiety of Belonging.” Dealing with the anxiety of belonging

Phillips has scrutinized interracial relations in history for ethical judgments and expressed his yearning for the establishment of a new world order of ethical justice and racial equality.

Black Gold, Past and Present

In *Out Of America: A Black Man Confronts Africa* African-American journalist Keith Richburg expresses his sense of gratitude for slavery. Keith traveled to and lived in Africa for three years, after which he thanked God that his ancestors were snatched away and survived the trans-Atlantic voyage to America.¹ Refuting Keith Richburg’s opinion Phillips argues that “It is true enough that in music, sports, science, literature, in fact in many fields, people of African origin have made major contributions to Western civilization. But it is pernicious to see such achievements as exempla of the benefits of the slave trade and slavery” (*Colour* 309). In his novels, Phillips has pointed out that diasporan African blacks’ racial advantage, utility and cultural economic value is the precondition for them to be recognized as Anglo-American citizens. For Anglo-American blacks the identity of a natural born citizen or natural citizen has its legal validity but has to be fought for in reality. What the Anglo-American blacks have is a “symbolic citizenship” due to “cultural differences and social discrimination—the problems of inclusion and exclusion, dignity and humiliation, respect and repudiation” (Bhabha xvii).

In his travel book *The Atlantic Sound* (2000), Caryl Phillips rewrites Olaudah Equiano’s travels from Gold Coast to Liverpool to claim for his father’s lost money, a total of £ 2,678 from an English agent in 1881. Olaudah Equiano’s observation and Caryl Phillips’ inserted evaluation provide readers a panoramic view of the political economic reality in 19th century’s Liverpool. Liverpool’s prosperity was mainly based on its leading position in European transatlantic slave trade as Phillips writes: “In the ten years between 1783 and 1793, 921 ships employed in the slave trade left Liverpool. Together they shipped to the Americas over 300,000 slaves, who were sold at a sterling value of £ 15,186,850. Which means that slaves were worth an average £ 50‘per head’...” (*Atlantic* 44). Black slaves were considered as black gold and selling black slaves was the easiest way for Liverpoolians to make a fortune. Getting a slave by all means was Liverpoolians’ dictum. Traveling in Liverpool on the eve of the Millennium, Phillips witnesses and meditates on the economic depression of Liverpool and establishes two causal relations: 1. Black gold brings Liverpoolians’ prosperity; 2. Liverpoolians’ economic and psy-

1 Eddy L. Harris, “Africa Betrayed: OUT OF AMERICA: A Black Man Confronts Africa. By Keith B. Richburg.” <http://articles.latimes.com/1997-02-23/books/bk-31454_1_black-man-confronts-africa>.

chological depression in the end of twentieth century Britain has a lot to do with Liverpoolians' suppression of their uncanny slave trade history. Phillips continues to argue that the physical presence of slave trade history in Liverpool in the form of historical relics such as architectures, documents and art pieces and Liverpoolians' historical amnesia are in sharp contrast, as a result of which there is "a cynical wit and a clinical depression in the souls of Liverpool's citizens" (117).

Phillips contends that white people's consumptive desire for blacks does not end with the abolishment of the slave trade and slavery. In *Cambridge* and *Crossing the River*, the blacks are valued in various fields such as sex, religion, economy and art.

In *Cambridge* the black slave Cambridge presents a wide view of the living conditions of London blacks after the abolition of slave trade according to *Slave Trade Act of 1807*. At that time, although African blacks lived in almost every stratum of British society, the number of blacks who really enjoyed British citizenship was rather small. According to Cambridge, the darling blacks make their fortunes from English desires for their exotic colored bodies as British citizens loved to take up a black or brown companion as a fashionable appendage (*Cambridge* 142). On London streets Cambridge encounters many African blacks who are poverty stricken castaways, disabled black males begging on the streets and helpless black females selling themselves into prostitution. Ironically, the British, represented by Cambridge's master, attribute Londoners' indulgence in carnal pleasure to "the empire of Cupid" built by African blacks.

Phillips also describes the "value" of African blacks in Anglo-American colonial expansions for whose purpose freed black slaves were exiled to Anglo-American colonies. In *Cambridge* and *Crossing the River*, the British *Slave Trade Act of 1807* and American Colonization Society have endowed Cambridge and Nash British and American citizenships respectively. But their Anglo-American citizenship is relative and deceptive. Cambridge and Nash mistake their black Christian identity with Anglo-American citizenship and devote themselves to the dissemination of Christianity in Anglo-American colonies. Due to economic and health reasons, Cambridge and Nash have failed to carry out their religious missions. Cambridge's second diaspora from Britain to the West Indies and Nash's second diaspora from America to Liberia result in their reversed change of identity from Anglo-American citizens to a black slave (Cambridge) and an African native (Nash).

The stories of Cambridge and Nash are parodies of Olaudah Equiano's British life story (1745-1797). Enslaved as a child, Equiano purchased his own freedom in 1766 in London. He was a prominent abolitionist of Atlantic slave trade. Equi-

ano’s autobiography, published in 1789, contributed to the promulgation of the *Slave Trade Act 1807*. Similar with Equiano, both Cambridge and Nash are African Christian converts. Their wives are Anglo-American whites. Different from Equiano’s happy life in London¹, Cambridge in Britain and Nash in Liberia are confronted with extreme poverty resulting in the death of their wives and children, their exile from their Anglo-American homes and tragic death in colonies.

In *Cambridge*, Olumide, the African black, is named and renamed many times as Thomas, Tom, David Henderson and Cambridge. Change of names reflects Cambridge’s change of identities from an African black slave to a freed British citizen, from a British citizen to a black Christian missionary and finally from a black Christian missionary to a West Indian slave. Although David Henderson has acquired British citizenship after *Slave Trade Act*, the British racially exclusive attitude toward blacks and the continuity of slave trade outside Britain have rendered his British citizenship meaningless. Theoretically speaking the *Slave Trade Act* should have covered both Britain and its colonies but at the beginning of its application it only had a domestic validity. James Walvin, professor of history, argues the promulgation of *Slave Trade Act of 1807* did not mean the end of slave trade; on the contrary it was the beginning of a perfection of Atlantic slavery and slave trade (139). The abolishment of slave trade within Britain contrasted with the flourishing slave trade in British colonies. Leaving Britain, David Henderson is no longer protected by *Slave Trade Act*. On his missionary journey to Guinea he is deceived by a French passenger and sold by a British captain as a black slave to a British West Indian plantation.

In *Crossing the River* Phillips describes the American Colonization Society’s two major functions: the emancipation of slaves and the repatriation of freed blacks to Africa. Emancipation and repatriation do not grant African blacks in America American citizenship. The American Colonization Society’s real purpose is to safeguard American ethnic purity by repatriating the freed Blacks to American colonies in Africa. In 1821 and 1822, the society endeavored to found a colony on the Pepper Coast of West Africa. The colony was meant to be a resettlement site for free-born or manumitted American blacks.

Nash Williams’s previous slave master, Edward, is a rich and benevolent per-

1 In 1789 Equiano published his autobiography, *The Interesting Narrative of the Life of Olaudah Equiano or Gustavus Vassa, the African*. He travelled widely promoting the book, which became immensely popular, helped the abolitionist cause, and made Equiano a wealthy man. It is one of the earliest books published by a black African writer. In 1792, Equiano married an Englishwoman, Susanna Cullen, and they had two daughters. Equiano died on 31 March 1797. See <http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/historic_figures/equiano_olaudah.shtml>.

son who wants to find a way to relieve his sense of guilt because of his familial involvement in slave trade and slavery. The establishment of the American Colonization Society meets Edward's needs. Nash is freed and sent by the society as a Black Christian missionary to his birth place in Liberia. Nash's American citizenship becomes invalid in Liberia. He becomes a mere experimental subject of Macaulayism, the policy of ostensibly eliminating indigenous culture through the planned substitution of the alien culture of a colonizing culture with the help of Christian missionary education. The American Colonization Society believes that black Christians are more efficient in running American African colonies. Contrary to the society's plan Nash meets a tragic and untimely death before he is able to establish a Christian school in Liberia.

In his letter to Edward, comparing his life with the process of sprouting, growth, withering and the death of a plant Nash blames Edward's and the Society's indifference towards his repatriated life. "You, my father, did sow the seed, and it sprouted forth with vigor, but for many years now there has been nobody to tend to it, and being abandoned it has withered away and died" (*Crossing* 63). The death of Nash is regarded by members of the American Colonization Society as a kind of asset loss and a symbol of the marred beginning of the American colonial course. In fact, Nash's death will not influence the course of American colonization because more Nash-like freed blacks will be continuously sent from America to Liberia.

In *Dancing in the Dark* (2006) Phillips rewrites the life experience of Bert Williams, a Bahamian American entertainer, one of the pre-eminent entertainers in the Vaudeville era and one of the most popular comedians for almost all audiences of his time. As an artist Bert Williams regards American stage as his home but the conflicts between Bert Williams's stage identity as a black character and his social identity as a black American make him stageless/homeless. Bert Williams's successful stage performance cannot change American racism because the precondition for white audience's recognition of Williams's talents is his performance of stereotyped African black images. Phillips highlights Williams' dilemma by describing his off-stage melancholy mood just as Williams's friend W. C. Fields once commented that "He [Bert Williams] is the funniest and the saddest person I ever know" (Seibert 20). According to Phillips, as far as his achievements and reputation are concerned Williams should have been considered as a successful American who has fulfilled his American dream, but his success and American citizenship are based on his black persona in *mise en scene*.

Phillips's description of the repetitive process of Williams's putting on and removing masks reveals his identity crisis as an American black artist. As an Amer-

ican black Williams wishes to get rid of the bondage of the African black mask and the stereotyped African performances and enter the artistic field of white comedians. Williams’s success is based upon his observation of the invisible racial contract between black performers and white audience. Williams’s cross-boundary efforts end his stage career. Mr. Nail clarifies to Williams “the Negro is only acceptable on the American stage as long as he is singing idle coon songs and dancing foolishly, in other words, as long as he is a close approximation to the white man’s idea of a nigger” (*Dancing* 180). Williams is not satisfied with black impersonations and tries to change white audiences’ view of black artists. His mask-less performance violates white audiences’ aesthetic expectation, and is rejected by the angry white audiences. The loss of audience and the right to perform eventually result in Williams’s loss of his American stage/home.

In “Made in Wales,” one of the short stories in *Foreigners* (2007), Phillips continues to draw materials from the life experiences of renowned black celebrities. He rewrites the life story of Middleweight Champion of the World Randolph Turpin from 1951 to 1966. As a black British descendent, Turpin’s identity has gone through a series of changes from “Leamington Licker” to “British national hero” and to “beast in the jungle.” From beginning to the end, Turpin is never at home with his fellow countrymen.

In 1951 Turpin defeated world boxing champion Sugar Ray Robinson and was hailed by British as a British national hero. Turpin’s success is the best representation of the highest consumptive value of colored immigrants and their descendents in Britain. A political economic analysis of Turpin’s case shows that sanctification and demonization of Turpin correspond with a British economic boom in 1950s and the subsequent depression in the 1960s and 70s. After the Second World War, in order to promote economic development and build a welfare state, British political parties reached a consensus on a cross class and race alliance. After economic depression took place, British consensus politics became invalid and a culture of consensus and consent was replaced by one of crisis and coercion (Procter 86). When economic crisis comes British blacks are among the first to be affected and they are naturally considered as the source of moral panic as it is demonstrated in Enoch Powell’s “Rivers of Blood” speech. Turpin is both a beneficiary of British welfare state system and a victim of British “crisis and coercion” politics.

From *Cambridge* to *Foreigners*, Phillips’s postcolonial narrative of transatlantic diaspora covers a period of two centuries. Under this historical context Phillips contends that the abolishment of the slave trade and slavery is the genesis of a new stage of racial discrimination. He asserts racism has been genetically inherent with-

in Anglo-American societies and only changes its ugly face as it adjusts to modern times. Diasporan black Africans and their descendents can only be treated as Anglo-American citizens when they abide by the invisible racial contract, according to which whites are superior to blacks. According to Caryl Phillips, the realization of commercial value of blacks in contemporary Anglo-American societies is nothing new but an old practice in the old world order of slave trade and slavery.

Transatlantic Diaspora, Not Only a Black Matter

Transatlantic slave trade as the major form of early African diaspora involved slave traders' transportation of enslaved Africans, mainly from Africa to the Americas, and then their sale there. The slave trade industry not only creates the African diaspora but also creates a diaspora of British whites. In *Cambridge* diaspora becomes a shared fate of both black Africans and white British represented by Miss Emily Cartwright. For Emily, leaving England means a departure from home and her choice of living with her black female servant means an arrival at her new home. Between departure and arrival, Emily Cartwright narrates the good character traits of African black slaves who are sold to British sugar plantations in West Indies and challenges the legality of the old ethical relationship between the white British and black African slaves. Emily's anxiety of belonging is a result of displacement and moral disorientation.

Sent by her father to inspect his West Indian plantation before her arranged marriage to an old widower, Emily witnesses white people's brutality and hypocrisy and the sufferings of innocent blacks. The barbarity of the whites, the stillbirth of her child and the bankruptcy of the plantation result in Emily's disillusionment in her British citizenship. Emily stands for a group of diasporan British whites who are stuck in colonies because they despair of their mother country and do not have the means of going home (England). They are deserted by England almost at the beginning of their diaspora and their colonial life and labour can only satisfy British absentee landlords' material needs.

Emily Cartwright writes in her diary, "Perhaps my adventuring will encourage Father to accept the increasingly common, though abstract, English belief in the iniquity of slavery" (*Cambridge* 7-8). In 1807 British parliament passed the *Slave Trade Act of 1807* that abolished slave trade, and in 1833 passed *The Slavery Abolition Act* which abolished slavery throughout the British Empire. According to Emily's diary, the historical background of *Cambridge* is between 1807 and 1833. Against this historical context, Phillips illustrates how the lives of diasporan British whites represented by Emily are negatively influenced and displaced by British

slave trade and slave plantations in West Indies.

In Emily's first person narration the word “Father” appears always with the first letter capitalized. In the preface of the novel “Papa” and “England” are repetitively used. The equation between England and father is thus established. Emily's diaspora entails the desertion by both her father and England. Emily is a manipulated and badly treated daughter whose arranged marriage is meant to pay off her father's debt. Leaving England Emily becomes homeless. The death of her English maid Isabella and her two unfortunate experiences, food poisoning and the stillbirth of her child with the British manager Mr. Brown, and her awareness of the inhuman slavery system in the plantation have left Emily hopeless about the West Indian British community. Refusing to be financially exploited by British absentee landlords, Emily cuts the tie of her origin so as to be free from the evil and suffocating confinement of British slavery system in West Indian sugar plantations.

According to British doctor McDonald and plantation manager Mr. Brown, black slaves are promiscuous animals and lazybones pretending sickness, but in the eyes of Emily black slaves are loyal, innocent, hardworking and persevering. The contradictions between two facts about black slaves, the one told by British colonizers and the one observed by Emily contribute to Emily's failed acclimatization to West Indian natural and social environments. Emily is shocked by British whites' hypocrisy, scientific racism and brutal racial violence.

According to Emily's observation, the British are not carrying out civilizing and economic mission (*Cambridge* 24); the British are not noble saviors but lawless and shameless Yahoos. Economic exploitation, pleasure seeking and racial violence characterizes British life in West Indian plantations.

British doctor McDonald's judgment of black slaves as low animals seems to be logical and trustworthy but Emily claims that “The prospect of such easy wealth has attracted many *quacks* and under-qualified physicians to these islands, but as yet there is no thorough means of checking a man's credentials should he step from a ship and claim the title of *Doctor*” (35). McDonald's medical qualification is questioned and his “scientific” judgment is no longer trustworthy. Talking with Mr. Brown Emily finds that the reason that African blacks are considered as animals by their white masters lies in African blacks' irreplaceable labor value: “In short, if Negroes do not labour, then who will? After all, according to my instructor, white men and animals are unsuited to this form of drudgery” (85). Professor Paul Gilroy observed that the nature of plantation slavery is capitalism that takes off its coat (15); in *Cambridge* McDonald and Mr. Brown take on the coat of scientific racism to rationalize colonial capitalist exploitation of black slaves. The first prime min-

ister of Trinidad and Tobago Eric Williams commented that “Slavery was not born of racism; rather, racism was the consequence of slavery” (7). Kenneth Morgan uncovered British whites’ political economic motivation in their demonization of black slaves and argued that: 1. Slavery in nature is an economic phenomenon and slave trade as well as sugar sales had laid the foundation for the development of British capitalism and manufactures in late 18th century. 2. West Indian merchants and plantation managers were entrepreneurs who had facilitated British commercial operations. 3. Their business activities had a far reaching influence on British domestic political economy (30-31).

In *Cambridge* British colonizers’ self-claimed humanitarian treatments of black slaves such as medical aid and religious education are ill intentioned and maliciously carried out. Medicare for the blacks is to guarantee the amount of labor and economic returns on plantations but quack doctors’ medical practice causes the death of a great number of black slaves. As far as religious education is concerned white missionaries provide black slaves limited religious guidance to guarantee the moral and intellectual superiority of white colonizers. In the novel, Priest Rogers contends that with moral and intellectual superiority white colonizers can govern blacks who have an obvious physical superiority. British white colonizers know that black slaves’ insurrection cannot be suppressed by understaffed and under-equipped British militia and navy. In order to prevent black slaves from insurrection, colonizers represented by priest Rodgers try their best to deny black slaves’ access to Christian knowledge.

Witnessing Manager Brown’s irrational lashes on Cambridge to force obedience Emily sighs:

The *children of the sun* are mortals, and accordingly possess their share of failings and must endure the crack of the inhuman whip. But its use must be judicious, for there can be little more offensive to the human spirit than to observe the cattle-whip being inflicted with all the severity of vindictive malice. This, I must admit, I was unfortunate enough to witness, the villain bestowing the rope’s-end being none other than Mr. Brown. (*Cambridge* 41)

In order to win Emily’s favour Brown pretends to be a just law executor in Cambridge’s meat purloining case. Emily is sympathetic with Cambridge but she chooses to be on Mr. Brown’s side. Although Caryl Phillips’s official web editor regards Emily as “a morally-blind, genteel Englishwoman,” Emily’s choice of becoming Mr. Brown’s mistress cannot be regarded as an evidence of her moral blindness

because on one hand she is confused by Mr. Brown’s fair play of justice, and on the other hand, she wants to maintain her British identity by simply giving up moral judgment because Mr. Brown is Emily’s English countryman and the sense of belonging is established when she lives with Mr. Brown in a place full of black slaves.

In fact, Emily’s sympathy towards diasporan blacks goes beyond her time. As far as her insight of black diasporan history and foresight of diasporan blacks’ future are concerned, Emily is none other than Caryl Phillips’s spokeswoman:

Perhaps the commonest of all the negro airs that I have given ear to, and one of the very few that I have been able to distinguish as English, reflects the rootlessness of these people who have been torn from their native soil and thrust into the busy comer of our civilized world. It is much to be doubted that they will ever again reclaim a true sense of self. The evidence before my eyes suggests that such a process will unfold only after the passage of many decades, perhaps many centuries. It will not be swift. (70-71)

Despite her sympathy towards the African black slaves, Emily decides to suspend her moral criticism of British colonizers and become Mr. Brown’s mistress, because of her constant exposure to the propaganda of scientific racism and white colonizers’ atrocity against blacks. Emily’s self-cured disease caused by unacclimatization metaphorizes her moral fatigue or moral disorientation.

Emily’s anxiety of belonging is the result of a series of events, the stillbirth of her child with Mr. Brown, the desertion by Brown due to her persistent high fever after child birth, the murder of Brown by Cambridge, plantation’s reduction of output and imminent bankruptcy, and the insurrection of black slaves. Ashamed of her identity as the daughter of a British absentee landlord, Emily wants to get rid of that identity once for all. Emily eulogizes the industriousness of black slaves and white creoles and criticizes British absentee landlords’ parasitic lives as she comments: “They [black slaves and white creoles] were the holding stations for those who simply wished to extract profit to be lavished on English gaming tables and other more domestic vices” (126).

Emily decides to be away from the West Indian British community and live with her black servant Stella and becomes a West Indian white creole. In *Cambridge* Phillips has provided a definition for “creole”:

In England the term *creole* is generally meant to describe those of mongrel-

ized origins, but here the term refers to any, black or white, who is either well-seasoned, and thus deemed to have safely entered this new tropical life, or has been born in this zone and is therefore a full participant in the day-to-day commerce that surrounds the production of American sugar. (38)

Appreciating the beautiful gardens in black slaves' villages, the merry dances and singing of blacks, Emily realizes that compared with energetic and enthusiastic blacks on West Indian islands the cold blooded whites are lifeless hollow men. She declares, "If I were to be asked if I should enter life anew as an English labourer or a West Indian slave I should have no hesitation in opting for the latter" (42).

In "Epilogue" employing a garment metaphor, Caryl Phillips describes Emily's metamorphosis from an English genteel lady to a West Indian white creole:

England. Emily smiled to herself. The doctor delivered the phrase as though this England was a dependable garment that one simply slipped into or out of according to one's whim. Did he [McDonald] not understand that one day a discovery might be made that this country-garb is no longer of a correct measure? And what then? (177)

Emily regards her British identity as a disposable garment whose size does not fit her any longer and seriously considers her future in West Indies.

In the end of *Cambridge* Emily stands naked in front of the mirror observing her mature body and feels a new life is coming. In Emily's eyes Stella is no longer the clumsy imitator of Isabella but a dear family member. At sunrise Emily journeys up the hill to Hawthorn Cottage where Stella lives, which symbolizes Emily's choice of a creole life and the West Indian white creole becomes Emily's new garment of identity that brings her a sense of coming home.

Through the story of Emily, Phillips intends to demonstrate that the symbiotic diaspora of both African blacks and British whites during British transatlantic slave trade. When African blacks were sold and forced to leave their African homes and settle down in the West Indies a great number of British whites had to leave Britain to live in British colonies. Unable to return to Britain and suffering from the anxiety of belonging, many of them are gradually creolized.

As far as their functions in British colonial economic system are concerned, white British managers, inspectors, and bookkeepers are not different from black slaves in British colonial plantations. Satisfying the material needs of rich and greedy absentee landlords is the existential value of diasporan African blacks and

British whites. Some diasporan British have renounced their British identity due to their loss of financial capacity and lack of confidence in their British fellow countrymen. Black slaves or black people in general provide a life line for the diasporan British whites exemplified by the familial relationship between Emily and her black servant Stella. In the end of the novel Caryl Phillips envisages an imagined community in which white creoles and black slaves are harmoniously living together.

Phillips's postcolonial rewriting of transatlantic diaspora presents readers with a panoramic view of the old world order of colonial economy and politics. As it is written in *Cambridge*, the financial gains of British absentee landlords are mainly based on the diaspora and hard workings of both British whites and African blacks. Emily's life experience in a West Indian plantation epitomizes the victimization and sufferings of ordinary British people in the course of British colonization and primitive accumulation of capitalism. Phillips argues that, "Across the centuries British identity has been a primarily racially constructed concept...Race and ethnicity are the bricks and mortar with which the British have traditionally built a wall around the perimeter of their island nation and created fixity" (*New* 272-273). Writing back to the history of transatlantic slave trade, Phillips has put forward another argument that "the bricks and mortar" of race and ethnicity do not make sense and do not work any longer because diaspora of people of different races has already changed the ethnic landscapes of both previous colonies and Anglo-American societies. The racially pure Anglo-American societies exist merely in the fantasies of white racists.

In his essay collection *A New World Order* (2001) Caryl Phillips has commented on many postcolonial writers' (such as Richard Wright, James Baldwin, Nadine Gordimer, J. M. Coetzee, V. S. Naipaul and Zadie Smith to name but a few) strategies of anti-racial discrimination and drawn a conclusion that these writers almost unanimously suffer from "The High Anxiety of Belonging" and have failed to alleviate it. According to Caryl Phillips, these colored ethnic writers have tried to fend off racial discrimination and win an equal footing for their countrymen in Anglo-American societies but like many of their fictional characters they are either disillusioned or lost in a reverie of a multi-racial, multi-cultural utopia.

Questioned by his lawyer about how to dispose of his body after death, Phillips declares that he wishes his "ashes to be scattered in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean at a point equidistant between Britain, Africa and North America...a place that, over the years, I [Phillips] have come to refer to as my Atlantic home" (*New* 304). Born in St. Kitts, growing up in England, living in America, travelling among England, America and Africa, Caryl Phillips records his anxiety of belonging and

dedicates himself to the description and interpretation of the diasporan subjects', both blacks and whites, collective and historical anxiety of belonging accompanied by an acute sense of home insecurity.

In *Crossing the River* (1993) Africa appears as the first person narrator, a benevolent father who has been troubled by a sense of guilt and regret for centuries because of his failure to protect his children from being sold into slavery. As the father of countless diasporan Africans the first person narrator sympathizes with the rootlessness and hardships of diasporan African blacks and calls for diasporan African descendants to return home:

For two hundred and fifty years I have listened to the many-tongued chorus. And occasionally, among the sundry restless voices, I have discovered those of my own children. My Nash. My Martha. My Travis. Their lives fractured. Sinking hopeful roots into difficult soil. (*Crossing* 1)

The time span of "two hundred and fifty years" is equivalent to the African diasporan history. African diaspora is the result of black slave trade conducted by European imperial powers. Addressing black slave trade and slavery, Phillips introduces readers to the fundamental ideas that racism should have ended with the abolishment of black slave trade and slavery and in an age of globalization people from different racial, national, and cultural backgrounds are inevitably linked together. Racial antagonism as an inheritance from the old world order of colonial economy and politics causes the anxiety of belonging of both races, black and white.

"The New World Order" or global governance proposed by western politicians after two world wars is no more than a re-arrangement of the old world order in which the political, economic and cultural interests of the western countries are protected and aggrandized. As a result, the so called "New World Order" is related with a set of old political, economical and cultural orders. When the world order is politically and economically addressed, its ethical nature is ignored. The core of a world order is ethical because an ethical order justifies the righteousness of political, economic and cultural decisions and actions. The establishment of an ethical order depends heavily upon cultural hegemony. Cultural hegemony implemented by epistemic violence guarantees Anglo-American white colonizers' superiority over the colonized colored people. The political, economic, cultural and racial superiority of Anglo-American whites has long been internalized as the unquestionable nature of the ethical order of the world. Through his postcolonial narrative of transatlantic diasporan history of both blacks and whites Caryl Phillips intends to

render Anglo-American cultural hegemony invalid and urges the establishment of a new world order of ethical justice and racial equality. According to Caryl Phillips there are three preconditions for the establishment of the new world order: 1. Anglo-Americans' recognition of their crimes against black slaves and black citizens; 2. Anglo-Americans' acknowledgement of African diasporans' contributions to the development of Anglo-American societies; 3. Anglo-Americans' realization of the shared (diasporan) history and fate with the blacks. The respect for the shared history and fate will help to relieve people of both races, especially the white, of their anxiety of belonging and sense of home insecurity.

Works Cited

- Bhabha, Homi. "Preface to The Routledge Classics Edition." *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- George, Rosemary Marangoly. *The Politics of Home*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1999.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 1993.
- Millar, T. B. "A New World Order?" *The World Today*, Vol. 48, No. 1 (Jan.1992): 7-9.
- Morgan, Kenneth. *Slavery, Atlantic Trade and the British Economy, 1660-1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Phillips, Caryl. *Cambridge*. New York: Vintage International Vintage Books, 1993.
- . *Colour Me English*. London: Harvill Secker, 2011.
- . *Crossing the River*. London: Vintage Books, 2006.
- . *Dancing in the Dark*. London: Vintage Books, 2006.
- . *A New World Order*. London: Random House UK Ltd., 2001.
- Procter, James. *Stuart Hall*. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.
- Walvin, James. "The Slave Trade, Abolition and Public Memory." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Sixth Series*, Vol. 19 (2009): 139-149.

从八蛮进宝瓷瓶看全球化进程对叙事传统的冲击： 兼论熟人社会向陌生人社会的转型

The Impact of Globalization on the Narrative Tradition Reflected from the Ba Man Jin Bao Porcelain Vase: The Transition from an Acquaintance Society to a Stranger Society

傅修延 (Fu Xiuyan)

内容摘要：英国马戛尔尼使团来华在八蛮进宝瓷瓶上被表现为蛮夷进献，这一讹误从表面上看是既有的叙事传统使然，实际上却反映出乡土中国仍停留在熟人社会阶段，以及当时人对陌生人社会到来的猝不及防与诸多不适。这个“错把生人当熟人”的故事告诉我们全球化为当今世界的大势所趋，现代人不但要继续和身边的熟人打交道，还得进一步学会用各种手段与越来越多的“远方的陌生人”打交道。以铜为镜可以正衣冠，以瓷为镜亦有助于今天的人们抬头望远，走好当下的与世偕行之路。

关键词：瓷瓶；叙事传统；熟人社会；陌生人社会

作者简介：傅修延（1951-），男，江西铅山人，文学博士，江西省哲学社会科学重点基地江西师范大学叙事学研究中心首席专家、江西师范大学资深教授，博士生导师，研究方向为叙事学、比较文学与世界文学。本文系国家社科基金重大项目“中西叙事传统比较研究”【项目编号：16ZDA195】的阶段性成果。

Title: The Impact of Globalization on the Narrative Tradition Reflected from the Ba Man Jin Bao Porcelain Vase: The Transition from an Acquaintance Society to a Stranger Society

Abstract: The Macartney Mission's visit to China in 1793 was presented as barbarians bearing tributes on the Ba Man Jin Bao porcelain vase. Such a misrepresentation appears to be a result of the existing narrative tradition but, in reality, reflects how earthbound China remained stagnated in an “acquaintance society” and reflects how unprepared and uncomfortable people then felt towards the advent of a society of strangers. This story, in which strangers were mistaken for acquaintances,

tances, tells us that globalization is an inevitable trend in the world today. Modern people need to deal not only with the acquaintances around them, but also with an increasing number of “distant strangers.” Mirrors of brass help us to get dressed, while the “mirrors of porcelain” help us to look ahead and choose the right path in today’s modern world.

Key words: porcelain vase; narrative tradition; acquaintance society; stranger society

Author: Fu Xiuyan, Ph.D. and Chief Expert at the Center for Narratology Studies of Jiangxi Normal University, is Senior Professor and Ph.D. supervisor at Jiangxi Normal University (Nanchang, 330031, China). His research interests are narrative studies, comparative literature, and world literature (Email: xyfu@jxnu.edu.cn)

罗兰·巴特提到叙事无处不在以及“似乎任何材料都适宜于叙事”时举例甚多，¹ 本文想为他那张长长的单子作点补充：绘有人物故事图的瓷器也是一种重要的叙事载体，因为较之于其上列举的玻璃窗绘之类，瓷器与社会生活的关系似乎更为密切。刊载小说与新闻的书报杂志需要拿起翻开方能开始阅读，负有装饰、陈列和餐饮功能的瓷器却时刻以一种“展开”的姿态邀请人们观看，这些器具在客厅、餐厅和起居室中与人朝夕相对，人们的视线会在不经意间与其发生接触，这就导致了一种频繁而又不自觉的“强迫阅读”。瓷器不仅是中国的“国器”，在西方世界中亦是一种无法忽视的存在，不管是平民之家还是豪门府邸，其中均有瓷瓶、瓷盘和瓷杯之类的身影，美国白宫中甚至有一间专门陈设中国瓷器的 China Room。工业革命以来西方物质文化趋于繁荣，人们身边的家具、灯具和文具等多用贵重金属、玻璃和高档木料制成，但许多家庭仍愿意把一只典雅的中国瓷瓶放在最为显要的位置。美国诗人华莱士·斯蒂文斯《坛子的轶事》一诗，说的就是陶瓷圆器的独特魅力——“坛子圆圆地立在那里，/ 高高的，气宇非凡。/ 它君临四方”（斯蒂文斯 2），这种王者气度使得四周事物放弃了矜持，从四面八方涌来匍伏其下。

瓷器中的精品虽受人瞩目，其表面的图像却一直未引起学术界的足够关注。一些内蕴丰富的人物故事图至今仍处于被人熟视无睹的状态——潜伏其下的历史“本事”和文学“底本”无人钩沉，更不用说深入解读与其相关的社会文化心理。本文之所以选择八蛮进宝瓷瓶来做专门讨论，主要是因为瓷

1 “对人类来说，似乎任何材料都适宜于叙事：叙事承载物可以是口头或书面的有声语言、是固定的或活动的画面、是手势，以及所有这些材料的有机混合；叙事遍布于神话、传说、寓言、民间故事、小说、史诗、历史、悲剧、正剧、喜剧、哑剧、绘画（请想一想卡帕齐奥的《圣于絮尔》那幅画）、彩绘玻璃窗、电影、连环画、社会杂闻、会话。而且，以这些几乎无限的形式出现的叙事遍存于一切时代、一切地方、一切社会。”罗兰·巴特：《叙事作品结构分析导论》，张寅德译，载张寅德（编选）：《叙述学研究》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，1989年，第2页。

瓶上的故事发生在西风东渐的关键时刻，彼时古老的东亚大陆正遭受全球化浪潮的首轮冲击，对这一故事的讲述从表面上看是继承了既有的叙事传统，实际上却反映出乡土中国对陌生人社会到来的猝不及防与诸多不适。以铜为镜可以正衣冠，以瓷为镜亦有助于今天的人们抬头望远，走好当下的与世偕行之路。

一、瓷瓶的制作与相关叙事传统

八蛮进宝瓷瓶在收藏界被称为“粉彩八蛮进宝图螭耳瓶”，属国家一级文物，现藏景德镇中国陶瓷博物馆。制作该瓶是为庆贺乾隆皇帝弘历的八秩大寿，为了表现四海升平、万方来贺的欢腾氛围，制作者特意选择了来自最遥远国度的英国马戛尔尼使团为图中人物。中央电视台四套《国宝档案》在介绍这只瓷瓶时，指出“八蛮进宝图瓶主体描绘的就是英国使团快要到达承德避暑山庄的场景，八蛮指的就是当时来避暑山庄进献的英国使团”。¹ 其他介绍也多采用类似说法。瓷瓶的颈部饰有一对螭龙耳，口沿下方一周如意云纹，颈部绘缠枝花卉纹，间饰以蝠衔环双鱼纹等，包含了洪福齐天、子孙绵长、富贵有余等多种象征。八蛮进宝图则绘于瓶腹，成为整幅瓷绘的主体。“万寿节”的节日氛围需要用艺术作品来营造，当时宫廷画家创作了一大批反映周边藩属国家及邻邦来华致贺的叙事性绘画，景德镇作为御窑所在地，自然也须供奉相应的作品，瓷瓶就是这样成了当时贺寿大潮中的一朵美丽浪花。



八蛮之“蛮”为上古华夏族对南方少数民族的通称，《礼记·王制》对“蛮”的解释是“南方曰蛮，雕题交趾，有不火食者矣”（杨天宇 212）。与“八蛮”类似的表述尚有《周礼·夏官·职方》中的“四夷”“七闽”“九貉”“五戎”“六狄”等，这些带有虫兽偏旁的名称显示，民族之间的隔阂曾经导致过许多歧视性的想象。不过古人虽重华夏而轻蛮夷，却又意识到华夏和蛮夷同

1 详见 2008 年 1 月 7 日至 8 日中央电视台四套节目《国宝档案》之《粉彩八蛮进宝图瓶》（上下），节目总长 20 分钟。

属一体，大家共同生活在天子管辖的天下之内。不仅如此，五方杂糅的漫长历史，使得华夏与蛮夷间的融通由文化而及于血缘，此种“剪不断，理还乱”的亲族关系，使得中华民族内部极少世界上某些敌对民族间那种不共戴天的仇恨。早期中国的空间想象是华夏居中而蛮夷居偏，位居中原的天子如有喜庆，周边的蛮夷来贺是其应尽的义务。八蛮进宝这一表述并非清朝的发明，中国历朝历代都有蛮夷进献之类的节目来为良辰佳日助兴，明史关于寿宴礼仪的记载中，便有“八蛮献宝舞”和“九夷进宝队舞”之类的名称。

八蛮进宝瓷瓶高 74.8 厘米，口径 25.6 厘米，足径 22 厘米，这样的体量在当时的制作条件下堪称“器型高大”。¹ 中国自先秦时代起便有以重器纪事的习惯，器物越大其表面缕铭图文就越方便。商周青铜器有不少是因事而铸，其上的铭文为对相关事件的叙述，图案和纹饰则负有沟通幽明的使命。将叙事功能赋予陈放在显著位置上的贵重器物，原因不外乎三条：一是将事件牢固地记录下来；二是时时提醒在生之人这一事件的存在；三是昭告冥冥之中的神灵和先人。² 青铜时代开启了这种叙事传统，从那以后每逢有重大事件发生，便会出现相应的勒石铭金之作，人神共鉴的叙事意味在形形色色的碑碣文、钟鼎文和摩崖文中不绝如缕。到了无神论时代，这一传统仍然保留了下来，无论是矗立在公共场合的英雄纪念碑，还是为特定事件铸造的警世钟和回归鼎之类，都有告慰在天之灵的成分。懂得了这种叙事传统，便能明白制作八蛮进宝瓷瓶的深层意图。中国古代早有“国之大事，在祀与戎”之语（《左传·成公十三年》），“祀”和“戎”的功能都是维持一国之君的家族香火，弘历在“人生七十古来稀”的古代中国迎来自己的八十岁生日（他活到八十七岁），这一事实似乎预示着爱新觉罗皇朝的国祚绵长，因此用一件足堪传世的瓷器瑰宝来记录这件普天同庆的大事，其用意在于永续圣明天子德被四方的盛世图景。

二、人物故事图上的时空错位

然而仔细观察瓷瓶上的人物故事图，便会发现其中颇多蹊跷，具体来说就是图中描绘与英国使团来华史实有三处不符。

一是人物形貌不符。图中面目较为清晰的人物，个个长相犷厉毛发粗密，看上去更像是来自文明社会边缘的蛮夷部落，而不太像高鼻深目的欧罗巴人。

1 “此器器型高大，绘制精湛，为乾隆粉彩中的精品。”铁源主编：《江西藏瓷全集——清代（上）》，北京：朝华出版社，2005 年，第 188 页。

2 铭文的载体青铜器上面镌有神话性的动物纹样，张光直在《中国青铜时代》中认为其功能在于协助巫觋沟通天地，笔者据此提出：“与其说铭文是一种纯属人间的通讯，还不如说它是一种人神共鉴的文字传播，它的内容固然诉诸于人，但铭事者还希望神灵参与监督……青铜铭事开始了中国的‘铭事’传统，从这以后，在大型硬质载体上铭勒文字不单意味着牢固地记录事件，其仪式上的意义还为隆而重之地将所记内容昭告天地神明。”傅修延：《先秦叙事研究——关于中国叙事传统的形成》，北京：东方出版社，1999 年，第 66 页。

18 世纪汉语中的“夷”仍是异域人士的代称，这样的长相当然更契合“英夷”一词引发的想象。从服饰上看，西服革履与领带之类在图中全无踪迹，主要人物有几位束发戴冠，多数人身着箭袖风格的袍服，还有几位头顶上插着野鸡尾羽制成的翎子（亦称雉翎）。戴翎之人一般是武将，这些都是传统戏中的藩邦将领造型，过去舞台上的金兀术就是这副装扮。

二是标题名实不符。进宝应该是进献宝物，但从图中装在礼盒或瓶器之类中的宝物看，这些东西并非来自异域的进献之礼，而是乾隆皇帝的赏赐之物——也就是说图中呈现的是“英夷”获赏后返回的情景，因此画面上的行动不能称“八蛮进宝”而应为“八蛮获赏”。图中可以辨认清楚的礼品，基本上都是中华本土的特产，如瓷瓶、漆盘、寿桃、茶叶、绸缎和大小荷包之类，这些全都符合弘历对来贺使节赏赐的有关记载。赐予英国使团如此贵重的礼品（总值据说超过 50 万两白银），是因为弘历考虑到“尔国王僻处重洋，输诚纳贡”，所以“朕之赐予优加，倍于他国”（王之春 144）。

三是交通工具不符。图中除推车、挑担与肩扛者外，几名头领模样的人物均有自己的坐骑。这些坐骑并非都是马匹，其中至少有三头麒麟、狻猊之类的怪兽，还有人牵着一头长牙卷鼻的白象。这些细节再清楚不过地反映了制作者的认知局限——长期闭关锁国的内陆生活，使得许多国人忘记了陆地之外还有浩瀚的海洋，人家明明是借蒸汽机之力从海上劈波斩浪而来，却被画成从陆路靠双脚与兽力一步一步走来，画面背景上的巍峨群山还暗示了这些人来自文明世界之外的地方。

不过这里最关键的问题还不是有乖史实，而是与时代严重脱节。如果这幅图像绘制于明朝，如果把这件事搁在朝贡体系未受外来冲击的东亚世界之内，沿袭蛮夷进献之类的叙事模式并无多大不妥，因为可以把它看成是无须过于计较的图像隐喻——在正统人士眼中，华夏周边皆为化外之地，来自茫茫林莽的茹毛饮血之徒大约就应该是画面上的那幅样子。然而瓷瓶的制作是在 18 世纪末，一旦把图像上的人物坐实为 1792 年来华的英国马戛尔尼使团，我们便会发现这里存在着严重的时空错位。彼一时也此一时也，此时的天下已经不再是传统格局中的东亚小世界，而是因航海时代到来而开放了洲际界限的整个地球，英国马戛尔尼使团来华标志着一个新的时代已经开始：西欧一个偏僻岛国挟工业革命之力成为世界上最强大的国家之后，开始觊觎欧亚大陆最东端的庞大市场，由此拉开了中西两大文明相互冲突和激荡的序幕。从这个角度看，把乘坐战舰而来的英国使团描绘成图像上的蛮夷，是一场把先进当成落后的天大误会。过去蛮夷进献是为了表示宾服，而英国使团是为攫取当时的中国市场而来，用“来者不善善者不来”形容其意图可谓再合适不过。当然，马戛尔尼使团来华也说是为乾隆皇帝祝寿，为人祝寿须有礼物馈赠，其精心挑选的礼物中最为引人注目者，莫过于配置了 110 门大口径火炮的“君主号”战舰模型（使团乘坐的“狮子号”战舰备有 64 门火炮，

与“君主号”相比可谓小巫见大巫），以这艘滕艚巨舰的模型为“进献”之礼，其恫吓意图昭然若揭：谈判不成便用大炮轰开中国的大门！后来的事实告诉我们，“船坚炮利”正是西方列强给当时国人留下的主要印象。¹

三、时空错位的历史原因：由熟人社会向陌生人社会的艰难转型

人物故事图上令人哭笑不得的时空错位，从表面上看是瓷瓶制作者的责任——御窑中的技师与画工镇日埋头操作，他们哪里知道外面的世界发生了如此之大的变化。然而把板子打到他们身上未免过于简单，我们应该下沉到中国社会的文化心理层面，追寻导致这种错位的深层原因，以下的讨论围绕熟人社会和陌生人社会这两个概念来进行。

1. 熟人社会与瓷器上的熟人

熟人社会是乡土中国的产物，费孝通《乡土中国》（Earthbound China）一书的英文标题由人类学家马林诺夫斯基亲自命名，所谓“Earthbound China”说白了就是“绑在土地上的中国”。要理解“绑在土地上”这一表述，不妨读一下著名诗人臧克家《三代》中的诗句：“孩子在土里洗澡，/爸爸在土里流汗，/爷爷在土里埋葬”（臧克家 231）。费孝通认为乡土中国的农耕文化是催生熟人社会的主因，他这样解释两者之间的关系：“向泥土讨生活的人是不能老是移动的。在一个地方出生的就在这地方生长下去，一直到死”，“历世不移的结果，人不但在熟人中长大，而且还在熟悉的地方上生长大。熟悉的地方可以包括极长时间的人和土的混合。祖先们在这地方混熟了，他们的经验也必然就是子孙们所会得到的经验。（费孝通 21）”从这一意义上说，旧时的国人不仅被“绑在土地上”，他们还被“绑”在熟人当中，这就导致乡土社会中的人际关系主要是由熟人构成。当代中国虽已进入工业化和城市化的轨道，但国人在心理上还不能说完全走出了熟人社会，因为“熟人好办事”之类的想法仍在左右我们的行为，许多人直到今天还习惯于通过种种关系和渠道，去寻找或者说发现那些能够帮助自己解决困难的“熟人”。

“绑在土地上”意味着成天与泥土打交道，瓷器的原料来自山间的泥土，没有哪种器物与泥土的关系有这样直接，由此可知瓷业在东方发展到高峰是一种必然，因为农耕民族有更多与泥土相关的经验与情感。宋应星《天工开物》上篇的“乃粒”将大米分为粳米与糯米，下篇的“陶埏”又提到瓷土可分为“粳米土”与“糯米土”，这样的分类方式提醒人们农业是瓷业的母体。

“陶埏”对瓷坯生产过程的细致描述，²也让人想起赣地大米食品如米粿、米

1 “无非恃其船坚炮利，以悍济贫。”林则徐：《会奏穿鼻尖沙嘴叠次轰击夷船情形折》（1839），杨国桢编：《中国近代思想家文库·林则徐卷》，北京：中国人民大学出版社，2013年，第238页。

2 “造器者将两土等分入白春一日，然后入缸水澄。其上浮者为细料，倾跌过一缸。其下沉底者为粗料。细料缸中再取上浮者，倾过为最细料，沉底者为中料。既澄之后，以砖砌长方塘，逼靠火窑，以借火力。倾所澄之泥于中吸干，然后重用清水调和造坯。”宋应星：《天工开物》，潘吉星译注，台北：台湾古籍出版有限公司，第249页。

粉、发糕的制作，两者都包括了杵春、缸澄、和料、加温等程序。不仅如此，瓷器的精巧和脆弱，要求制作者须有特别的耐心与爱心，这种要求恰恰对应了农耕民族相对温和的天性。林河说“农耕文化赋予中华民族的爱心、精心、耐心与爱好和平的天性”，这是因为我们祖先所作的工作主要是驯化植物：“驯化动物与驯化植物在方式方法上是有很区别的。驯化动物只要有一根鞭子与一点食物就够了。动物不驯服，就用鞭子抽它，动物驯服了，就奖赏它一点食物。而驯化植物的方式方法大不一样，你用鞭子抽它，或者是拔苗助长，都只能使植物死亡，一定要有爱心、精心与耐心，还要有和平的环境，才能使植物得到驯化与高产。”¹ 英国 18 世纪小说家丹尼尔·笛福经营过一家砖厂，所以他能在《鲁滨孙漂流记》中细致书写主人公在荒岛上屡遭挫折的制陶过程，² 制陶与制瓷相比要容易许多，从这里可以想见我们古人为发明瓷器有过怎样的付出。

如果说“绑在土地上”使国人结下了与瓷器的缘分，那么“绑”在熟人当中则决定了瓷器上讲述的大多是熟人的故事。笔者近期关注中西叙事传统的差异，这种差异可从生产方式角度得到解释：西方人历史上大多为海洋与游牧民族，他们习惯于在草原、大海与港湾之间穿行，其讲述的故事因而更多涉及远方异域，这一点颇为直观地呈现在西方各大博物馆收藏的古希腊罗马陶质瓶器上，那上面有许多陌生人乃至怪物的形象。相比之下，农耕文化导致国人更为留恋身边的土地家园与熟人社会，流浪汉叙事注定在安土重迁的中国难成气候。由于叙事传统的惯性作用，我们这边直到晚近仍然热衷于讲述熟人熟事，以异域远方为背景的叙事作品堪称凤毛麟角，人们习惯欣赏的是国门之内的“这边风景”。³ 新近热映的电影《流浪地球》，甚至以带着地球家园“流浪”为故事线索。这种大气候影响下的叙事性瓷绘，自然也会以国人耳熟能详的人物为对象，以著名的元青花八大人物故事图罐为例，这些传世之作上的“鬼谷子下山”“百花亭”“刘备三顾茅庐”“尉迟恭单骑救主”“西厢记焚香”“昭君出塞”“周亚夫细柳营”和“锦香亭”等，皆为当时人喜闻乐见的本土故事。

2. 陌生人社会与瓷器上的陌生人

有熟人社会就会有陌生人社会。首先在社会学领域使用陌生人一词的是格奥尔格·齐美尔，他在《陌生人》一文中说陌生人最初是为逐利而“突破

1 李建辉：“中华民族为什么自古是一个爱好和平的民族？——访文化人类学家、作家、民俗学家林河”，载《中国民族》，2002 年第 7 期。

2 “调合陶泥，做出了多少奇形怪状的丑陋的家伙；有多少因为陶土太软，吃不住本身的重量而陷了进去，凸了出来；有多少因为晒得太早了，太阳的热力太猛而爆裂了；有多少在晒干前后一挪动就碎了。总之我经常费了很大的劲去找陶土，把它挖起来，调合好，弄到家里来，把它做成泥瓮，结果费了差不多两个月的劳力，才做出两只非常难看的大瓦器，简直没法把它们叫做缸。”笛福：《鲁滨孙漂流记》，徐霞村译，北京：人民文学出版社，1982 年，第 106 页。

3 王蒙的长篇小说《这边风景》获 2015 年第九届茅盾文学奖。

地方性限制”的商人（齐美尔 341），这在和平年代来说应该没错，但我们都知在在有冲突的区域，首先穿越防线的是那些手执武器的陌生人。陌生人实际上有两种：一种是齐美尔在该文中提到的“天狼星上的居民”，这种陌生人对地球人来说毫无意义，因为他们生活在与我们毫不相干的另一个星球之上；另一种就是出现或行将出现在我们身边的陌生人，他们带来威胁、扰动与不安，其到来意味着既有的秩序已然或即将被打破。受齐美尔启发，詹姆斯·弗农在《远方的陌生人：英国是如何成为现代国家的》一书中提出了陌生人社会这一概念，他认为与“远方的陌生人”之间的长期贸易和社会互动，为国内市场狭小的不列颠群岛提供了率先进入陌生人社会的契机。所谓陌生人社会是一种基于认同感的抽象存在，人们不一定都要住在邻近的社区，甚至也不需要相互谋面——“不断正规化的国家性组织能够连接和动员远方的陌生人，结社文化和政治文化的重构正是围绕这样的组织而展开的。这种重构归功于对抽象理念的印刷以及印刷品的广泛传播”（弗农 122）。将该书与费孝通的《乡土中国》对读，可以得出这样一种认识：全球化进程的一个重要表征是熟人社会逐步转型为陌生人社会，人们从只在熟人中生活变为与越来越多的陌生人打交道，这是一种不以任何人意志为转移的历史规律。

这样的进程当然也会被各种载体的叙事所反映。西方叙事从一开始就在歌颂寻找金羊毛和远征特洛亚的勇士，人们对异国他乡的看法是既充满危险又值得向往，因此古希腊罗马瓶器上才会有那么多远方异物和陌生人的形象，这种情况说明西方人对陌生人社会的到来早有心理准备。另须指出，西方一直有在瓶器上绘画的传统，瓶画的内容多为神话故事和英雄传说，带有很强的叙事性。出土瓶器在西方拥有众多爱好者，这一欣赏传统也为中国瓷器进入西方作了铺垫。众所周知，欧洲尤其是英国 18 世纪以来与“远方的陌生人”之间的长期贸易，在东方主要以茶叶和瓷器为主，而较之于茶叶，瓷器因制作工艺复杂而更不容易被取代。弗农说陌生人社会的建立归功于“印刷品的广泛传播”，需要补充的是，瓷器在西方与东方的“连接”上也扮演了不容忽视的角色。在影像手段尚不发达的时代，色彩鲜艳、质地晶莹的中国瓷器带来的视觉冲击无与伦比。具体来说它使得“远方的陌生人”来到身边，中国的人物故事通过瓷器进入欧洲的千家万户，成为西方人不时凝视的对象。如此一来，前文所说的“这边风景”便被挪到“那边”，远方和远景变得不那么遥远。除了缩短东西方之间的心理距离，瓷器上的中国故事和人物还为西方生活注入了异域情调，妆点了上至贵族下至百姓的生活环境，促进了西方社会的“日常生活审美化”。更为重要的是，瓷器导致的“连接”增加了西方人对东方的憧憬，这种憧憬为其朝着东方扬帆远行提供了动力。

相比之下，陌生人社会对国人来说则是一种缺乏心理准备的到来。古代中国与外部世界虽早有接触和交流，但明朝在郑和下西洋之后开启海禁，清朝乾隆年间更加强了闭关锁国的力度。采取这些措施在当时均有具体原因，

从根本上说还是农耕民族以土地为生，对外无需求亦无兴趣，因而察觉不到全球化浪潮对东亚海岸的拍击。回过头来看，马戛尔尼使团来华之所以称得上划时代的事件，是因为这个事件表明国人习惯的熟人社会已难以为继——此前西风尚未完全压倒东风（如台湾被荷兰侵占后又迎来光复），而此时大不列颠作为人类历史上前所未有的“日不落国”，已经亮明了自己对远东市场志在必得的态度。然而在叙事传统的惯性作用之下，这样的事件在瓷绘上仍被纳入蛮夷进献的叙事框架，西装革履的英国绅士在画面上成了头插野鸡羽毛的“英夷”。清廷此时还在做着“普天之下，莫非王土”的春秋大梦，全然没有意识到这个“天下”已经不再是过去的宗藩世界，打破既有秩序的远方陌生人已经乘着炮舰来到自己身边。瓷绘与时代脱节的根本原因即在于此，假如要用一句话来归纳画面上的叙事讹误，那就是“错把生人当熟人”！

有人可能会觉得这样的讹误源于画工不善于描绘陌生人，下列事实或可证明不能将板子打到他们身上。国人常用的瓷器上虽然少有西方元素，但外销瓷上却早有陌生人的形象。外销瓷的生产与贸易贯穿唐宋元明清五朝，16世纪中叶西方传教士就在景德镇订购宗教用瓷，瓷绘上从此开始出现与西方宗教有关的人物故事。康熙年间以青花瓷为主要品种的景德镇瓷器大量外销，其中有相当一部分是民窑按海外订单所作，包括西洋人物故事、田园风景在内的各种西方元素被用于青花瓷装饰。相对于青花瓷，18世纪彩绘瓷上的西洋人物故事有更为丰富的表现，色彩在瓷器装饰中的优势得到进一步发挥。值得注意的还有18世纪的西洋人物瓷塑，其工艺包括康熙五彩、素三彩以及乾隆粉彩，福建的德化窑白釉人物瓷塑也深受西方人喜爱。再往前说，魏晋南北朝至唐代是中国历史上民族大融合的重要时期，北齐黄釉扁壶上的胡人形象栩栩如生，唐三彩中的武士俑形神兼备，它们具有与汉人迥然不同的深目高鼻特征。瓷器上的胡人说明前人早就掌握了在瓷上表现陌生人的技法，因此这属于“非不能也，盖不为也”——不是技术层面的“不能”而是总体设计层面的“不为”。

四、余论：以瓷为镜

以“八蛮进宝”为名的并非只有这只保存在景德镇的瓷瓶，目前还有一些同名瓷作散落于世界各地。笔者注意到包括这只瓷瓶在内，反映马戛尔尼使团来华的瓷绘上大多会出现一名少年，这就是使团副使斯当东的儿子托马斯。12岁的小斯当东是英国使团中唯一会说一点汉语的成员，他的协助翻译为沉闷的觐见仪式活跃了气氛，弘历龙颜大悦之余对其赏赐有加。但他万万不会想到，这位接过自己腰间佩带的黄色丝织荷包的外国小童，成年之后竟然在英国下议院极力鼓吹对华发动鸦片战争，众所周知正是这场战争掀开了中国近代史亦即列强辱华史的第一章。八蛮进宝瓷瓶后面藏着这个故事，博物馆方面不能只介绍瓷瓶本身，还应同时向公众讲述它后面这段令人扼腕的

历史。

传世瓷器有许多价值连城，然而瓷器上携带的故事有时比器物本身更为珍贵。人物故事图在工艺瓷乃至日用瓷上都有大量存在，但国内外博物馆和相关图书在这方面都未予以足够的重视，有的语焉不详介绍不足，有的张冠李戴闹出关公战秦琼的笑话，陶瓷图像专家倪亦斌先生在《看图说瓷》一书中举出了大量此类错误。瓷器是中国的象征，瓷器上的中国故事及其讲述方式值得深入研究，八蛮进宝瓷瓶上的叙事虽与时代脱节，其讹误却能显示全球化进程对叙事传统的冲击，以及乡土中国向现代中国转型的不易——“错把生人当熟人”说明陌生人社会的到来已是当今世界的大势所趋，现代人不但要继续和身边的熟人打交道，还得进一步学会用各种手段与越来越多的“远方的陌生人”打交道，这是瓷瓶给人最重要的启示。邮票中的“错品”有时可以开出天价，八蛮进宝瓷瓶亦将因错位的叙事而成为绝世珍品，因为除了艺术价值外它还有难得的爱国主义教育功能——它可以提醒人们居安思危，切勿再作颞颥自大的井底之蛙。

最后要说的是，瓷器真是一种兼具乡土性与世界性的奇妙器物，它不仅在中西交往史上扮演过重要角色，其自身发展也被打上深刻的时代烙印。也就是说瓷器这面镜子上不仅映现历史风云，时代和历史反过来也在不断影响这面镜子的面貌。例如，蒙元时代打开的东西方交流大格局，扩大了苏麻离青之类含钴釉料进入中国的渠道，青花瓷上的蓝绿釉色因此而倍显秾艳，这就大大增加了中国瓷器在世界上（尤其是伊斯兰世界）的受欢迎度；与此同时，马背上民族的豪放风格，也催生了体量达到一定规模的大件瓷器（宋代是“汝瓷无大件”），显而易见，只有在像元青花那样的大盘大罐大瓶上，才有足够大的平面铺开人物故事图。¹ 不过最终决定这一切的，还是中华民族海纳百川的气度。弗农说“创造新的传统是现代性经验不可分割的一部分”（弗农 21），农耕经济如前所述固然决定了以往的叙事传统，但别忘了华夏文明之所以垂数千年而不毁，是因为它有一种见机而作、应时而变的能力。据此可以断言，国人引以为豪的瓷器仍将在新的历史进程中绽放出新的光彩。

Works Cited

巴特：《叙事作品结构分析导论》，张寅德译，载张寅德（编选）：《叙述学研究》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，1989年。

1 “中华有瓷器。宋代的白瓷、青瓷、青白瓷等极其兴盛，不过，几乎没有在瓷器上画图案的传统、习惯、嗜好及需要。到了蒙古时代，青花瓷器一举产业化。当时，作为青料的钴蓝是来自伊朗等中东伊斯兰世界的进口物品。……伊朗有制造陶器的悠长传统，却无制造瓷器的能力，因为没有高岭土这样的土壤；但另一方面，在器物上绘上彩图却是自古以来便有的。蓝、青、绿等以蓝、绿色系染料为主的彩图品味，很明显是存在的。我们也能确认其时存在着与青花瓷极为类似的青花陶器。”杉山正明：《蒙古颠覆世界史》，周俊宇译，北京：三联书店，2016年，第141页。

- [Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narrative." Trans. Zhang Yinde, quoted in Zhang Yinde (ed.), *Narratology*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 1989.]
- 笛福:《鲁滨孙漂流记》,徐霞村译。北京:人民文学出版社,1982年。
- [Defoe, Daniel. *Robinson Crusoe*. Trans. Xu Xiacun. Beijing: People's Literature Press, 1982.]
- 费孝通:《乡土中国 生育制度》。北京:北京大学出版社,1998年。
- [Fei, Xiaotong. *Family Planning in Earthbound China*. Beijing: Beijing UP, 1998.]
- 弗农:《远方的陌生人:英国是如何成为现代国家的》,张祝馨译。北京:商务印书馆,2017年。
- [Vernon, James. *Distant Strangers: How Britain Became Modern*. Trans. Zhang Zhuxin. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2017.]
- 傅修延:《先秦叙事研究——关于中国叙事传统的形成》。北京:东方出版社,1999年。
- [Fu, Xiuyan. *Narratology Studies of the Early Qin Dynasty – The Establishment of the Chinese Narrative Tradition*. Beijing: Oriental Publishing House, 1999.]
- 李建辉:“中华民族为什么自古是一个爱好和平的民族?——访文化人类学家、作家、民俗学家林河”,《中国民族》7(2002):61-64。
- [Li, Jianhui. "Why Chinese People Have Always Been Peace-Loving: Interviewing Cultural Anthropologist, Writer and Folklorist Lin He." *Chinese Nations* 7 (2002):61-64.]
- 倪亦斌:《看图说瓷》。北京:中华书局,2008年。
- [Ni, Yibin. *Porcelain in Pictures*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2008.]
- 齐美尔:《陌生人》,载齐美尔:《社会是如何可能的:齐美尔社会学文选》,林荣远编译。桂林:广西师范大学出版社,2002年。
- [Simmel, Georg. "Strangers." *How Is Society Possible: A Selection of Simmel's Sociology Essays*. Trans. Lin Rongyuan. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press, 2002.]
- 杉山正明:《蒙古颠覆世界史》,周俊宇译。北京:三联书店,2016年。
- [Sugiyama, Masaaki. *How the Mongols Toppled World History*. Trans. Zhou Junyu. Beijing: Sanlian Bookshop, 2016.]
- 斯蒂文斯:《坛子的轶事》,蒋洪新译,载蒋洪新(编):《英美诗歌选读》。长沙:湖南师范大学出版社,2004年。
- [Stevens, Wallace. "Anecdote of the Jar." *Selected Readings of British and American Poems*. Trans and Ed. Jiang Hongxin. Changsha: Hunan Normal University Press, 2004.]
- 宋应星:《天工开物》,潘吉星译注。上海:上海古籍出版社,1993年。
- [Song, Yingxing. *Tiangong Kaiwu*. Trans with Notes. Pan Jixing. Shanghai: Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1993.]
- 铁源主编:《江西藏瓷全集——清代(上)》。北京:朝华出版社,2005年。
- [Tie, Yuan, ed. *Collections of Jiangxi Porcelain—Qing Dynasty (Book 1)*. Beijing: Zhaohua Publishing House, 2005.]
- 王之春:《清朝柔远记》,赵春晨点校。北京:中华书局,1989年。
- [Wang, Zhichun. *Records of Hospitality towards Strangers in the Qing Dynasty*. Ed. Zhao Chunchen.

Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1989.]

杨国桢编：《中国近代思想家文库·林则徐卷》。北京：中国人民大学出版社，2013 年。

[Yang, Guozhen (ed.). *Literature Archive of Chinese Thinkers in Near-modern Times—Lin Zexu*. Beijing: China Remin University Press, 2013.]

杨天宇：《礼记译注》（上）。上海：上海古籍出版社，1997 年。

[Yang, Tianyu. *The Interpretation of the Book of Rites (Book 1)*. Shanghai: Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1997.]

臧克家：《三代》，载《臧克家诗选：新编》。北京：人民文学出版社，2012 年。

[Zang, Kejia. “Three Generations.” *Zang Kejia’s Poem Selection: New Edition*. Beijing: People’s Literature Press, 2012.]

《吉尔》：脑文本与小说创作

Jill: A novel on Brain Text and Novel Writing

陈 晞 (Chen Xi)

内容摘要：菲利普·拉金是二十世纪英国杰出的文学家，其半自传体小说《吉尔》展现了二战时期的年轻人为了获取社会认同而产生的困惑。本文从文学伦理学批评的角度，首先考察拉金的脑概念与其小说《吉尔》人物塑造的关系，在此基础上，本文进一步探讨了小说主人公肯普从生活经验中形成的脑概念怎样有意识地重组、重构而成为脑文本，又是怎样探寻合适的文学形式将脑文本更好地呈现出来。本文通过解析脑概念的组合过程、脑文本的形成方式，提出脑文本不仅决定了作者的写作内容，还决定了作者的表达方式。肯普讲述吉尔故事的过程和不同方式对应了人类小说写作的探索过程，因而对《吉尔》中脑文本与文学创作的研究具有典型性和普遍性意义。

关键字：脑概念；脑文本；菲利普·拉金；《吉尔》

作者简介：陈晞，湖南大学外国语学院教授、博士导师，主要研究方向为英美文学。本文为湖南省社科基金项目阶段性研究成果，项目名：“菲利普·拉金小说创作与诗学研究”【项目编号：17YBA081】的阶段成果，国家社科基金重点项目“文学伦理学与文本研究”【项目编号：13AWW001】阶段性研究成果。

Abstract: Philip Larkin is one of the most distinguished writers in 20th century, whose semi-autobiographical novel *Jill*—reveals the frustration of college students who tried to acquire the social recognition during the World War II. From the perspective of Literary Ethics Criticism, this paper first investigates Larkin's literal creation of the protagonist of *Jill*—Kemp, which is based on the Larkin's own brain concepts. Furthermore, this paper analyzes how Kemp's life experience has effected the construction of Kemp's brain concepts and brain text, thus how his brain text is composed in words as literary works. By deploring into the combination codes of brain concepts and the construction of brain text, this paper points out that a writer brain text determines his writings and his styles, and Kemp's endeavor in telling Jill story is the epitome of novel writing exploration in western literature.

Key words: brain text; brain concept; Philip Larkin; *Jill*

Author: Chen Xi is Professor at the School of Foreign Studies, Hunan University (Changsha 410078, China). Her major research fields are English and American lit-

erary studies (Email: chenxi@hnu.edu.cn).

文学创作一直以来被看成是“一种特殊的复杂的精神生产，是作家对生命的审美体验，通过艺术加工创作出可供读者欣赏的文学作品的创造性活动”（狄其骢等 183）。毋庸置疑，文学作品是由作者创造出来的，文学作品的创作过程就是作者创造的过程。在这个过程中，作者从现实生活、自然界和其他的文学作品等客观源泉中获取素材，再把这些素材通过头脑进行内化，这个内化过程就如俄国作家契诃夫所言“让我的记忆把题材滤出来，让我的记忆里像滤器那样只留下重要的或者典型的东西”（契科夫 256）。从文学伦理学批评的角度来看，这种从记忆中滤存的东西就是脑文本，现实生活、自然界和文学作品在作者头脑中的记忆就是脑概念。本文以菲利普·拉金小说《吉尔》为研究文本，分析拉金的脑文本及其小说《吉尔》中肯普的脑概念和脑文本，阐释脑概念的不同组合和由此生成的脑文本不仅决定作者的写作内容，还决定了作者的表达方式。《吉尔》是拉金的第一部小说，也是他走向文学生涯的里程碑似著作。二十世纪五十年代英国小说处于低潮，《吉尔》是该时期为数不多的佳作之一，当时的评论家曾高度评价《吉尔》是英国战后新小说的先驱（Larkin, *Required Writing* 63）。这部小说从肯普跨进牛津大学展开故事情节，讲述了出身工薪阶层的大学生试图进入富有同学圈的心路历程。肯普为博取同龄人认同所做出的努力，展示了这位爱好文学又缺乏生活和写作经验的大学生在心理和艺术上的成长过程：在疏离中被自己虚构的人物激发想象力和创造力，一步一步探索打开通向艺术殿堂的大门。

一、拉金脑概念与《吉尔》

《吉尔》是一部半自传体小说，拉金曾坦诚自己与小说中的主人公肯普“在很大程度上有相同之处”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 25），并将这部小说归类为“青少年成长小说”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 24），可见，肯普的成长经历与拉金的个人体验有着千丝万缕的联系。该小说一开始讲述肯普到牛津大学求学，却遭遇了人际关系的挫折。肯普为了获得室友富二代克里斯托弗的认同，曲意逢迎克里斯托弗，当他自以为被克里斯托弗之流接纳时，无意中听到克里斯托弗和女友讥笑自己。正当肯普委屈、愤怒而又不知所措时，收到了姐姐的来信，发现克里斯托弗对自己有个姐妹颇感兴趣，于是，肯普谎称收到的是妹妹的信，并把这个根本不存在的妹妹取名为吉尔（Jill）——这部小说的标题便是以吉尔为名。肯普最初杜撰吉尔是为了获得克里斯托弗的关注，后来吉尔成了肯普无法进入克里斯托弗世界的一种自我平衡。肯普借助伪造与吉尔的通信，把自己的理想、渴求以及不满倾泻出来。虽然肯普写的信没有引起克里斯托弗的持续关注，肯普却开始对这个杜撰的吉尔着迷，不再写信而是用第三人称的口吻创造吉尔的生活。不久，他对自己写的吉尔

故事“很失望，这不是他想要的东西”¹（130）。于是，肯普又以吉尔的口吻写日记，把她塑造成心目中的理想女性。直到在现实生活中，他遇到吉尔的化身——吉莉安，肯普心目中理想——吉尔——在现实中幻灭。

如果“文学家创作出来的文学作品，都是对自己或别人的脑文本进行加工处理的结果”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：口头文学与脑文本”14），那么，《吉尔》中的肯普就是拉金对自己脑文本进行加工处理的结果。脑文本是由脑概念组成的，脑概念“从来源上说可以分为两类，一类是物象概念，一类是抽象概念。物象概念是有关客观存在的概念”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”31）。物象概念的形成首先是对客观存在的事物的感知，然后产生印象，对于拉金来说，结巴是他成长过程中形成的一个重要物象概念。拉金四岁开始口吃，结巴招致同学的嘲笑和嫌弃，“坐在课堂上大气都不敢出，生怕老师叫起来回答问题。以至于最后，几乎所有的老师都明白了我的小心思，大家都不管我了，让我一个人呆着”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 48）。结巴让拉金“感觉是一个局外人”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 48），让他产生被孤立的印象，并以物象概念的形式储存在他的记忆中。在《吉尔》中，结巴这个物象概念多次出现，比如：肯普到达牛津大学门口，觉得学校的门房都穿得比自己体面，当他鼓足勇气向门房问路时，紧张得说话结巴，连自己的名字都说不清（5）。又如，肯普与克里斯托弗第一次见面自我介绍时也是结结巴巴：“呃——我——”，“这是，我想这是——我名叫肯普”（7）。这种紧张焦虑而引起的“结巴”，表现了主人公在人际关系中由于出身贫穷而产生的自卑。拉金曾说：“肯普的工人阶级出身和我的结巴一样，这种固有的内在障碍让人沮丧”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 63），拉金认为自己的口吃和肯普的贫穷一样是无力改变的交际障碍。印象经过大脑的处理实现从感知到认知，从而得到抽象概念并存储在大脑里，拉金的身上具体体现是：口吃让他感知到自己与周围人的隔阂，从而在他的脑海里形成了孤独和疏离的抽象概念。拉金借肯普这个虚构的角色把这种孤独疏离的抽象概念书写出来，比如：小说开篇描写肯普去牛津的路上，蜷缩在火车车厢角落里，刻意与其他旅客拉开距离；又如：肯普到达寝室时看到室友克里斯托弗和朋友正聊得起劲，他“开始局促不安，像晕船一样头晕。他检查自己：裤裆的纽扣都扣上了，外表没有什么异常，但是他的脸变得更红，双脚并拢，挺直腰杆，然后又觉得似乎有点傻，于是尝试着换一种姿势，两脚交叉，凝视着窗外”（31）。其实，拉金对肯普由于疏离感而产生的紧张局促和敏感焦虑的描写展现了肯普与周围的人方枘圆凿，而且这种状况贯穿整部小说。

除了口吃，拉金把自己对牛津大学周遭事物的感知、认知和理解也以脑概念的形式存储在大脑里，为《吉尔》的创作提供素材，比如：拉金以优异

1 本文相关引文均出自 Philip Larkin, *Jill* (London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2005)。文中的引用均为本人翻译，下文对该小说的引用只标页码不再一一说明。

的成绩拿到“高等中学毕业证书”，进入牛津大学圣肯普学院英语系学习；肯普也是以优异的成绩获得“高等中学毕业证书”，并获得牛津大学的奖学金。拉金刚进牛津大学时，对新环境感到恐惧和不安，他曾回忆说：“牛津吓坏了我。公学（public school）¹的男孩儿吓坏了我。大学教师吓坏了我。童子军吓坏了我”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 48）。拉金这段回忆中除了口吃这个脑概念，还提到了公学的男孩、教师、童子军等不同类型的人。人也可以成为一个脑概念，因为“对物象的感知产生印象，印象经过大脑的处理实现对物象的定义，产生概念，实现对物象的理解...例如，一个人的形象进入视域后成为物象，物象被感知则得到这个人的印象”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”31）。公学男孩在拉金的印象中是嚣张、傲慢和自私，他在《吉尔》中通过克里斯托弗将公学男生这个脑概念淋漓尽致地展现出来。克里斯托弗是一个自私蛮横的人，他就把离门远、离炉子近的床占为己有，将照片挂在墙壁唯一的钉子上，晚上总是玩到深夜才回寝室，把肯普从睡梦中惊醒，“以为流氓冲进寝室，吓得发抖”（21）。这些细节显示克里斯托弗自私自利、没有修养，而良好的修养是成为绅士的重要条件，绅士教育又是具有英国特色的一种教育，绅士风度更被视为英国民族精神的一种外化。英国公学是培养绅士的精英教育，真正的绅士不但具有非凡的气质、优雅的举止、渊博的学识，还有坚强的自制力以及团结协作的精神，更重要是，懂得仁爱、尊重别人，特别是对弱势者更为同情，态度更温和。显然，克里斯托弗不具备绅士风度，那么毕业于公学的他为什么行为举止与绅士背道而驰呢？小说中一位深谙英国教育的同学一针见血地指出：“我尊敬那些伊顿公学或哈罗公学的学生。他们都是有修养的人……但像克里斯托弗之流，想要跃入不属于他们的高阶层，到兰普莱那种劣质公学读书，在那里学到的是粗俗的语言和坏习气”（189）。这位同学还透露克里斯托弗的母亲是演员，父亲“名声不好”（190），是个生意人，显而易见，克里斯托弗非正统贵族出身，无法进入正宗的公学，他在牛津大学里也没有被上流社会所接纳。在兰普莱这所“劣质”公学里，克里斯托弗没有学到绅士精神却学会了拉帮结派。精英公学学生之所以喜欢建立小圈子，是因为这些学生从小寄宿，出于自我保护而结成帮派，建立一种共属的认同感，这种认同让小圈子成员产生一种内群体偏向（in-group favoritism）和外群体歧视（out-group derogation），所谓内群体偏向就是群体内部成员之间分享较多资源以及正向评价，而外群体歧视是对群体外部成员分配较少资源并给予负向的评价（Otten 22）。克里斯托弗的内群体偏十分明显：他把兰普莱公学的同学合照挂在墙上，在桌上摆放着有兰普莱图章的笔记本，与同在牛津读书的兰普莱校友三

1 Public School 可以翻译成“公学”，英国的 Public School 其实是私立学校，是典型的精英贵族学校，学费也非常昂贵。比较有名的公学有：如伊顿公学（Eton College），哈罗公学（Harrow School），西斯敏公学（The Royal College of St. Peter in Westminster）以及温彻斯特公学（Winchester College）等等。

天两头聚会喝酒，回忆兰普莱读书时的人和事。克里斯托弗与同样毕业于兰普莱的同学拉帮结派其实是社会认同焦虑的体现，他的暴发户出身使他不能被正统的上流社会所接纳，所以他与自己的同类结成小帮派，以对肯普这些拿奖学金的穷学生进行外群体歧视来彰显他们的优越性，比如：他们总是把克里斯托弗和肯普合住的寝室作为聚会据点，但是在谈话中又完全把肯普排除在外，还时不时嘲笑、挖苦肯普，让肯普“有一种冲出寝室的冲动”（13）。孤独的肯普也想要通过社会认同来增加自信，希望自己属于特定的社会群体，从而获得作为群体成员带给他的情感和价值意义，所以，肯普设法调整自己去找寻和克里斯托弗的共同点，试图让克里斯托弗的圈子接纳自己。拉金对肯普身份认同的探索反映了二十世纪四十年代英国高等教育的状况，当时的英国政府倡导教育机会均等，推动高等教育从精英向大众化发展，少数像拉金一样出身社会中下层的优秀青年通过严格的竞争考试，获得奖学金进入牛津、剑桥这样名校，而之前只有上流社会的子弟才有机会进入这些顶级大学学习。这些平民学生进入名校以后，遇到了社交和社会认同的伦理困境。和肯普一样，拉金与牛津大学中精英出身的同学格格不入，但是，他没有像肯普一样试图跨进不属于自己的阶层，而是在同样中下层阶级出身的同学中找到了认同：拉金和金斯利·艾米斯等同学组成“七人帮”，甚至发明一套他们之间才懂的密码进行交流，这七个人后来几乎都成为英国现代知名作家和运动派的主要代表人，而他们从牛津大学建立的文学理念就是“反精英”，他们的作品抒写普通人和平凡的事。

如果肯普是拉金对局外人这个脑概念的自我书写，那么克里斯托弗就是拉金对记忆中某些同学的脑概念的书写。拉金在牛津大学就读时曾和诺埃尔·休斯同寝室两年，但是他和休斯相处并不愉快，拉金描写肯普与克里斯托弗同寝室的感受其实是抒发自己的郁闷：“想到没有比这里友善的地方可以住，让他更加沮丧，... 他希望至少可以有自己的房间...”（37）。小说中，克里斯托弗不仅和肯普同寝室，他俩还同一个导师，在现实中，拉金也有一个同导师的同学：诺曼。如果说有关肯普的脑文本是拉金以自己为原型，那么有关克里斯托弗的脑文本很可能就是以诺曼为原型。首先，拉金和诺曼外形上的差异存在于肯普和克里斯托弗之间。拉金年轻时身材修长，带着眼镜，一副文弱书生的样子；肯普“脸纤细瘦长，总显得有些紧张，嘴部紧绷，眉头微皱……头发丝般发亮，像小苗一样柔软……”（1）。诺曼长着一副大脸盘，个性粗犷乖张，“他莫名其妙的高声大笑时刻可能会突然变成暴怒”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 18），而小说中克里斯托弗“比肯普高，比肯普强壮。深色的头发从前额向后梳成一个大背头，下巴短而方，大鼻子，肩膀宽厚……他的气质中带着狂妄和自以为是”（7）。其次，在生活习惯方面，诺曼自由散漫，自我约束与他毫不沾边，比如：当拉金“听完9点钟的课演讲回来时，他（诺曼）还穿着睡袍，由于已经错过了一个半小时前的早餐，诺曼郁闷地撕着干

面包吃，喝着没加奶的茶。他对我去听的课不屑一顾，‘那个混蛋简直就是浪费时间……我比那个混蛋强多’”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 18）。在《吉尔》中，多次提到克里斯托弗醉醺醺深夜回寝室，一直到睡到第二天上午，赶不上学校的早餐、翘课是家常便饭。克里斯托弗之于肯普的个性差异就像诺曼之于拉金：任何拉金认为好的品质、言语和行为，“比如准时、谨慎、节俭还有体面，诺曼都会报以米高梅电影片头的狮子般咆哮，谴责其庸俗守旧”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 19）。在《吉尔》中，肯普带到牛津大学最珍贵的东西就是母亲给他的咖啡瓷器，而克里斯托弗从家里带来的是啤酒杯和高脚酒杯，这些物象概念象征着不同的生活方式：咖啡瓷器是用来喝下午茶的，精致的瓷器装上点心、咖啡或茶，让人感受到心灵的祥和与家庭式的温暖，代表的是传统的生活方式；而克里斯托弗的酒具代表的是一种放纵、及时行乐的生活方式。《吉尔》中还罗列了克里斯托弗的其他生活用品，比如：真皮钱包、玉石烟灰缸、真丝坐垫、羊毛拖鞋、紫色浴袍，这些物象概念彰显了一种物质享受主义，而这些物品是肯普的经济条件无法企及的，它们让肯普产生自卑，同时，又不无向往。

拉金以自己为原型，将以现实生活和个人经历为基础的脑概念加工形成关于肯普的脑文本，并以小说这种文学形式将脑文本呈现出来。拉金在描写肯普和克里斯托弗不同的价值观以及肯普在冲突的价值观和诱惑之前无所适从之际，展现了二十世纪四十年代年轻人的伦理环境，特别是英国高校的教育状况，正如拉金自己所言：这部小说“越来越被当成一种历史文献…记录了现已消失的牛津大学生活模式”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 25）。

二、《吉尔》中肯普的脑文本与文学创作

如果《吉尔》是拉金的脑概念和脑文本转化为而形成的书写文本，那么《吉尔》中肯普对“吉尔”这个虚构人物的构建，解构了脑概念是怎样转变成脑文本，又是怎样以书写文本形式呈现在读者面前的。《吉尔》中，肯普在生活中找不到慰藉和满足，这迫使他借助写信、日记、故事来发泄潜意识的愤懑和排遣内心的寂寞。肯普于无意之间杜撰出吉尔，却不由自主深陷于对虚构人物的迷恋中，其实，这个虚构人物早已存在于肯普的脑本文，吉尔的故事可以说是肯普在无意识中把不同的脑概念组合在一起存储于大脑，大脑再对这些脑概念进行有意识地处理，“按照某种规则将脑概念组合起来进行思考以获取新的意义”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”30）。脑概念是松散的、无系统的记忆文本，它以什么样的形式和规律来形成脑文本，取决于作者想要达到什么样的目的和效果。肯普最初之所以编造吉尔的故事，其目的是“引诱沉溺于女色的克里斯托弗”（Bruce 109），编造与吉尔的通信其实就是肯普开始小说写作的探索。

肯普来自工人阶级家庭，单纯、有理想、有自制力。到牛津大学后，肯

普尝试着改变自己进入富二代克里斯托弗的圈子，比如：强迫自己喝酒来获得克里斯托弗的认同，暗地里模仿克里斯托弗的说话方式和穿着打扮，然而，正当肯普自以为被克里斯托弗接纳时，克里斯托弗和伊丽莎白的讥讽给他当头一棒，特别是伊丽莎白说克里斯托弗已经把肯普“调教好了”（92），“调教”这个词让肯普意识到他们根本没有平等对待自己。肯普困顿着“将要怎样对待克里斯托弗”时（96），发现克里斯托弗对自己姐姐的来信表现出异常的兴趣，于是，肯普谎称有一个中学生妹妹吉尔，当他“欣喜地观察到克里斯托弗对他的羡慕和嫉妒”（99），就继续编造吉尔吸引克里斯托弗的关注。当肯普脱口而出是妹妹的来信时，“他对自己说谎并不感到意外，但没想到的是竟能轻易脱口而出：这些故事仿佛早在他想要说出来之前就编好了，是他保持了很久的秘密。他思忖是否这个谎言在说出来之前早就存在于脑海中某个黑暗的角落”（100）。从某种意义上，肯普脱口而出的根本就不是谎言而是脑文本，这个脑文本早就存在于他脑海里，以故事的形式讲述出来，因为“如果没有脑文本的存在，他们都无法讲述故事。显然，在讲述故事和已有的文本关系中，必须有一种文本存在，讲述是为了把已有的文本转换成口头语言，让听众能够接受和理解”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”29）。所以，肯普脱口而出有关吉尔的故事时，并没有考虑要说什么和怎么说，这个脑文本在肯普的思想中早已存在，不需要特意设计，换句话说，他脱口而出的其实就是口头文学，是存储在大脑的文本通过声音媒介口头表达出来文学形式。

肯普把自己以及与克里斯托弗相关的细节以脑概念的形式储存在脑海中，通过对这些脑概念增容、减省、替换和改写，形成脑文本，再通过对这些脑文本的不断调整，最终成为虚构的文学作品。肯普为什么杜撰出吉尔呢？是因为肯普“一直寻找克里斯托弗与家庭有关系的东西……实际上，克里斯托弗的软肋可能就是家庭”（19）。从克里斯托弗的言谈中，肯普发现克里斯托弗和姐姐的关系很生疏，当肯普发现克里斯托弗对姐妹的话题感兴趣时，以为找到了克里斯托弗的情感突破口：亲情，因此，克里斯托弗家庭中手足亲情缺失作为一个脑概念储存在肯普的脑海。针对亲情而设计的吉尔让克里斯托弗放下了防备，开始诉说他对家、家人以及被送到公学寄宿的感受：“如果你很小就被送去上学的话，你确实失去了和你家的联系…有时候我会后悔，你知道的…有种与家里失去了联系的感觉”（99）。由此可见，肯普编造吉尔的故事刚开始是成功的，达到了他预期的效果。事实上，在肯普口头讲述的吉尔的故事中，其脑文本对一些脑概念进行了替换。首先，肯普把姐姐的来信替换成不存在的妹妹的，并强调：“她很漂亮了，而且聪明伶俐”，因为肯普觉得年轻美貌的妹妹比现实中年长十岁的姐姐更能吸引克里斯托弗。其次，肯普把自己的个性爱好替换成吉尔的，描写吉尔“敏感”、“爱好诗歌”、对“大英博物馆”流连忘返、独自观看莎士比亚戏剧表演（98）。肯普孤独、

渴望友谊的脑概念也替换成吉尔因最要好的同学去了美国而倍感孤独和寂寞。另外，肯普把克里斯托弗的寄宿中学替换成吉尔的学习环境，因而她在寄宿学校的故事容易让克里斯托弗产生共鸣。最重要的是，针对克里斯托弗亲情的缺失，把姐弟之间的疏远替换成兄妹之间的亲密。克里斯托弗曾告诉肯普有一次在伦敦的高档酒吧看到有个女孩“以为她想要搭讪我...她突然浅笑着走过来说：‘你是克里斯托弗吗？’。她竟然是我姐姐康斯坦斯。我们几乎两年没见过面了”（97）。针对克里斯托弗和姐姐关系疏远的脑概念，肯普替换成自己和吉尔关系亲密，“经常一起聊天、旅游”（100）。当肯普感觉克里斯托弗对吉尔饶有兴趣，决定把这个故事继续编造下去——编造和吉尔的通信。其实，从口头讲述吉尔的故事到以书信体讲述，是从口头文学发展到书面文学，肯普把脑文本以口头文学的表达形式发展成为以书面文学表达，这个转化对应了人类历史中文学从口头文学开始，发展成为书面文学。

肯普希望把写给吉尔的信看作是与克里斯托弗沟通的桥梁，因此信中描述的事件都与克里斯托弗相关，比如：有一次，克里斯托弗抱怨肯普没有及时替他写第二天上课要交的论文，当肯普连夜帮克里斯托弗写完论文，克里斯托弗却懒得抄一遍直接翘课不交作业。肯普看到自己付出一番心血克里斯托弗却毫不领情，心中对自己、也对克里斯托弗非常生气：

泪水刺痛了他的眼睛，他没有可以复仇的办法——除了借助吉尔。他不是很清楚这个办法是否可以再次奏效...当克里斯托弗在晚餐前站在壁炉前面换衣服时，约翰故意炫耀地说，‘我想我必须找个时间给吉尔回封信了，’接着，他开始写这封回信。（111）

肯普在信中写道：“克里斯托弗是我的室友，他每周的作业不可救药地依赖于我”（112），其实这段描述是克里斯托弗不学无术在肯普脑海中的脑概念的书写，但是，肯普在叙述整个事件的时候进行了改写。因为“人的大脑根据某种伦理规则不断对脑概念进行组合和修改，脑概念的组合形式也在修改过程中不断发生变化”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”33），肯普虽然为克里斯托弗代写了论文，但是心里很反感，所以肯普在信中表达了自己的真实想法：写论文是克里斯托弗自己的事，不是“我”的事（112），谴谪克里斯托弗的学术舞弊行为。肯普的脑文本对脑概念的修改和改写让他把心中想对克里斯托弗说又不敢当面说的话，畅快淋漓地说了出来，讽刺和批评了克里斯托弗不学无术。特别是，肯普在信中改写了事件的结局：克里斯托弗由于没抄完“我”替他写的论文，没去上课，受到了老师的批评。这件事以克里斯托弗受到老师的批评收场，暗示了肯普对抄袭作假的态度和立场。另外，克里斯托弗说话时常带着刻薄而炫耀的口气，肯普把这种说话方式以脑概念的形式储存在脑海里，在写给吉尔的信中肯普

模仿克里斯托弗装腔作势的腔调说自己“作为一个学者必须有一种姿态，有一种担当，而且对同学中没什么天赋的人有一种责任”，暗中显示了“我”学术上的优越感以及对克里斯托弗之流不学无术的鄙视。

肯普的大脑“按照某种文学样式对脑概念进行思考和组合，获得的脑文本就是文学文本”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”30），肯普杜撰的书信就是书信体的小说。在这种书信体小说中，他可以把记忆中的脑概念进行替换、增容、省减、改写，重构牛津大学的经历，从中获得快乐和慰藉，甚至成为一种寄托。例如，肯普在一封写给吉尔的信中是这样描述他与克里斯托弗及其朋友们第一次见面：

我发现我在这里交朋友一点都不难：到达的当天下午，我发现在我的房间里有人想开茶话会但是可能开不成。

（不是他们的房间是“他”的房间；他没有和别人合住）

克莱斯·沃纳和两个姓道林的（其中一个女性，妩媚但是轻佻）、一个叫艾迪的笨蛋和另一个安静、不起眼的休·斯坦斯密斯，他们想开个茶话会但是开不了。因为太晚了，他们不想出去，也真不知道能到哪儿去，大学里什么都没有，除了面包、牛奶和茶——他们还没有餐具。所以我来扮演慷慨的主人，拿出我的新餐具，每个在场的人都玩得很开心，吃饱喝足。从此，我就相当受欢迎！无论如何，不是每一个新生在他入学的第一天就能搞定茶话会的……（113）

然而，肯普和克里斯托弗见面的实际情况是：克里斯托弗、伊丽莎白·道林、帕特里克·道林、艾迪·美克皮斯、休·斯坦斯密斯正在寝室开茶话会，肯普的入住打扰了他们的兴致，他们明显地排斥、冷落肯普。对艾迪和休的描写是肯普对现实中这两个人的脑概念的记录：艾迪给肯普的印象是“十分自信又愚蠢”（8）；休几乎没有说一句话。信中说由于他们没有餐具，“我”主动拿出自己的新餐具来，这个情节是肯普对记忆中脑概念的改写，真实情况是克里斯托弗擅自打开肯普没开封的行李取出餐具，当肯普以为“我们带了相同的瓷器”时，所有的人都嘲笑肯普，根本没有正常的伦理意识：在没有得到主人同意的情况下不能打开他的行李，更不说使用其物品了。根据弗洛伊德的心理分析，文学是作家没有实现的愿望，“未得满足的愿望是幻想背后的驱动力：每一次幻想都包含着一个愿望的实现，改善了不得满足的现实”（Freud 176），肯普对记忆中茶话会改写而成的脑文本是他在现实中交际生活受挫的应急机制，“产生强烈影响的实际经验唤起作家对早先经验的回忆，这回忆于是促发一个在作品中得到满足的愿望”（Freud 181）。肯普重构过去事件的经过就是小说创作的经过，是在脑概念重新组合的基础上产生的脑文本的文字记载。肯普和吉尔的通信是肯普尝试的书信体小说创作，

而肯普小说创作的过程与小说作为一个文学体裁在历史上发展的过程是一致的，文学史上最早的小说形式之一就是书信体小说。以书信形式为基本表达途径和结构格局的小说，通过一封封书信展开故事情节和塑造人物形象，以第一人称“我”为主人公，写人叙事都以“我”记忆中的脑概念为基础展开，增加真实感。

肯普刚开始用书信形式写作吉尔的目的是用来吸引克里斯托弗，但是那些“谎言”对肯普自身却产生极大的影响。吉尔已经变成了肯普抒发感情的窗口，“克里斯托弗早已不再是写作的主动动力”（112），写作让肯普内心变得充实而自信：

他觉得自己以前因为克里斯托弗而困扰实在愚蠢；他不再渴望能自信地对下人指手画脚，不再渴望很富有，不再渴望拥有一个忧郁的下巴，不再渴望在洗澡时能哼小黄调。这些虽然很美妙，但是肯普不再像原来那样对它们感兴趣了。（104）

可见在个人成长方面，吉尔的写作让肯普发现自我，而在艺术成长方面，吉尔的形象成为一个越来越清晰的脑文本出现在他的脑海：

她的形象在他的脑海里越来越清晰：她妙龄十五，很苗条，一头长长的深蜜色头发用一个白色的发带绑住，柔顺的头发飘落在肩头，身着白裙。她的脸不像伊丽莎白那样妆容粗糙，而是端庄秀丽，恬静优雅，高高的颧骨：当她笑的时候，她的颧骨看起来格外显眼，文静中又带些野性。（117）

一旦吉尔成为一个独立的脑文本，那么肯普就不满足于把写信作为书写这个脑文本的唯一方式，因为信限制了吉尔的自然发展：

在这种情况下，要继续给她写信完全不可能，他把一封未完成的信装在信封里烧掉了，因为他不满意。他开始用第三人称来写她，描叙她晚上弹钢琴时坐姿如何，接着又撕掉了。后来写关于她早上起床的事情，接着又撕掉了。最后他开始写曾告诉克里斯托弗的有关吉尔的情况，写了一页又一页，上面满是擦过的痕迹，他想要写一个连续的关于她的故事。他通过描述她的生活，开始让吉尔脱离自己的生活而存在，只描述她自己。这比给她写信简单多了：他发现他的这个想法比他之前预料的更成熟。（Jill 113）

将吉尔从信中释放出来并切换叙述技巧，标志着吉尔不再被用来引诱克

里斯托弗。用第三人称来讲述吉尔的故事，故事内容也越来越脱离肯普的生活圈，脑文本对脑概念的增容越来越多，写作的故事中虚构的成分越来越多，同时，这种写作方式让作者切入的视角更广，可以选择不同的角度展开更多吉尔生活的细节。从书信方式变为故事叙述，肯普关于吉尔的脑文本不局限于自己而需要更加丰富：吉尔有自己的生活，她的活动有自己的目的，例如：同样是人际关系，肯普对克里斯托弗的招摇浮夸既羡又妒；而吉尔却欣赏同窗密涅瓦的恬静淡泊；肯普抛弃学术和行为准则，力图进入克里斯托弗的圈子；而吉尔受密涅瓦成熟和独立的影响，冷静地“审视周围人，包括她自己”（123）。肯普以小说的形式塑造吉尔，让吉尔在叙述中自由发展，不再功利地利用她取悦他人或发泄自己情绪。在此，拉金通过肯普的写作经历变化告诉我们，作者的写作动机由欲望的驱使发展成为去探索 and 发现，塑造新人物形象。然而，新人物的塑造需要有更多的脑概念来构成新的脑文本，但是不管是年轻的拉金还是他小说中的肯普都缺乏生活经验，特别是在现实生活中与女性鲜有接触，对年轻女孩没有直接的物象概念，他们对女孩仅有的脑概念是从其他文学作品中获得的抽象概念，这就注定他所塑造这个女孩不可能丰满、真实，所以肯普“觉得吉尔的形象在这部小说中不是更清晰而是变模糊了，感觉缺少一种亲密感”（130），没有达到预想的效果。

为了解决这个问题，肯普再次尝试选择不同的表现形式，希望把吉尔塑造得更真实、丰富，而这种表达方式就是日记的形式：他不再写关于吉尔，而是成为了吉尔——在关于吉尔的脑本文中把自己的脑概念完全替换成为吉尔的所思所想。在日记里，吉尔的好恶就是肯普的好恶，其实也是拉金的好恶，比如：她不喜欢济慈的过度修辞、抵抗不合理规章制度等等，都是肯普脑概念的书写，也是拉金的脑概念的呈现。肯普原打算以日记形式记载吉尔一年半的生活，中间穿插一些感怀四季的小诗和生日感谢信等等，但是没写几天他就对这种写作感到怀疑，觉得没有达到他想要的效果。因为肯普在现实中和姐姐并不亲密，也没有和女孩交往的经历，除了有关女性的生理和心理特点的脑概念很少。没有这些脑概念支撑，肯普就没有办法写出符合女性特点的吉尔的小诗和感谢信。肯普写出的所谓“吉尔”的日记只是借用吉尔的学校生活来仿写肯普在牛津的生活以及对文学和学术的感悟，“他所做的一切都是以吉尔的形象出现的自己”，而肯普真正想要塑造的是“完全独立的吉尔”（133），毋庸置疑，以日记体的小说写作以失败而告终。

结语

拉金曾称痛苦是创作的动力（Larkin, *Required Writing* 47），吉尔既是肯普应对不如意现实的策略，又是他的灵感来源。吉尔的杜撰是肯普对脑概念组合的修改及其脑文本的书写，同样，拉金塑造的肯普也是拉金的脑概念的重新组合和脑文本的书写。《吉尔》这部小说象征性地讲述了文学青年在

写作动机、怎样讲述故事情节以及角色发展等方面进行的探索，而这种探索验证了拉金后来提出的：“你为什么写作，因为你不由自主会去写，仿佛你已看到那个场景、感受到那种感觉、拥有了这个构思，只需要用文字组合起来呈现在人们面前”（Larkin, *Required Writing* 59）。换句话说，艺术家为什么写作，是因为那些场景和感觉早已成为脑概念储存在艺术家的脑海里，构成了脑文本，只需要用文字通过合适的文学形式把脑文本呈现在人们面前。

Works Cited

- 契诃夫：《契诃夫论文学》。北京：人民文学出版社，1958年。
- [Chekhov, *Chekhov's view on Literature*. Beijing: Renming Literature Press, 1958.]
- 狄其骢 王汶成 凌晨光：《文艺学通论》。北京：高等教育出版社，2009年。
- [Di, Qicong, Wang Wencheng, Ling Chenguang. *Introduction to Theory of Literature and Art*. Beijing: High Education Press, 2009.]
- Freud, Sigmund. *Freud: Collected Paper*. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Larkin, Philip. *Jill*. London: Faber and Faber Limited, 2005.
- . *Required Writing*. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.
- Martin, Bruce. *Philip Larkin*. Boston: Twayne, 1978.
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：口头文学与脑文本”，《外国文学研究》6 (2013): 8-15。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Oral Literature and Brain Text.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2013): 8-15.]
- ：“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”，《外国文学研究》5 (2017): 26-34。
- [—.“The Forming Mechanism of Brain Text and Brain Concept in Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2017): 26-34.]
- Otten, Sabine & Amelie Mummendey. “To our benefit or at your expense? Justice considerations in intergroup allocations of positive and negative resources.” *Social Justice Research* 12.1 (1999): 19~38.

华莱士·史蒂文斯与茶的伦理书写

Wallace Stevens and Ethical Writing of Tea

马晓俐 (Ma Xiaoli)

内容摘要：华莱士·史蒂文斯是美国现代派诗歌的代表。他的生活方式与诗歌创作艺术；现实与想象的主题都与东方茶产生过交集和融合，并由此产生精神启迪，提升“纯粹”的想象境界。本文以冈仓天心的《茶之书》为切入点，探索史蒂文斯早期诗歌《茶》和《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》与东方茶的渊源，展示诗歌以茶为载体呈现的道德意义，以及诗人想象世界中的现实主义关怀与伦理表达。茶及其文化或许是诗人平衡“现实和想象”、“人类和自然”、“个体和世界”和谐有序发展的交叉点。

关键词：华莱士·史蒂文斯；《茶之书》；《茶》；《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》；伦理

作者简介：马晓俐，博士，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院副教授。

Title: Wallace Stevens and Ethical Writing of Tea

Abstract: Wallace Stevens is one of the representatives of American modern poets. His mode of life, his poetry, and his creatively unique poetic theme of truth and imagination, have intersection and combinations with oriental tea, which inspires the high purity of imagination. His poems “Tea” and “Tea at the Palaz of Hoon” will be discussed in detail from the perspective of his reading *The Book of Tea* by Kakuzo Okakuro. The moral value and ethics in the imagined world based on tea as a medium and carrier find expression in his tea poems. They also display the poet’s connection with tea culture and his spiritual sustenance on tea as a nexus between the truth and imagination; the individual and the world as well as the harmonious development between Human and Nature.

Key words: Wallace Stevens; *The Book of Tea*; *Tea*; *Tea at the Palaz of Hoon*; ethics

Author: Ma Xiaoli, Ph.D, is Associate Professor of English at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research areas are British and American Literature and Tea Culture (Email: maxiaoli@zju.edu.cn).

华莱士·史蒂文斯(1879-1955)是一位传奇式人物，大学就读于哈佛大学，获得纽约法学院的法律学位，1903年获得律师资格后就职于哈特德福意外事故保险公司。他从一名普通职员升职到副总裁，事业获得成功。同时他又

坚持纯粹的诗歌创作,出版有《簧风琴》(1923),《秩序观念》(1936),《拿蓝色吉它的人》(1937),《最高虚构笔记》(1942)和《必要的天使》(1951)等诗集。作为“业余诗人”,他是美国著名现代派杰出诗人代表,被誉为“诗人中的诗人”、“纯粹的诗人”和“批评家的诗人”等雅号,在诗歌和评论界也占有不可替代的重要地位。早期创作时期,史蒂文斯以茶为主题写过两首诗歌:《茶》(1915)和《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》(1921)。此外,《垃圾人》、《混沌鉴赏家》和《三位游客观日出》等诗歌都涉及茶的内容。本世纪初,美国著名史蒂文斯研究专家理查森教授指导的博士论文“华莱士·史蒂文斯与东方文化”中,作者Zhu博士以中国“公案”为例,论述东方文化对诗人的影响,其中有涉及茶的内容。2004年,美国学者尼克的论文“史蒂文斯与茶的世界”探讨了诗人与茶相互交融的关系。然而他们的研究却鲜有论述茶的伦理表达。本文探索史蒂文斯如何相遇“茶的哲学”,以及诗人以茶为载体呈现的道德意义、想象世界中的现实主义关怀与伦理书写。

一、遇见“茶的哲学”

史蒂文斯一生“深居简出”,大部分时间在纽约和康州小镇度过,基本上是以早上外出工作,晚上回家写诗的方式过着一种平静安逸的生活。他很少出国,并未到过大洋彼岸的亚洲,然而,他与东方的茶结有深厚的缘源。根据史蒂文斯的书信记载和藏书,茶的信息与实物主要来源于中国、日本、锡兰(今斯里兰卡)三个国家。他在书信中记载1909年经常去纽约市艾斯特图书馆阅读和晚上回家写阅读笔记的情景:“阿拉伯的礼仪,波斯的诗歌,中国的道德准则,印度思想……,日本彩……。唐代皇帝的荣耀或者宋代社会的优雅。……还摘抄记录了(中国文人墨客)的四大技艺:作诗、弹琴、品茶、下棋”(Zhu 10-11)。

早在史蒂文斯在哈佛学习期间(1897—1900),波士顿美术博物馆东洋艺术博物馆内已收藏有较为丰富的东方艺术品。因为,自美国哈佛学者阿内斯特·费诺罗萨(Ernest Fenollosa, 1850-1908)在日本东京帝国大学的任职(1878-1889)结束后,将许多东方艺术品带回美国,并于1890年被聘为波士顿美术馆东方部主任,掌管他本人及友人赠送的东方艺术品。著名史蒂文斯研究专家纽约州立大学琼·理查森教授认为,“诗人在哈佛期间产生对东方物品的兴趣,其精华已经发展成为他性格中不可缺少的一个组成部分”(Richardson 33)。可以说,费诺罗萨在波士顿博物馆收藏和展出的东方艺术品对史蒂文斯的人生具有启迪作用,标志着他对东方及其哲学思想关注的开端。二十世纪初,费诺罗萨举荐自己的学生冈仓天心接替担任了美国波士顿美术馆东方部主任一职。冈仓天心(Kakuzo Okakura, 1863-1913)在东京帝国大学读书期间认识费诺罗萨,后来成为他的艺术美术启蒙老师。他学识渊博,才华横溢,精通中、日、英三国语言,通晓东西方古典文学、哲学、

美术、宗教等领域的精髓，一生频繁往来与中国、日本和美国等国家。他在美国期间，多次用英文演讲和举办茶会，红极一时，在人文艺术领域产生轰动，广交挚友并受到社会名流推崇和资助。他是日本著名美术家、美术评论家，作为“文化交流大使”，让西方世界听到了亚洲的声音。他先后出版《东洋的理想》（1903），《日本的觉醒》（1904）和《茶之书》（1906）三部英文著作，其中《茶之书》最为成功，影响力最大，出版后畅销不衰，广受关注，陆续出版十几种不同语言的译本。

《茶之书》是一本薄薄的英文小书。全书由七个章节组成，书的开篇讲述：“开始是作为药方，慢慢却变成了饮品，早在中国的八世纪时期，它（茶）就进入诗歌领域，成为一种极具风雅的娱乐方式。”此处，天心讲到中国是茶的发源地，茶最初为药用，后为饮品。历史记载着，品茶、吟诗作赋是古代中国人生活中的一种风雅娱乐方式。来自大自然的茶叶与艺术和雅士的融合，也呈现东方茶、生活方式和诗人三者之间的和谐画面。理查森教授在《华莱士·史蒂文斯：传记：早期时代 1879-1923》一书中多次提到史蒂文斯读过冈仓天心的这两本著作：《茶之书》和《东洋的理想》，并把部分内容摘抄在笔记本上。或许更令史蒂文斯震撼和深思琢磨的恐怕是在“人性的茶杯”章节里，天心精辟地总结出：“从一般接受意义上来说，‘茶的哲学’并不仅仅是审美主义。因为它还表达了我们（日本人）从伦理和宗教角度对人和自然的全部见解。它属于卫生学科，因为它强调清洁卫生；它又是一门经济学科，因为它舍弃繁琐和奢华，展示简洁中的舒适自在；它还是一门道德几何学，它界定了我们对宇宙认识的空间比例感。它使所有追随它的信奉者成为有品味的贵族，由此而代表着东方民主的神髓”（Okakura 1）。通过研读《茶之书》，史蒂文斯近乎着迷于东方茶，后来的生活中也一直追寻东方茶叶，用自身体验感知和习得“茶的哲学”的核心思想。《茶之书》在美国的出版影响并改变了史蒂文斯的生活方式和创作。

美国本土不产茶，市场上的茶叶主要来自英国、印度等拼配红茶，品种比较单一，市场不仅难以见到东方多样的茶叶品种，美国人对茶叶也是知之甚少，高品质的中国茶叶买卖更实属新鲜不易。在这样的历史背景下，史蒂文斯却十分热爱稀有的东方茶叶，非常执着购买和品鉴茶叶。他的家庭早餐和办公室似乎从来没有缺过茶，并且还喜欢和朋友探讨茶的品质。他在 1937 年 10 月 8 号的信中写道：“我在尽力想办法买到质量最好的茶叶。这里大多数茶叶都很普通，没有什么价值，然而你最近一次给我那些茶叶散发出一种自然的芳香和品质，我非常喜欢。我想再买些和上次一样那种精选茶叶，随信汇款给你 100 卢布，我对数量没有要求，只要能够买到质量上等的茶叶，能买多少，你看着办就行”（Israel 11）。在 1935 年冬季另一封写给朋友詹姆斯·A·鲍尔的信中，史蒂文斯曾提到寄钱委托一位在中国广东岭南大学读书的学生本杰明·科克（Qwock）买中国茶叶一事。他点明要买那种“博学茶”，即“中

国文人墨客喜欢喝的那种茶叶”(Letters 301)。同年,史蒂文斯在回复大吉岭基地联合茶叶公司的贝茨(Bartes)信中这样写道:“虽然不想打扰你,但我必须向你请教些问题。……我对茶叶了解的很少。……当我在旧金山想买些中国茶时,有人告诉我30美元可以买到一磅品质最好的茶……。我想旧金山的那个人似乎在给我开玩笑吧。但是,当时我对茶叶一无所知,我很想了解清楚事实”(Israel 11)。后来,他收到茶叶公司寄来的“优质花香橙黄白毫”红茶及回信:“这是能从山上采摘制作的最优质茶叶。……我们从来没有听说过世界上任何地方生产的茶叶有卖30美元一磅的。旧金山的那个人当然是在跟你开玩笑”(Israel, 11)。同一时期,史蒂文斯同锡兰总部里安纳多·范·盖泽尔(Leonard Van Geyzel)开始书信往来。1937年9月14日,史蒂文斯在写给盖泽尔的第一封信中,不仅提到给妻子和女儿买圣诞节礼物,而且还清楚地说要买茶叶:“我们家有三口人:我和妻子史蒂文斯夫人,还有14岁的女儿。我妻子可能想要一条项链,如果能够在锡兰买到的话……。我自己想要一些茶叶,比如说,5磅精选上等茶叶,不需要是同一种类的。我正在考虑可以买一些直条形的茶叶:那种我以后可以直接买到的。也许你可以在包装袋上标上贸易商的价格和名称。我喜欢的另外一种茶叶是那种在其它任何地方都弄不到手的,至少在一般市场弄不到手的那种茶叶。那种免税的茶叶你可以单独寄给我”(Letters 324)。虽然他声称对茶叶“了解很少,一无所知”,但是他被朋友称为“茶叶鉴赏家”。从上述信件中,我们可以看出史蒂文斯对茶的外观形状和品质等都有要求,称得上是行家。对于冈仓天心“茶的哲学”思想,史蒂文斯不仅在理论上和精神上追求探索,而且将购买茶叶、体验茶味、鉴赏茶品等实践方式贯穿于生活。不断地自我诠释和提升生活中茶的伦理表达。“茶的哲学”既从伦理的视角诠释了人和自然的关系,也指人的生活方式。它服务于人,告知人在生活中应该抛弃繁琐,不铺张浪费,简洁布局和空间留白设计也会使生活过得舒适开心。茶的哲学也是生活的哲学,是一种简单的生活方式。大自然赐福于人类的茶在生活中书写出伦理道德,人与自然可以交流,相互尊重才能和谐。对茶的热爱和理解,最终成就诗人一生的生活方式,也激发着他创作诗歌的灵感。正如美国学者尼克所说:“无论茶是作为一种商品还是一种文化形式都融入了史蒂文斯诗歌生活的两个阶段:早期阶段,茶促进《簧风琴》诗集的出版,使人联想到美学、声音实验、间或意象主义,更重要的是东方主义;后期阶段的那些富含哲理的长诗则经常展示出诗人对茶的鉴赏能力等”(Israel 3)。

二、《茶》¹: 茶表达的道德价值

诗歌《茶》写作于1915年,是史蒂文斯的早期作品。诗歌以茶为题但诗中却无茶字出现,这种诗歌创作手法与中国宋代诗人林和靖的《山园小梅》

1 文中史蒂文斯的诗歌译文部分有改动,但均选自:华莱士·史蒂文斯,《最高虚构笔记:史蒂文斯文集》,华东师范大学出版社,2009年。

一诗有着异曲同工之妙。《山园小梅》诗中不提“梅”字，却是空前绝后的咏梅诗歌。评论家 戈兰·蒙森 (Gorham B. Munson) 曾经说：“无可否认，他（指史蒂文斯）……受到中国诗歌的影响……由于他这种训练有素而且行之有效的细腻作风，史蒂文斯一直被人称作是中国式诗人”（Munson 44）。《茶》是一首自由诗，分八行排列，蕴涵着无穷的想象力和艺术张力，犹如一幅动人的自然画卷，让人欣赏茶的世界。茶叶自身异域的、神秘的属性和史蒂文斯的离奇想像，增加了理解这首茶诗难度。全诗如下：

《茶》

公园里，大象的耳朵¹
 在寒霜中皱缩，
 而小径上的落叶
 奔跑如鼠，
 你的灯光落
 在闪亮的枕上，
 海的阴影，天空的阴影，
 像爪哇的伞。（97）

西方学者评价这首诗说：“结构紧凑、集中、简洁，明显带有洛可可式的艺术风格，节奏轻松、诙谐，色彩清淡柔和”（Buttel 129）。然而，初读这首诗歌，给人的感觉是不易理解，思想上无法产生触动，主题表达含糊不清。这在某种程度上符合《簧风琴》诗集的特点，“论有序的随意性：或许像宝石，但缺少明确的意义”（Israel 5）。事实上，该诗的题目“茶”字至关重要，读者只有认识茶、了解茶，并有饮茶的经验，脑海才会浮现诗歌创作的意象。诗歌题目的“茶”（Tea）字的涵义宽泛，它既可以指“泡茶、饮茶行为过程”，也可以指静态的“一杯/壶茶（汤）”，还可以指“茶叶”、“茶树”，甚至“茶点”。那么史蒂文斯想要表达的是哪个方面呢？是在想象茶树种植园的景观还是在体验品茶？一人品茶沉思还是在与朋友茶叙？诗歌出现的第二人称叙述，是表达两人对话场景还是说话者自言自语？“你”作为“听者”是指代他人还是用拟人手法指代茶？美国作家和批评家维克登认为，这首诗的“每一行”都“以某种方式传递着茶的印象和感觉”（Vechten 43）。

这首以茶为题的诗，是接近自然与生活的诗歌。通过补充一些信息，诗歌会出现不同的茶场景和意象。首先，我们大胆设想诗人晚上独自一人在家用茶杯冲泡一杯绿茶的过程中，触景生情，杯中动态的茶叶画面激发诗人创作灵感。诗歌开始的诗行“公园里，大象的耳朵在寒霜中皱缩”留给

1 大象的耳朵：南美洲的一种热带植被，可食用，它的树叶巨大且形状酷似大象的耳朵，由此获得广受喜爱的名称。

读者深刻印象，此处，公园可以理解为对空间地域的界定，暗喻为茶杯，一种透明的玻璃杯。泡茶人先将球形的珠茶（早期出口的中国绿茶）放入冰冷的茶杯中，然后给杯中注入热水，茶叶受到热水冲泡的瞬间，杯底茶叶自动翻滚，叶片自然舒展，形态变化无常，但又形态可辩，看似“小径上的落叶奔跑如鼠”。然后，出场的“你”既可以暗指说话者或听话者。他/她的（家中）的灯光照在闪亮的枕上（pillow）？或者可以理解为灯光照在用来放茶杯的垫子上（pillow）？杯中的茶叶在灯光下继续游动着，漂浮在水面的茶叶与茶汤和底部的茶“海天一色”，透过光的折射，形成“海的阴影，天空的阴影”。有些完全舒展的茶叶一芽两叶，“像爪哇的伞”。在诗歌结尾，茶叶由近至远，联想到“爪哇”，回到现实中的茶叶贸易集散地。史蒂文斯用一种动态的记录，表达自己从球形的干茶叶入杯到品饮茶汤伦理感受，揭示了茶的伦理属性和自然的灵性。诗中提到的“公园里”或许暗指“茶叶种植园里”，霜冻的气候使叶片卷曲皱缩，秋风吹起落在地面的树叶，像老鼠在奔跑。“你”可能指太阳，“太阳的灯光”照在茶树之间，形成相互之间投射的阴影。不过，后几行“落在闪亮的枕上”和大海和天空形成的阴影很难解释清楚。但有一点比较明确的是，诗歌第二部分从“你的灯光”开始到“爪哇的伞”结束，诗人亦或在告知他人茶叶的来源地，或吟出自己对于爪哇的异域风情的向往。那里曾经是世界茶叶贸易中心，有他曾经特别熟悉和钟爱的茶文化氛围。有茶的世界是文明有序的世界，是诗人想象中的世界。现实生活中的茶也是伦理和想像的载体。诗歌最后以异国的鲜明色彩结束，反映了诗人的积极思想。这首诗中的诗行“你的灯光”，还可以理解为象征智慧之光。无论东方或是西方，饮茶能够交流情感，增添智慧。在这里，无论茶叶还是茶汤，都成了伦理的载体，成了人和人之间心灵交流的媒介。在诗人的想象里，西方同东方并不遥远，就在杯中，就在茶中。

《茶》的创作离不开诗人对茶的理解和“茶人精神”的领悟。茶性俭，茶自身的性质决定了它对人的身心健康有益，有助于人们提升道德意识，进入自我修行和道德修养的精神世界。史蒂文斯始终恪守简单淳朴的生活准则，以独特的思维方式在诗歌中追求人生的道德境界，表达自己的伦理关怀。他白天忙于工作，下班后回到家中，饮茶沉思，然后进入自己诗歌王国漫游。1909年史蒂文斯写给埃尔希的信中说：“天色已暗，我打开台灯……——饮茶仪式已结束。——我不应该猛地脱掉黑色法官帽和长袍，而立刻换上象征权力的白色法官帽和一套五颜六色——或有可能，一套江湖小丑的戏装？因为当我坐在窗前开始写作，我面临现实，是其中的一部分，但当我打开台灯和拉下窗帘——一切都不在真实，至少不需要，这样我便迅速进入世外桃源”（Letters 134）。喝茶不仅可以提神醒脑，而且有助于净化心灵和提升道德境界。这是一首茶的赞美诗，更是一种伦理表达，通过茶表达诗人的道德感悟和精神追求。

三、《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》：想象世界的伦理表达

1921年，史蒂文斯创作了《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》一诗，与《茶》这首诗一样，诗歌以“茶”为题，但诗中却不出现“茶”一词。这首诗处于诗集《箫风琴》中诗歌排列顺序的正中心位置，构成诗集的核心部分：

莫以为我在紫气缭绕中穿越
所谓极至的孤单并降落西天，
我就会少了一点我自己。

我胡须上闪亮的膏药，
不绝于耳的颂歌，大海在我内部的
潮涨潮落，这些不算什么吗？

我的心境下着金色的香油之雨，
我的耳里回旋着颂歌的听觉，
我自己就是汪洋大海的罗盘：

我自己就是那个我漫游的世界，
我的所见所闻皆源于我自身；
那儿，我感到我更真实也更陌生。（50）

哈罗德·布罗姆认为，《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》很容易被理解为一首哲学诗歌，一首唯我论或主观理想主义的练习诗，也或许可以解读为是像弗洛伊德“心理理论”那样的心理理论，假设一种潜意识主宰着意识的精神生活。诗歌中的“胡恩”指通往史蒂文斯作为诗人的未来发展之路。这首诗歌表现了诗人通过想象构建自我，然后发现自我的经历。该诗歌被认为是一个纯虚构的世界，“胡恩”是一个模糊的东方智人，自己快乐地生活在虚构的世界里。“胡恩”可能表示“英雄月亮”。在史蒂文斯早期诗歌中，月亮和太阳表示想象和现实。“胡恩”所说的自我和虚构世界的感觉，事实上是唯我论的。他总结说，自我是唯一的现实。诗歌中，史蒂文斯“试图将潜意识的影像短暂投射出下凡在西方世界的一位想象的太阳神”（Powell 290）。诗歌显然比被虚构的纯西方的哲学诗歌要复杂许多。饮茶人即“说话的人”在“在那里”品茶、感知、体验、顿悟，然后进入忘我的道德境界。这首诗把东方现实世界中的茶及其茶文承载的伦理连接在一起，以茶写思想，写境界，茶在诗中成了伦理的载体。

冈仓天心的《茶之书》可能是史蒂文斯感知和想象古代东方茶文化的直接来源。首先，《茶之书》内涵丰富，寓意深刻，可以称得上是一部优秀的

文学作品。在谈及茶历史和哲学的第一和第二个章节，冈仓天心引经据典，文学双关语更是信手拈来，频频与古典文学产生呼应。他说：“的确，局外人多半不懂我们为何要如此无事生非。他会说：这根本就是茶‘碗’风暴嘛！”（The outsider may indeed wonder at this seeming much ado about nothing. What a tempest in a tea-cup! He will say.）他将英国剧作家莎士比亚的戏剧剧名“无事生非”（*Much Ado about Nothing*）使用的恰到好处，表现直面本意的同时，使读者瞬间联想到莎翁的经典喜剧。同时，虽然“茶杯里的暴风雨”（a tempest in a tea-cup）源于18世纪法国哲学家孟德斯鸠，但不得不说，它也唤起了莎翁后期创作的另一部戏剧“暴风雨”（*The Tempest*）。其中，tea-cup与章节题目中cup（*The Cup of Humanity*）产生主体呼应，也将茶、文学和人性三者关联起来，可谓独具匠心。此外，天心也提到英国散文家斯蒂尔及其创办的家喻户晓的期刊《观察者》和英国第一位词典编纂家约翰逊对茶的痴迷。巧借法国作家小仲马名作《茶花女》（*The Lady of the Camellias*），改为了“茶中皇后”（*The Queen of the Camellias*）。更奇妙的是，“茶中皇后”的比喻又与英国第一首咏茶诗相关联，那是宫廷诗人沃勒写给凯瑟琳皇后的一首祝寿诗（马晓俐92-95）。不难理解，这些信息会留给史蒂文斯深刻印象，触动诗人的感官。中国“南朝的诗人曾经留下热爱茶饮的断篇残句谈及‘玉液之沫’。”史蒂文斯的诗话剧《三位游客观日出》中有“来自智者的饮品？来自玉液？（Drink from wise men? From jade?）”，而“玉液”和提及的“茶”和“智者”产生的意象源自史蒂文斯阅读过的《茶之书》和《中国禅宗》，受到中国古典诗歌的影响（Zhu 164）。史蒂文斯也曾经说过：“有些物体更容易激发暗喻。一个茶杯比整体世界更容易接纳暗喻”（270）。

通过《茶之书》，史蒂文斯了解到中国唐朝“诗人”陆羽（733-804）及其著作《茶经》，世界第一部茶叶专著，堪称茶叶百科全书。陆羽一生嗜茶，精研于茶，对茶业的发展和传播作出无可替代的卓越贡献，被誉为“茶圣”。冈仓天心称陆羽为诗人，认为，“早在八世纪中期，东方诞生了第一位茶叶使徒——陆羽。他生于儒、释、道三教合一的时代。当时泛神崇拜象征主义者呼吁人们能反映特殊性下的普适性。而东方诗人陆羽则知晓存在于茶叶世界的和谐与秩序可以统治万物”（Okakura 13）。陆羽制定了“茶的法则”，而《茶经》是“茶的圣经”，也是一首旷世叙事史诗。天心叙述把概括了《茶经》三卷十个章节的主要内容。他拥有精湛的汉语和英语互换驾驭能力，为了直观展示最优质茶叶品质，他选择采用直接翻译法，使其能够更加生动地带给西方人的想象。譬如，英文

According to him the best quality of the leaves must have ‘creases like the leathern boot of Tartar horsemen, curl like the dewlap of a mighty bullock, unfold like a mist rising out of a ravine, gleam like a lake touched by a zephyr,

and be wet and soft like fine earth nearly swept by rain' (Okakura 14)。

与此相对应的中文版《茶经》内容为

茶饼外观千姿百态，粗略地讲有的像胡人的靴子，皮面皱缩像京锥的纹样；有的像峰牛的胸部，有起伏的褶皱；有的像浮云出山，曲折盘旋；有的像轻风拂水，微波涟漪；有的像陶匠箩筛陶土，再用水淘洗出的泥膏那么细腻陶工淘洗陶土成为澄泥；有的又像新平整的土地，被暴雨急流冲刷过后的平滑（陆羽 41）。

对比译文会发现，天心除了略去陆羽原文中的一句“有的像陶匠箩筛陶土，再用水淘洗出的泥膏那么细腻陶工淘洗陶土成为澄泥”之外，他忠实于原文，运用英语文学修辞明喻手法，且保留了中国古典风格的抒情排比句，近乎完美地呈现一种诗歌般的意境。再如天心对茶汤部分的编译：

There are three stages boiling: the first boil is when the little bubbles like the eye of fishes swim on the surface; the second boil is when the bubbles are like crystal beads rolling in a fountain; the third boil is when the billows surge wildly in the kettle. The filmy leaflet hung like scaly clouds in a serene sky or floated like waterlilies on emerald streams (Okakura 14-15)

汤花，有的像枣花在圆形的池塘上漂然浮动；有的像回环的潭水、曲折的洲渚间新生的浮萍；；有的则像晴朗天空中的鳞状浮云（陆羽 85）。

不难想象，陆羽对茶外形、品质和茶汤的诗歌般的描绘，定然会勾起史蒂文斯会对东方茶文化的想象和向往。诚然书中有关茶叶物质属性等实物描写也作用于诗人对茶叶品质的博学及其生活方式。

最重要的是，史蒂文斯的茶诗与中国唐朝诗人卢仝的茶诗《走笔谢孟谏议寄新茶》有关联性。中国古代历史上，有“茶仙”雅号的卢仝的《走笔谢孟谏议寄新茶》（又称《七碗茶诗》或《饮茶歌》）与陆羽的《茶经》近乎齐名，均可谓千古佳作。诗歌源于收到朋友孟简将军赠送的阳羨月团茶，卢仝有感朋友深情，作诗表达感谢之情。诗歌包含了三个部分的内容，首先写新茶本是天子王公贵族享用之物，如何到了山野人家以及受宠若惊之感。之后，写诗人反关柴门自煎饮茶的情景和自我感受，如润喉、除烦、泼墨挥毫以及得到成仙、羽化飞升和精神境界。第三部分笔锋一转，写茶农如何冒着生命危险攀悬山崖峭壁采摘茶叶的情景。《茶之书》中，天心挑选翻译了该诗歌的中间部分，也是最朗朗上口，家喻户晓，经久传唱的中间部分。这部分把品茶人的心理和生理感受描绘得淋漓尽致，表达诗人卢仝对茶的喜爱，

一人自煎自饮，独享茶的美，进入精神净化的境界。

……一碗喉吻润，二碗破孤闷，三碗搜枯肠，唯有文字五千卷。四碗发轻汗，平生不平事，尽向毛孔散。五碗肌骨清，六碗通仙灵。七碗吃不得也，唯觉两腋习习清风生。蓬莱山，在何处？玉川子乘此清风欲归去……。

The first cup moistens my lips and throat, the second cup breaks my loneliness, the third cup searches my barren entrail but to find therein some five thousand volumes of odd ideographs. The fourth cup raises a slight perspiration, ---all the wrong of life passes away through my pores. At the fifth cup I am purified; the sixth cup calls me to the realms of the immortals. The seventh cup---ah, but I could take no more! I only feel the breath of cool wind that rises in my sleeves. Where is Horaisan? Let me ride on this sweet breeze and waft away thither(Okakura 15)。

诗人首先如实记录每杯茶带给他的不同感受，然后一步步获得灵感，文思泉涌，在幻想中乘风追寻向往之地。诗人提到的蓬莱山是虚构的，是汉族神话传说中的神山，神仙居住地，常用来泛指仙境。天心的译文并没有将蓬莱山直译为 Mountain Penglai，而是选用 Horaisan 这样一个生僻词，带给西方读者对其的猜测和想象，可谓恰到好处。卢仝以日常生活中最为普通的饮茶为素材，用奇特的想象，夸张与浪漫艺术手法，彰显别致或怪异的审美，语言朴实无华，却充满张力。他不仅使用生僻词表达自我虚构的地方，也使用具有自我特点的最简洁的数字。融繁与简于诗歌，集现实日常生活与想象的仙境于一身，也含蓄表达出饮茶人从生理到心理的道德升华境界。

《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》诗歌中，诗人史蒂文斯与茶仿佛浑然一体，“我”暗指茶叶，也指诗人自己。诗歌的前三小节，“我”是一种拟人手法，实则用茶叶在讲述自己的故事。茶杯中的“我/茶叶”，被水浸润，缓缓舒展身体，散发的香气，但并不会“少了一点我自己”。茶叶在茶汤中上下翻滚，被比喻成大海里的“潮涨潮落”。而这些海浪对于杯中的茶叶根本不算什么，茶叶自由自在，淡定地掌握着自己的方向，“我自己就是汪洋大海的罗盘。”第四小节，我/诗人得到茶叶的启迪，转向思考人生，走到舞台的前方，发出内心的声音，告诉自己如何活出“真实自我”。进入这样的精神境界后，诗人的感觉是“更真实也更陌生。”形成围绕从杯中茶的变化叙述，转入思考自身状态、人类与自然、个体与世界之关系。周围笼罩着在西方世界代表高贵的紫色的云雾缭绕，扑鼻而来的茶汤茶香飘荡弥散在胡恩的宫殿---诗人/品茶人进入想象的世界。史蒂文斯“通过自己的思想和感觉来发现那一刻在他看来是诗歌的东西”(273)。他生活中喝茶，感知茶带给他的灵感，也“在自己的诗歌里以诗歌本身的途径来显露他发现的东西”(273)。正如

怀汀 (Anthony Whiting) 所说, “《胡恩宫殿里的茶话》一诗同时表现出创造感和喜悦感, 这不同于带有怀疑的反讽里所表达的那种创造和喜悦”(Whiting 97)。那些真实的、吸引人的感觉一部分起源于茶, 茶用它的力量包围了周围的空间。茶是“那里”的一部分, 在那里, “我自己就是那个我漫游的世界, 我的所见所闻皆源于我自身; 那儿, 我感觉我更真实也更陌生”(50)。

阅读斯蒂文斯的茶诗歌, 脑海浮现中国古代茶圣陆羽的《茶经》、茶仙卢仝的《七碗茶歌》, 自然感悟到一种时空的张力与东方茶文化的含蓄哲理精神的契合, 似乎正是那种捉摸不定、似是而非的“茶气”指引着诗人穿梭于现实与想象的自然转换。身处美国二十世纪工业革命时期, 遭受城市化发展带来的环境污染等种种弊端和挫伤, 陷入矛盾冲突的自然环境伦理困境, 史蒂文斯通过感知和体验和想象, 犹如古代东方文人墨客那样, 在茶及其文化的沐浴和熏陶下, 用茶诗寄托精神, 表达现实与想象的差距, 呼吁保护环境, 提倡人类和自然和谐有序发展。史蒂文斯的茶诗在当下仍然具有警示后人的伦理现实意义。

Works Cited

- Benfey, Christopher. *The Great Wave: Gilded Age Misfits, Japanese Eccentrics, and the Opening of Old Japan*. New York: Random House, 2003.
- Bevis, William W. *Mind of Winter: Wallace Stevens, Meditation and Literature*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1988.
- Buttel, Robert. *Wallace Stevens: The Making of Harmonium*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1967.
- Cook, Eleanor. *Poetry, Word-play, and Word-war in Wallace Stevens*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1988.
- Israel, Nico. “Wallace Stevens and the World of Tea.” *The Wallace Stevens Journal* 28.1 (Spring 2004): 3-22.
- 陆羽: 《茶经》, 沈冬梅编。上海: 中华书局 2010 年。
- [Lu, Yu. *The Classic of Tea*. Ed. Shen Dongmei, Shanghai: Zhonghua Book Company, 2010.]
- 马晓俐: 《多维视角下的英国茶文化研究》。杭州: 浙江大学出版社 2010 年。
- [Ma, Xiaoli. *A Study of British Tea Culture from a Multi-dimensional Perspective*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang UP, 2010.]
- Munson, Gorham B. “The Dandyism of Wallace Stevens.” *The Achievement of Wallace Stevens*. Ed. Ashley Brown and Robert S. Haller. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1962. 41-45.
- 聂珍钊: 《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京: 北京大学出版社 2014 年。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- Okakura, Kakuzo. *The Book of Tea*. Dreamsmay edition, 2001.
- Phillips, Siobhan. Wallace Stevens and the Mode of the Ordinary, *Twentieth-Century Literature* 54.1 (Spring 2008): 1-30
- Powell, Grosvenor. “Sturge Moore’s ‘The Powers of the Air’: Socrates and the Self-regarding Figure of

Wallace Stevens." *The Modern Language Review* 88.2 (1993): 283-296.

Richardson, Joan. *Wallace Stevens: The Early Years. 1879-1923*. New York: William Morrow, 1986.

Riddel, Joseph N. *The Clairvoyant Eye: The Poetry and Poetics of Wallace Stevens*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1965.

华莱士·史蒂文斯：《最高虚构笔记：史蒂文斯文集》，陈东东 张枣编；陈东飏 张枣译。上海：华东师范大学出版社 2009 年。

[Stevens, Wallace. *Notes toward a Supreme Fiction: Wallace Stevens: Poems and essays*. Shanghai: East China Normal UP, 2014.]

Stevens, Wallace. *The Collected Poems of Wallace Stevens*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1954.

—. *Letters of Wallace Stevens*. Ed. Holly Stevens. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

Vechten, Carl Van. "Rogue Elephant in Porcelain." *Yale University Library Gazette* 38 (October 1963): 41-50.

Weston, Susan B. *Wallace Stevens: An Introduction to the Poetry*. New York: Columbia UP, 1977.

Whiting, Anthony. *The Never-resting Mind: Wallace Stevens' Romantic Irony*. U of Michigan P, 1996.

Zhengming, Zhu. *Wallace Stevens and Oriental Culture*. New York: The City University of New York, 2001.

人兽变形神话中的女性身体改造与主体性建构：拉弥亚与白娘子

Female Physical Transformation and Subjectivity Construction in Metamorphosis Myths: the White-Snake Lady and Lamia

张 欣 (Zhang Xin) 赖琦琳 (Lai Qilin)

内容摘要：蛇化女子与人类男性相恋是中西神话传说中共有的母题，而其中白娘子和拉弥亚两个文本链构建了此类人兽变形形象的突出代表。二者在女性身体改造过程中的相似性和在主体性建构中的差异性，构成了极具研究价值的艺术张力和伦理反差。二者通过蛇身变形凸显了女性身体被淫邪化的共同困境，而白娘子通过身体改造不仅摆脱了身体困境，还获得了人类女性伦理意识启蒙和女性主体性身份建构；而相形之下，拉弥亚的“蛇之淫性”却始终没有褪去，始终是男性欲望的隐喻载体和男性主体性文化建构的陪衬物及附属品。两者的主体性差异折射出东西方对“爱欲”主题的差异性阐释。白娘子文本链所展现的东方之“爱”聚焦于宿命姻缘和伦理忠贞，而拉弥亚文本链呈现的西方之“爱”则在感性与理性、欲望与克制等二元之物的此消彼长中繁衍生息。

关键词：白娘子；拉弥亚；身体改造；伦理意识；主体性建构

作者简介：张欣，文学博士，广东外语外贸大学英语语言文化学院教授，外国文学文化研究中心兼职研究员，主要从事中西戏剧比较和美国文学研究。赖琦琳，广东外语外贸大学英语语言文化学院英语语言文学硕士研究生。本文系广东省普通高校重点科研项目“中西神话视域中的女性伦理取向研究”【项目编号：2018WTSCX029】的阶段性成果。

Title: Female Physical Transformation and Subjectivity Construction in Metamorphosis Myths: The White-Snake Lady and Lamia

Abstract: The White-Snake Lady and Lamia are two highly responsive mythical and legendary images of metamorphosis and romantic love, but they display significant differences in their physical transformation and subjectivity construction. Both serpent bodies suffer the same physical and metaphorical dilemma of being defamed as seductive and obscene. However, due to the White-Snake Lady's physical

transformation, she has achieved not only a human body, but also a human ethical consciousness and female subjectivity. By contrast, Lamia, with similar storylines and dramatic conflicts, fails in the pursuit of human identity with her never-subsiding serpent obscenity. While the White-Snake Lady remains the protagonist of her legend, Lamia in her myth is at most a foil for the male figures representing rational power and temperance. The two legends of love, with highly similar plots, represent a fundamental difference in Eastern and Western perspectives toward love themes, with the Eastern myth focusing on doomed marriage and feudal ethical codes, and the Western version centering on such dualities as sensibility and rationality, desire and restraint.

Key words: the White-Snake Lady; Lamia; physical transformation; ethical consciousness; subjectivity construction

Author: **Zhang Xin**, Ph.D., is Professor of English at Faculty of English Language and Culture, researcher of literary studies at Center for Foreign Literature and Culture, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (Guangzhou 510420, China). Her current research interests include comparative drama studies and American literary studies (zhanghao20041001@126.com); **Lai Qilin**, is M.A. candidate of English Literary Studies at Guangdong University of Foreign Studies.

迄今为止，对中西神话中“蛇化女子”与人间男子相恋这一传说的研究不乏其数，聚焦点则明显集中在中国白蛇传故事和西方拉弥亚原型的比较研究上。由于两段故事无论在基本内容还是在人物结构上，都存在着高度的相似性，成为比较文学研究的一门显学。作为历代相传的集体共享型故事，两个神话形象在各自所属的文学传统中都被视为故事原型，不断得以重现和重释。中西比较文学研究学者往往会从“蛇化女子”传说故事中抽取普及度和重要性相匹配的两套文本链进行比较研究。一套是由古希腊哲学家费洛斯特拉图的《阿波罗尼传》（*Apollonius*），到17世纪英国作家罗伯特·伯顿（Robert Burton）的《忧郁的剖析》（*Anatomy of Melancholy*），进而到19世纪英国诗人济慈（John Keats）笔下的叙事诗《拉弥亚》（“Lamia”）形成的“拉弥亚文本链”。与之形成强烈呼应的另一套文本链则是中国文学中衔珠报恩的“白娘子”形象。关于这一文学形象的文字记载始于东晋史学家干宝的《搜神记》，再现于唐宋时期的小说话本中，进而经17世纪明代冯梦龙话本《警世通言》中的《白娘子永镇雷峰塔》和清代方成培的《雷峰塔传奇》（1771）奠定了白蛇传人所共知的故事格局。盛行于20世纪的神话原型批评理论为拉弥亚和白娘子比较研究提供了有效的理论视角，使一系列与此母题相关的文学再现文本都被囊括在共同的“移位”神话体系中进行整体性和互文性观照。迄今相关的比较研究主题包括原型的演化历程、象征结构以及伦

理取向,也不乏少数女性主义视角的研究成果,侧重展现“蛇化女子”在中西文化中对情欲和感性的性别隐喻。在对两套叙事文本链的比较研究中,济慈的拉弥亚和方成培的白娘子被视为匹配度最高的版本,成为两条文本链的核心交点。

变形神话是中西方古代神话类别中共有的一个重要分支,但在神话流传和发展中却显现出明显的民族差异性。从好色的主神宙斯开始,希腊神话中的变形绝技往往成为满足原始欲望的绝佳武器,反映了人类避苦趋乐的天性。而从女娲到大禹,从夸父到精卫,保存至今的中国变形神话却折射了寡欲治国、建功立业的儒家理想。无独有偶,拉弥亚和白娘子的“蛇女”叙事传统也是中西女性神话中共有的叙事模态,承袭了中西古代人兽互渗的变形神话文学原型,但二者通过女性身体改造和女性性别身份却展现了迥然相异的伦理价值取向。

一、“蛇之淫性”与女性身体改造

作为人类特殊的精神领域和普遍的精神机能,神话原型一直以“集体无意识”的形态流淌在人类文学的血液中。始于远古的神话,在现代社会中并未消亡,只不过改变了以往神话的存在形式,甚至借用现代科技和科幻想象作为神话的构成元素和换装面具,使神话传说和人工智能之间形成了互文关联。人兽合体和人兽变形的神话想象与当下人工智能的研发创想,究其本源,都可视为人类对自我“身体”所进行的想象性和实践性改造。而在这种改造过程中,“身体”的“物质性”和“文化性”都显现出旺盛的生命力。“身体”作为当代文化研究关注的重要对象,时而被藏匿于灵魂和理性的阴影之中,时而又在尼采式惊世骇俗的非理性主义话语中显露光辉。在文化研究话语中,“身体”已经不仅仅是生理上的肉体组合,而是承载丰富意象、多层隐喻和浓厚意识的文化概念,是承载主体性和符号意义的个体和社会存在。“身体既是一个被表现的客体,也是一个有组织地表现出概念与欲望的有机体,两套表现系统相互缠绕和重叠,所有的社会都创造理想的身体意象用以定义自身,社会身份有很多就是关于我们怎样察觉我们自己和他人的身体的”(卡瓦拉罗 105)。“身体改造”是白娘子和拉弥亚故事链叙事模式所共有的母题。从“蛇妖施法改造身体”到“蛇获人形与人相恋”,进而“遭遇外力蛇形暴露”,直至“爱情湮灭姻缘破裂”,在充满浪漫主义精神的人妖爱情悲剧叙事模式中,女性身体的改造和复原成为贯穿故事的核心脉络,充分显现了女性动物性和女性身体改造的主题。

身体以及身体与精神之间的关系问题,作为贯穿西方哲学传统始终的核心命题,在 20 世纪中期西方学术研究“身体转向”浪潮中被推至声名显赫的位置,而身体政治与文化建构之间也随即形成了强有力的纽带关系。“身体的生物性特质常常被对立与精神的崇高性,身体与精神之间的顽强博弈不仅

彰显出人们对于自身存在本质所特有的持续探索，而且也深刻影响了权力结构、社会样态和文化表征”（刘岩 128）。从荷马时期对人体的赞誉，到希腊古典时代哲学家对精神（灵魂）的崇尚以及对身体的贬损，进而到近代以笛卡尔为先驱的“身心二元论”，都为西方近代理性主义哲学奠定了坚不可摧的基础，并派生出“属性二元论”等流传甚广的二元论范式。其中，生物性别二元论和社会性别二元论成为 20 世纪后结构主义直面的挑战。由于两性在人类繁衍过程中的生理分工差异，女性生命力大部分为延续物种所耗费，使得身体之于女性主体性的意义远大于男性，女性成为较男性更从属于物种的性别，进而具有更高的动物性。女性动物性在白娘子和拉弥亚的动物之身和“蛇性之淫”中得到了充分展现。“蛇化女子”通常与人性中的动物性本能和非理性欲望形成紧密的文化意指关联。费洛斯特拉图《阿波罗尼传》中的拉弥亚是一种人首蛇身、吞食孩童的妖怪，嗜血的欲望和赤裸的肉欲形成了强烈的意象关联。随着历史的演进，拉弥亚渐渐变得温顺多情，在伯顿和济慈笔下进行了成功的身体改造，获得了天真可爱的少女形象，并成为了“悲哀的爱”的牺牲者。然而，拉弥亚“蛇性之淫”的烙印并没有完全消除，她暗恋青年学者李修斯（Lycius）却不得亲近，因此通过与迷恋林泉仙女的天神赫尔墨斯（Hermes）¹ 进行交易换取了美女之身，从而得以亲近李修斯。故事由天神和女妖的欲望为起点展开，以双方的交换而各成其愿，感性和情欲成为故事情节延续的助推力。神性与妖性在欲望和感性中融合共谋，充分显现了希腊文明中避苦趋乐的人性，“蛇之淫性”也得以彰显。

拉弥亚和白娘子在形象演变与故事情节上的高度契合已经获得了学界的普遍共识，但二者在身体改造中显现的女性身体困境，却显现出极具价值的差异性。中国白蛇传奇以《搜神记》为始端，打造了“衔珠报恩”的故事原型，也解析了中国文化中有关“蛇兆吉”和“龙（蛇、水）为贵”的由来。与身份卑微的拉弥亚不同，白娘子贵为骊山老母²之徒，得观音菩萨点化，用千年修炼之身圆人间未了姻缘，使白娘子身体改造的历程褪去了“蛇之淫性”和妖性之恶，饱含天命之贵和人伦之暖。从明、清直至现代，白娘子形象已经逐渐演化为真、善、美的化身，与许宣（许仙）的姻缘也褪去了唐志怪小说中蛇妖所隐含的色欲禁忌的喻示。这也一定程度上解释了家喻户晓的电视剧版《新白娘子传奇》中女扮男装的许仙深入人心且毫无违和感的原因，因为女体许仙及其性别表演进一步淡化了“蛇性之淫”的蕴涵，纯化了这段天作之合的爱情姻缘。拉弥亚和白娘子由“蛇性之淫”的始端走向了不同的方向，并在二者身体改造过程中显现出迥异的女性身体主体性与精神主体性

1 赫尔墨斯是宙斯之子，商旅、变戏法的人和窃贼的保护神，被评论家戏称为“成功的流氓”（Boulger 250）。

2 骊山老母，又称黎山老母，是在古代神话中由女神崇拜而塑造出来的女神形象，传说她是女娲的坐骑，亦传她是女娲的一个化身。她地位极高，以教化人的圣母和法力无边的师傅形象频繁出现于小说、戏剧和民间传说中。

建构面貌。和众多的希腊神话女性人物一样，海神之女拉弥亚的变异也是由孽缘所致。拉弥亚原为主神宙斯的情妇，被妒火中烧的赫拉灭后并施咒，沦为半人半蛇的怪物，还落下个忆子成狂、吞食孩童以解心头之痛的恶习。拉弥亚对血液的饥渴、对孩童的吞噬，打造了她不洁和蛮愚的刻板形象。拉弥亚与李修斯未得正果的两性（人兽）结合，实质上是蛇女拉弥亚代表的感性和哲人阿波罗尼代表的理性的博弈。柏拉图的信徒李修斯原为理性教化的产物和传承者，但难以遏止的情欲使他被拉弥亚的少女幻象所迷惑，而他急于展示的虚荣又将这场幻象引致幻灭。而济慈将著名的“赫尔墨斯插曲”¹引入伯顿的拉弥亚叙事框架中，让沉迷于爱情游戏的“爱的窃贼”赫尔墨斯与巧舌如簧的拉弥亚一拍即合，通过交易获得对方的协助，满足各自的情欲，让读者在拉弥亚身上看到了诱骗夏娃的撒旦的影子。赫尔墨斯和拉弥亚的交易已然成为济慈版拉弥亚叙事的始端和点睛之笔，也使二者在“引诱者”和“入侵者”的形象上达成一致。但读者不禁会问，拉弥亚作为被诅咒的蛇妖，以何资本与贵为神祇法力无边的宙斯之子进行交换呢？《拉弥亚》长诗开篇交待了拉弥亚具有隐匿林中仙子的法力，在其后她也展示了不少装点婚礼的法术，但都只能称得上是雕虫小技，与赫尔墨斯不可同日而语。但在“神无完神”的希腊神祇家族中，十二主神之一的信使赫尔墨斯也不得不因为疯狂钟情但不得而见的林泉仙子，而与最高法力仅限于隐匿仙子的拉弥亚实施交易。由此可见，与白娘子“衔珠报恩”的义举截然不同的是，拉弥亚出卖林中仙子换取人身和爱情的行为实为背信弃义的道德失义。也正由此，当“蛇性之淫”在白娘子由蛇形获人形的过程中被消解殆尽之时，拉弥亚的变形则延续了其蛇性的本质，较之变形前有过之而无不及。如果说白娘子通过身体改造，摆脱了蛇形躯体的困境，获得了作为人的女性意识和女性主体身份；则相形之下，拉弥亚获得的美女之身并未真正使她（或仍应称为“它”）走出身体和精神的困境，也未能实现其从兽到人的转变，也就更加谈不上女性意识和女性主体性的建构了，其“蛇之淫性”并未被“人之善性”所取代。

二、“人之善性”与女性主体性建构

正如聂珍钊教授在其建构的文学伦理学批评体系中所指出的：“能否分辨善恶是辨别人是否做人的标准。善恶的概念是与伦理意识同时出现的。善恶一般不用来评价兽，而只是用来评价人，是评价人的专有概念。因此，善恶是人类伦理的基础”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子”4）。运用文学伦理学批评视域中的善与恶这双二元对立的衡量标准，可

1 济慈长诗《拉弥亚》前145行是西方评论界所称的“赫尔墨斯插曲”（Hermes Episode），讲述了拉弥亚通过交换的手段受到奥林匹斯神赫尔墨斯的帮助，化为美女并得以与李修斯相恋的序曲。“赫尔墨斯插曲”被学界普遍认同为济慈创作的拉弥亚形象的有力注解，是济慈对伯顿笔下已经成型的拉弥亚故事架构的重要添加元素，并使原本淡薄的美女蛇色诱无知男的老套故事变得深厚而复杂。

以帮助我们厘清中西两个蛇女传说最为本质的差异性。首先,文学伦理学批评中提及的“善”与“恶”的概念,是“世间善”,而非出世间的至善或真善,因为后者是没有与之相对应的“恶”的。其次,“世间善”分为内善和外善,即心善和行善。而外善或行善必须有对象方能成立,其具体层次可分为“不害”和“利人”。所谓“不害”,就是我们常说的“己所不欲,勿施于人”。而“利人”则是一个更高的层次,可谓“己欲立而立人,己欲达而达人”。这也就是儒家思想中常说的“独善其身、兼善天下”的“仁道”。

运用这种善恶的尺度,我们不难发现,拉弥亚在由蛇身变幻为人身的过程中,仅仅只是获得了引诱和取悦李修斯的“人形”而已,并未成为真正意义上的人。正如拉弥亚在诗中所言:“我爱一个哥林多青年——多幸福!把我女人的形状给与我,放在他所在的地方”(济慈 181)。诗作开篇,拉弥亚对赫尔墨斯极尽阿谀恭维之能事,将迷情寡欢的赫尔墨斯一步步引入自己预设好的圈套,进而使李修斯也落入设定的情局。但不可否认的是,拉弥亚自始被施予“人形”,被置于“他地”,始终是赫尔墨斯所代表的男性占有欲的附属品,同时也是阿波罗尼代表的哲学理性的牺牲品。拉弥亚在这场交易中,不过是暂时获得了迷惑李修斯的幻影,婚礼上当面对阿波罗尼令万物枯萎的目光凝视和无以阻挡的“一条蛇”喝令时,她“惨叫一声后便烟消云散了”(211)。此处,阿波罗尼与法海的相似性不言而喻,是两个故事链最具说服力的汇合点。但通过细致的文本梳理不难发现,法海对白娘子的“收复”远比阿波罗尼对拉弥亚的“制服”要艰难波折得多。拉弥亚运用巧言善辩之功,得以借助赫尔墨斯帝王之身而不得仙子之爱的郁郁寡欢之际,挑起赫尔墨斯男性占有欲不得满足的饥渴,获得了出卖林中仙子换得美女之身的机会,并在李修斯必经之路上施以幻术诱骗“爱情”。而这一系列的雕虫小技在阿波罗尼的目光中化为乌有,无计可施,使得故事结局部分情节单一、节奏简洁。相比之下,白娘子与法海的斗法可谓一波三折、情节多变。这种情节设置上的巨大反差,不仅仅呈现了中西文学创作与审美习惯的差异性,更突显了白娘子“为人”的善恶意识和“为女人”的性别身份建构历程。白娘子故事中,从游湖借伞到缔结姻缘,从端阳现形到昆仑盗草,从水漫金山到法海合钵,直至状元祭塔,这些耳熟能详的桥段细致描绘了白娘子为人、为妻、为母的完整身份建构历程。很多比较文学研究将白娘子被镇雷峰塔下作为与拉弥亚烟消云散相对应的结局,许宣对应李修斯,法海对应阿波罗尼,妻离子散对应灰飞烟灭,使两个故事的高度匹配性一目了然。但细读两则故事的终结点却有截然不同的发现,也印证了两个故事截然相反的走向。西方学界的拉弥亚迷们从未停止为济慈笔下这位“爱情的牺牲者”寻求一条活路。对拉弥亚一声惨叫后消失的结局,有学者认为这为拉弥亚凄美爱情故事续写埋下了伏笔,拉弥亚消失的人形不一定意味着拉弥亚的死亡或是她与李修斯爱情的终结。一种推断认为,拉弥亚有可能飞回到老巢疗伤,伺机东山再起。这种设

想让中国读者不禁联想到神话故事中“百折不挠”的“白骨精”，她们不断变幻人形来迷惑男性，驱之不散，无疑强化了拉弥亚的“妖性”，也进一步显现了拉弥亚“妖性”和白娘子“人性”的本质区别。另一种推断则认为拉弥亚和李修斯被拆散的肉体在灵魂深层结为一体。这一推断的牵强之处显而易见。李修斯对拉弥亚外表的迷恋引发了二者肉体的结合和依恋，在走向灵魂之爱的道路上还没出发已经遭遇厄运，故事情节描述丝毫无法为二者灵魂结合之说提供有力的证据。由此看来，拉弥亚读者的善意只是徒然，而相形之下，白娘子的故事结局则显然蕴含了“由悲转喜”的伏笔，“妻离子散”也决不是白娘子故事唯一的终结。自“白蛇被压塔下，许仙变心出家”的悲惨结局之后，又有了“状元祭塔，母子相会”的温情场面和希望延续。

相比拉弥亚巧舌如簧的预谋和人形幻灭的结局，白娘子的“善心”与“善行”成为故事发展的核心动力。经观音点化下凡报恩，与许宣缔结姻缘，助许宣治病救人，诞下子嗣许仕林，白娘子自始至终坚守着“行善报恩”的初衷。法海法师随着白蛇传说在中国民间的广为流传，在“只羡鸳鸯不羡仙”的语境下，也被披上了“法海你不懂爱”¹的顽石刻板形象，落得人神共愤的境遇。但相比阿波罗尼对拉弥亚的绝对强势，法海与白娘子在法力上则是旗鼓相当，不分伯仲。关于法海和尚的来历版本繁多，但无论是以降妖除魔，拯救苍生为己任的法海大师，还是为报私仇，穷追不舍的法海和尚，这一角色在白娘子女性主体性建构中起到的作用无疑是至关重要的。正是因为法海设阻，才使白娘子在为人、为妻、为母的道路上遭遇困境和挑战，也正因为此，法海的“设阻”更加凸显了白娘子的坚忍和执着，展现了其“善心”和“善行”，成为白娘子女性主体性建构的助推力。

白娘子最突出的“善”的对象自然是许宣。她信奉姻缘宿命的中国伦理范式，获救报恩以身相许，下嫁底层贫寒书生并恪守为妻之道，遭遇背叛仍忠贞不移。有当代读者将白娘子对许宣的“善”称为“愚善”，表达了读者对白娘子的喜爱和同情，但“对文学的理解必须让文学回归属于它的伦理环境和伦理语境，这是理解文学的一个前提”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语”19）。在婚姻论财之风盛行的江南地区，在许宣把持着“非我族类，其心必异”的戒备心理并屡次背叛的婚姻现实中，“世俗婚姻波折坎坷，恰恰成为白娘子由蛇精获得为人、为妻、为母的伦理身份，进而完成其兽性因子与人性因子此消彼长的孕育土壤”（张欣 117）。白娘子对报恩的执着是其人性建构的根基，而其对婚姻的忠贞是中国封建女性主体性的重要组成。相形之下，拉弥亚与李修斯凄美哀怨的爱情故事，则更多展现的是征服和屈服的关系。拉弥亚用美女之身征服了理性主义传承人李修斯，而道高一尺魔高一丈的老师阿波罗尼用更坚定的理性使拉弥亚代表的感性幻影灰飞烟灭。这一征服与屈服的二元对立关系，在“赫尔墨斯插曲”中早露端倪。很多评

1 “法海你不懂爱”是国内流行乐坛走红一时的一首通俗歌曲的标题。

论把赫尔墨斯对林中仙子的追逐简单定义为纯粹的爱情游戏，但善用骗术的“赫尔墨斯钟情于林中仙子并非因为她的某些品质，而是因为她众多的追求者赋予了她价值”（Reiman 63）。彰显男性尊严的占有欲和对女性征服后的成就感无疑是赫尔墨斯委身与拉弥亚交易的驱动力。由此看来，白娘子和拉弥亚呈现了截然不同的两性爱情价值取向。

三、爱的变奏：两性之爱的东西诠释

在希腊文中，“爱”一词就有三种不同的类别，即 eros（欲爱）、philia（智爱）和 agape（圣爱）。始于希腊哲学理性时代的拉弥亚形象，是哲学家费洛斯特拉图《阿波罗尼传》中与理性对立的“欲爱”的象征。在希腊神话中，爱无疑是与原始欲望，特别是与性欲和生殖力紧密联系的，而追逐与征服则是与希腊欲爱密不可分的孪生物。除了词源学中“欲爱”（eros）一词的来历以外，希腊爱神厄洛斯（Eros）在赫西俄德的《神谱》中也被赋予了夺人心智的魔力。“在不朽的诸神中数他最美，能使所有的神和所有的人销魂荡魄呆若木鸡，使他们丧失理智，心里没了主意”（斯威布 27）。显然，拉弥亚对哲学青年李修斯难以遏止的爱欲和占有欲显现了趋乐避苦的希腊欲爱模式，表现了自我欲望与满足的扩张，表达了爱欲中占有和征服的内驱力。在拉弥亚故事的基本叙事中，由阿波罗尼代表的希腊哲学时代的“智爱”无疑完胜了拉弥亚所代表的不堪一击的“欲爱”。所谓“智爱”，就是对智慧（知识）和真理的爱。希腊哲学传统构建的灵魂与肉体的二元结构，无疑将由理性主宰的灵魂置于被欲望所驱使的肉体之上。希腊哲人所推崇的理性生活则是把理性视为掌控自然冲动和肉体欲望的原则，将自然欲望纳入理性秩序之中。拉弥亚在阿波罗尼目光凝视下的消亡，正是欲望屈从于理性的象征，也是幻影臣服于真理的艺术再现。济慈长诗《拉弥亚》则通过巧妙添设的 145 行诗“赫尔墨斯插曲”将同样被欲爱所驱使的魔法偷盗之神赫尔墨斯与拉弥亚并置，突显了拉弥亚爱情悲剧的欲爱之源。然而，深受文艺复兴浸润的浪漫主义诗人济慈对拉弥亚传说的迷恋和续写，则更多缘于诗人对拉弥亚式感性和直觉的崇尚，以及对科学理性至上的资本主义文明的抵御。自文艺复兴后，超出自然欲望和理性认识的宗教“圣爱”经历了世俗化的转化，人的感性得到了肯定，“爱”成为与个体息息相关而且触手可及的强烈情感。济慈笔下的拉弥亚被赋予了更多人类女性的特质，成为了人类“情爱”的代言人。这种“情爱”既能使诗人坠入情网、品尝爱的甜美，又能使诗人跌入痛苦的深渊，感怀伤逝。这种“情爱”就是我们常说的“love”。拉弥亚形象在西方文学传统中的经久不衰折射了西方文明中爱的变奏。她由希腊神话乐园走向希腊哲学殿堂，进而走进浪漫主义诗作中，呈现了由“欲爱”到“智爱”，直至“情爱”的变迁。这一变迁体现了情感来源和情感对象的流变。感性和理性的二元对立以及二者在情感驱动力中的此消彼长构成了西方多元爱情观的本质差异。而情感施

与对象从客体世界（即表象）到本体世界（即真理），从超自然的博爱到触手可及的世俗之爱，则构成了西方爱情观的多元结构。

华夏文明也同样不乏悠久而厚重的爱情传统，既有“蒹葭苍苍，白露为霜”的婉约，也有“窈窕淑女，君子好逑”的炙热，而“愿得一心人，白首不相离”的忠贞和“执子之手，相濡以沫”的浪漫则是华夏爱情观最具代表性的表达。这种由“爱情”到“亲情”的升华也是华夏农耕文明和安居意识的集中体现。白娘子的传说从下凡报恩开始就深深刻上了华夏文明对“爱情”的诠释。爱情是与姻缘宿命、伦理纲常、忠贞奉献等密不可分的。方成培的《雷峰塔传奇》被视为白蛇故事链中最具承前启后意义的版本，在情节上较前人做了适当增减，为现代白蛇故事奠定了基本格局。方成培版本的“前故事”交待了捧钵侍者许宣和白蛇的宿缘，以及法海在孽缘完满之日方可点悟许宣的故事定局。这一故事架构为白蛇的下界和法海的纠缠找到了前世宿命的合法性，也为故事结尾白娘子和许宣的双双得道寻找到了合法性。除此之外，方版开篇的《开宗》与终篇的《佛圆》，首尾呼应，“佛起”而“佛结”，使爱情故事嵌套在宗教叙事框架中，展现了浓郁的宗教意蕴。故事情节的起承转合都成为了“宿缘未尽”的艺术表现。结局《佛圆》既没有带来“有情人终成眷属”的大团圆，也没有走向拉弥亚式的凛冽凄美，而是以白娘子得以宽赦超生和许宣点化得成正果而终结。使读者感悟爱情的力量之余，更被宗教宿命的威严所震慑，强化了姻缘宿命的伦理意蕴。“许身报恩”的白娘子形象高度契合了华夏主流文化中女性贤良淑德的性别伦理观念。而市井商人阶层的许宣在这场爱情中充分体现了“利”、“欲”二字。尽管白娘子和许宣的婚姻折射的是中国封建社会底层婚姻的模式，但白娘子对“夫为妻纲”的坚守却表现得淋漓尽致、不折不扣。这不仅仅体现在白娘子对世俗婚姻波折坎坷的坚忍，对许宣重利多疑软弱背弃的隐忍，更表现在白娘子折损道行为许宣繁衍后代的修为。

我们不难看出，拉弥亚作为折射男性感性和欲望的客体，其自身作为欲望隐喻载体的功能自始至终没有改变。对拉弥亚的遏制和毁灭，意味着西方文明挣脱原欲、追求理性的诉求。因此从严格意义上说，拉弥亚的故事实际上是李修斯的故事，是摆脱原欲驱使走向理性的西方文明的故事。相比之下，白娘子的主体性地位则从未遭遇撼动。白蛇故事作为中国四大民间传说之一，无论在民间传说经典化的进程中，还是在后世改编再现多元化的过程中，白蛇“妖性”和“人性”的此消彼长始终是不同版本共同聚焦的主题。白娘子对于婚姻关系的执著维护，是区别于白蛇精传说的核心文化内涵，“标志着白娘子形象由沉迷性欲的‘妖性’向追求人类爱情婚姻稳定伦理关系的‘人性’的本质性转变”（张欣 114）。由此可见，白娘子和拉弥亚的女性主体性建构是在与男性人物的关系建构中完成的，白娘子和拉弥亚由蛇到人的转变也显然是女性身份和主体性建构的神话隐喻。借助女性主义和身份批评的视角，我们不难从白娘子蛇体、女体到母体的演化历程中抽取出华夏文明对“何以

为人”、“何以为女人”和“何以为母亲”的身份思索。无论是借用道佛之争和情法之争为故事发展推波助澜的法海大师，还是前世施救，今生相恋的“弱男子”许宣，都显然成为了白娘子女性主体性形成和完善过程中的陪衬。相比之下，拉弥亚和她本应守护的林中仙子却都成为了男性感欲望与理性无情的陪衬物和牺牲品。拉弥亚从蛇体到女体直至瞬间化为乌有的过程，更大程度上是作为男主人公李修斯男性身份建构的映像而存在，是男性主体性文化建构的附属品。这种女性主体性的强烈反差无疑成为中西蛇女传说最显著的分化。

Works Cited

- 卡瓦拉罗，丹尼：《文化理论关键词》，张卫东等译。南京：江苏人民出版社，2006年。
- [Cavallaro, Dani. *Critical and Cultural Theory*, trans. Zhang Weidong etc. Nanjing: Jiangsu People's Press, 2006.]
- 济慈：《济慈诗选》，朱维基译。上海：上海译文出版社，1983年。
- [Keats, John. *Poems by John Keats*, trans. Zhu Weiji. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 1983.]
- 刘岩：“女性身体的文化规约与意义重建”，《外国文学》4（2015）：128-34。
- [Liu, Yan. “The Cultural Constraints and Meaning Reconstruction of the Female Body on the Theoretical Thresholds of Judith Butler and Luce Irigaray.” *Foreign Literature* 4 (2015): 128-34.]
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语”，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1(2010): 12-22.]
- ：“文学伦理学批评：伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子”，《外国文学研究》6（2011）：1-13。
- [—, “Ethical Literary Criticism: Ethical Choice and Sphinx Factor.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2011): 1-13.]
- Reiman, Donald H. “Keats and the Humanistic Paradox: Mythological History in ‘Lamia.’” *Studies in English Literature, 1500-1900* 11(1971): 659-69. (Web. 4 Jan. 2009.)
- 斯威布：《希腊的神话和传说》，楚图南译。北京：人民文学出版社，1958年。
- [Schwab, Gustav. *Greek Myths and Legends*, trans. Chu Tunan. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 1958.]
- 张欣：“‘白娘子’和‘美人鱼’的斯芬克斯之谜与伦理选择”，《外国文学研究》3（2018）：110-9。
- [Zhang, Xin. “The Sphinx Riddle and Ethical Selection in the Images of the White Snake and the Mermaid”, *Foreign Literature Studies* 3(2018): 110-9.]

《赫索格》中的代际创伤与记忆书写

Intergenerational Trauma and Memory Writing in *Herzog*

刘兮颖 (Liu Xiying)

内容摘要：贝娄的经典长篇小说《赫索格》中的同名主人公赫索格遭遇来自家庭和犹太历史的代际创伤，前者是他在现实生活中遭遇到的，后者则与其族裔身份乃至历史记忆有关。无论家庭代际创伤还是历史代际创伤都与他的身份危机密切相连，创伤记忆造成了赫索格的身份认同危机。从赫索格面对心理创伤时采用的应对措施可以发现他经历了几个不同的阶段：回避问题、自我否定、创伤叙事、找寻自我，其中创伤叙事对于疗救赫索格的精神危机尤为重要。真正帮助赫索格治愈精神创伤并找寻自我的是他的家人以及早年全部的家庭记忆，后者以代际传递的方式影响着赫索格的伦理选择并重新建构了他的身份。家庭记忆的代际传递对赫索格精神创伤的复原起到了至关重要的作用。

关键词：《赫索格》；代际创伤；记忆书写

作者简介：刘兮颖，华中师范大学文学院副教授，主要从事英美文学研究。本文为国家社科基金项目“20世纪美国犹太文学中的记忆书写研究”【16BWW063】的阶段性成果。

Title: Intergenerational Trauma and Memory Writing in *Herzog*

Abstract: Herzog, The eponymous hero in Saul Bellow's classic novel *Herzog* encounters the intergenerational trauma from both the family and the Jewish history. He encounters the former in his real life and the latter is closely related to his ethical identity and even the historical memory. Both his family generational trauma and his history generational trauma are intimately linked with his identity crisis. The trauma memory leads to Herzog's identification crisis. In view of the resolution measures while Herzog is facing his psychological trauma, the reader can discover several phases Herzog experiences: evasion of the problem, negation of self, trauma narration, pursuit of self. Among them, the trauma narration plays a vital role in treating Herzog's spiritual crisis. It is his family members and all the family memory of his early life that really assist Herzog in curing his spiritual crisis and the pursuit of his identity. His family memory influences Herzog's ethical

selection and helps reconstruct his identity through the way of intergenerational transfer which has a crucial function in the recovery of Herzog's spiritual trauma.

Key words: *Herzog*; intergenerational trauma; memory writing

Author: Liu Xiying is Associate Professor at the School of Humanities, Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China). She specializes in the study of European and American literature. Email: longlongw@126.com

诺贝尔文学奖得主索尔·贝娄（Saul Bellow, 1915-2005）的经典之作《赫索格》这部小说本身具有开放性和多义性，目前学界已有无数的阐释和解读方式产生。国内外的研究者着眼于赫索格遭遇的精神创伤，本文试图深度解析家庭的代际创伤给予摩西·赫索格的深刻影响，尤其是记忆如何重构了他的身份和生活道路。美国学者彼得·莱文曾指出：“记忆形成了自我认同的基础”（9）。赫索格的家庭记忆塑造了他的情感依恋模式，并在他治愈精神创伤的过程中起到了积极作用。通过对于家庭生活的回忆，赫索格联结了自己的过去、现在以及未来，尤其是与苦难深重的犹太民族共同体相融合并进行自我反省之后，他做出了自己的选择，不仅平复了创伤记忆，还激发了坚韧向上的乐观主义精神，重获安宁平稳的生活。

一、代际创伤与赫索格的身份危机

赫索格所遭遇的代际创伤来自家庭和犹太民族史两个方面，前者是他在现实生活中遭遇到的，后者则与其族裔身份乃至历史记忆有关。无论家庭代际创伤还是历史代际创伤都与他的身份危机密切相连，创伤记忆造成了赫索格的身份认同危机，进而影响到他的伦理选择。代际创伤涵盖以下内容：其一，家庭里的父辈与子辈两代人均遭受相似的精神创伤，这种创伤记忆具有代际性、传递性和类似性。心理学家的研究表明，儿童期创伤的效应会持续到成年期。小说中赫索格的父亲乔纳遭遇好友的背叛和出卖，经受了被欺骗而产生的痛苦悔恨悲伤等心理折磨。创伤不仅仅存在于唯一的直接受创者父亲身上，在非直接承受者少年赫索格的心理上也有所投射，给予了他无比深刻的创伤记忆。家族秘而不宣的精神创伤在后辈心理层面会得到再现，造成了非直接承受者的精神危机和伦理困惑。其二，家庭代际创伤具有历史性和形而上的意义，与赫索格的种族以及移民身份密切相关。在治愈代际创伤的过程中赫索格不仅对于父辈的移民身份有了更为深刻的理解，而且将自我身份的建构延展到宏大的犹太历史中去，从而具有了悲天悯人的情怀。

赫索格遭遇的代际创伤首先来自于父亲乔纳的被骗和受辱事件。乔纳和朋友沃伦斯基一起向放高利贷的人借钱卖私酒，结果还没有抵达边界就被人抢劫一空，父亲被人暴打一顿伤情惨重。出人意料的是父亲后来发现这次抢劫是沃伦斯基与那班强盗勾结在一起实施的。这突如其来的创伤事件摧毁

了父亲的日常生活，伦理秩序和规则被破坏，也使得过往的伦理关系失去了合理性和存在的价值。根据《精神病学通论》（*Comprehensive Textbooks of Psychiatry*）所述，所有心理创伤的共同之处在于，这是一种“极度恐惧、无助、失去掌控力和面临毁灭威胁”的感觉（转引自赫尔曼 30）。父亲遭遇创伤事件后经历了如下几个阶段：首先，质疑加害者是犹太同胞和朋友沃伦斯基，但是遭到了妻子的坚决否定。接着，出于各种难以言说的缘由，隐藏受辱憋屈的心理，开始哭述自己的受难史，发泄苦闷的心情。最终，作为沃伦斯基的恩人和好友，父亲选择不再追究他的罪责，保持了终身缄默。

父亲为何沉默不语？他的内心深处对于好友的背叛持怎样的想法？作为儿子的赫索格由始至终对此一无所知。小说中写道：“当父亲发现，原来是沃伦斯基与那班强盗勾结在一起进行抢劫时，他的内心的感觉究竟怎样呢？他从来没有说起过”（249）。父亲的沉默意味着这已成为家庭生活中心照不宣的秘密，不再触及创伤，仿佛这件事情从未发生过，能够自动地从日常生活中隔离出去。由于叙述者采用了第三人称有限视角进行叙事，读者只能从赫索格的视角窥探父亲的不作为，揣测其原因，却与赫索格一样发现父亲的沉默是一个无法解说的谜题。沃伦斯基与父亲不仅是好友，后者更是前者的恩人，在沃伦斯基落难之际收留了他，却没有想到他以怨报德，出卖了自己。他们彼此之间的身份发生了逆转，伦理关系出现了彻底的翻转。沃伦斯基从患难与共的朋友变成了加害者，父亲从恩人变成了受害者。沃伦斯基的欺骗和背叛毁坏了两人之前和谐友好的情谊，粉碎了人与人之间的信任感。创伤以身体记忆的形式镌刻在父亲的脑海中，“门牙开了个缺口，外套已被撕破，衬衣和内衣裤上都沾满了血迹”（196）。衣物可以替换，然而被打落的牙齿——身体记忆时刻提醒父亲经受的背叛、凌辱和折磨。

从最初遭到重创之时落泪的心酸到后来的沉默不语，父亲是否经历了失眠、梦魇、愤怒、羞耻、内疚、悔恨、哀伤，赫索格已不得而知。父亲的回避其实符合创伤后应激障碍症状之一——禁闭畏缩。“当一个人感到彻底地无能为力，任何形式的抗拒也已经无望时，他可能会进入屈服放弃的状态”（赫尔曼 38）。换句话说，受创者会产生精神上的麻痹无感，由此会避免任何时候回忆起过去的创伤，这当然可以规避再次触发创伤的风险，但与此同时也意味着错失了重构积极生活的契机。究其缘由，大概包括以下几方面：其一，父亲心存善念，他不愿意对犹太同胞实施报复行为。对沃伦斯基的否定和谴责也意味着对自己之前善行的彻底否定，这件事将让孩子们见证父亲的愚昧无知、识人不清和悔不当初。这恰好是身为人父的乔纳无论如何不愿意承认的人性的弱点，他的羞耻感阻止了自己。其二，父亲认为隐瞒真相对于孩子们身心的健康发展至关重要，他力图为他们创造出一个富有安全感的环境，保持对人性良善友爱一面的坚守；其三，父亲想要重新回归正常生活，不再追究往事。见证了人性阴暗面之后的父亲保持着沉默，然而沉默并不意味着

遗忘，更不表示原谅；其四，回避表明父亲企图以自己的方式抵御痛苦，因为再现创伤记忆有可能令人情绪崩溃，让人重新体验到难以忍受的折磨，人们将被不可阻挡的冲动所摧毁。从另一个角度而言，这是自我保护的手段，他没有选择发泄怒火到无辜的家人身上。但彼时的父亲并没有意识到创伤事件带来的代际性影响。当儿子赫索格遭遇到同样的创伤性事件时最初采取的处理方式——回避问题几乎与父亲如出一辙。赫索格最初甚至迁怒于告知自己真相的朋友阿斯弗特，认为对方在撒谎。承认事实意味着赫索格对自己智商的否定和自尊心的摧毁，在他者眼中被戴绿帽子的丈夫绝非正面形象，受骗者这一身份本身足以证明他交友不慎、愚不可及。所以他压抑自身的情感表达，否认被欺骗的事实。

从另一个角度而言，不仅父亲在这场意外变故中深受其害，整个家庭都受到沉重打击，孩子们目睹父亲的惨状后不禁伤心落泪。赫索格在精神上也因此打上了创伤记忆的深刻烙印。小说中写道：“我难过得再也忍不住了，居然有人敢对他动武——他是父亲，是个神圣不可侵犯的人，是个国王。我的心都快要被这可怕的事窒息了。我以为我会因这事厥死过去”（197）。在年幼的赫索格心目中，父亲不仅是父性权威坚不可摧的存在，更是全家的庇护者，为家庭提供物质保障。父性权威代表着稳定的秩序、强大的力量以及无可替代的榜样，赫索格是父亲的崇拜者，他从父亲那里获得精神支持。当他发现一直以来的父性权威居然受到了挑战并且被暴力殴打的时候，意识到一个无可争辩的事实，父亲由强者变成了弱者，他不再是神圣不可侵犯的，外在的异己力量能够摧毁一切。他感到害怕、恐惧和无助。彼时少年赫索格还不明白这种异己力量来源于何处？为什么身为犹太人要过着如此颠沛流离的生活？除了血缘亲情，父母给予他的究竟是什么？可以肯定的是，少年赫索格对自我身份的建构并没有确切的认知，更不可能洞察到他者眼中的族裔身份在社会生活中被接纳的程度及其遭遇到的各种困境。他找不到合适的方式表达自己愤怒悲伤焦灼的情绪，只能痛哭流涕，为父亲的无辜被打和自己的无能为力而感到伤心难过。这是父性权威坍塌的时刻，也是一个令儿子无法接受不知所措不可理喻的时刻。作为父亲创伤的目击者，赫索格也遭受了沉重打击。然而，当创伤事件发生的时候，赫索格的父母并没有及时疏导孩子们惊恐不安的情绪，他们自顾不暇，也全然没有意识到这件事会对小儿子赫索格造成极大的心理创伤。“虽然创伤症候群有许多固定的特质，但不会在每个人的身上都相同”（赫尔曼 53）。与兄弟姐妹们相比，赫索格受到的创伤尤为深重。显然在同一创伤事件中，个体的差异反应起到重要作用。他的兄弟姐妹们成年之后都迈入了富有的中产阶级行列，有着稳定的职业和家庭生活。他们属于抗压能力较强的人，具有积极的处事态度和成熟的社交能力。这样的人会较少出现创伤后应激障碍的症状。在赫索格童年时代封闭狭小的家宅空间里，混乱的生活环境容易造成父母对于孩子情感上的忽略。与

此同时，父母与孩子们之间会产生相互的认同感，孩子会感知父亲的创伤，而父母也为了孩子努力奋斗谋求生存之道。这能够强化彼此的安全感和依恋感，但也造成了父母与子女之间边界的模糊。

如果说年少之时的赫索格因父亲的身体受伤而痛哭的话，那么成年之后的他回首往事时对于父亲由始至终保持非同寻常的沉默感到震惊和不解，直至多年以后遭遇同样背叛和欺骗的赫索格才能够对父亲被背叛的痛苦和愤怒感同身受。代际创伤在赫索格身上的表征极为突出。此时的他对于身为美国犹太移民有了更为深刻的感悟，他认为受害者“有的哭出声来，有的默默地咽下伤痛，关于后者，你可以写一部人类的内心活动史”（249）。那些未曾说出口的心灵创伤阻碍了人们对被背叛的痛苦和愤怒进行开诚布公的交流。可以肯定的是，在赫索格看来父亲遭受的创伤不仅是肉体上的，更是心灵上的。对于很多受创者而言创伤本身无法言说，不能言喻的伤痛才是最深刻的记忆。

一般认为，创伤者的后代有可能获得创伤后的成长 (Tedeschi & Calhoun 456)。然而，赫索格并没有从保持缄默的父亲那里习得积极面对创伤的方式。恰好相反，他从父母那里习得了应对创伤的防御机制，这对日后赫索格与他人之间亲密关系的建立起到了一定的消极作用。当赫索格的婚姻出现问题时，他并没有寻求积极的解决方案，而是试图以视而不见的态度消解它或者将所有责任推卸到他人身上以期获得心理安慰。赫索格在离婚事件中感受到巨大的创伤，因为“自我与现实之间失去了平衡，统一性被打破，自身的连贯性也被割裂了”（赵静蓉 146）。他从原本和谐融通的环境中体会到突如其来的分裂、至亲好友的背叛。受创者赫索格被那种既期待又害怕受到羁绊和伤害的矛盾心理所折磨。首先是他周遭的伦理关系遭到彻底的毁坏。马德琳背叛了他们的婚姻，造成了夫妻关系的解体；格斯贝奇背叛了他们的友谊，造成了朋友关系的分裂。其次，他们各自的伦理身份发生了极大变化。马德琳从妻子变成前妻，格斯贝奇从好友变成情敌，而赫索格则由丈夫变成前夫。最后，作为受害者的赫索格在创伤发生之前的身份认同感也被摧毁。从前意气风发的大学教授变成了落魄的失婚者。小说中，赫索格数次以“待罪的羔羊”（142, 230）自称，显然他认为自己是马德琳与格斯贝奇婚外情的替罪羊，他所有的苦难均源于此。赫索格甚至对自己的犹太族裔身份和美国公民身份产生了深刻的怀疑。

由上面的分析可以看出，赫索格与父亲在性格、外表、人生经历等诸多方面存在着颇多的共同之处：其一，他们都与人为善以诚待人，推心置腹地对待朋友。其二，在不知情的情况下遭到知心好友的背叛。父亲遭遇的是物质损失和肉体上的创伤，而赫索格本人遭到了情感上的双重背叛。其三，面对朋友的背叛和出卖，赫索格和父亲都遭受了打击和创伤，而他们最初都采用了相似的应对策略——回避问题。从赫索格处理问题的方式可以看出他受

到了家庭代际创伤的影响，父亲曾以同样的方式处理被背叛和被欺凌的难题，保持了表面的和谐，维护了自我的尊严。赫索格在潜移默化中沿袭了父亲为人处事的冷峻作风。

作为具有犹太族裔身份的父亲乔纳和儿子赫索格，他们都在不同程度上受到了代际创伤的影响。这种代际创伤不仅来自于家庭，更经由历史记忆而来，镌刻在犹太后裔的灵魂深处，铸成了他们的受难意识，代代相传。而在现实生活中的悲惨际遇又进一步强化了这种创伤记忆，互为印证，生为犹太人绝非幸事，族裔身份是无形的烙印，时刻警醒着他们现世的艰辛与生存的不易。赫索格因父母的哀伤而愁苦，因家庭记忆而感知自己家族沉重的受难史。这种历史性的代际创伤让他对自我存在的价值、身份的追寻发出了意味深长的感慨。“我过去的岁月，年湮日渺，真像比埃及的历史还要久远”（187）。这不仅仅是赫索格个人的岁月，也是所有犹太人旷日持久的流散历程，他将个体的创伤体验与整个的犹太历史结合在一起，从而使得个体记忆有了厚重的历史感和更为久远的凝视。

这已然成为一种共同的受难意识和家庭记忆注入到赫索格的心中，作为联系他与兄弟姐妹们的情感纽带，加强了他们的家庭认同感和责任感。小说中写道，赫索格认为这是苦难教育，因为家族的受难史被父母讲述过无数次。不同于父辈的沉默不语，赫索格面对创伤时，以一种幽默的开放心态自嘲。这使得他能够客观地审视家庭的受难经历。作为大学教师和知识分子，赫索格有着自觉的反省意识，他站在历史的高度自觉地将整个赫索格家族的苦难纳入到犹太民族的受难史中去，认为他们延续了这种受难经历。《圣经》中记载了犹太人出埃及、圣殿被毁等诸多历史事件，自古以来他们厄运连连，经历被驱逐杀戮毁灭的种种灾难，赫索格家庭的不幸遭遇只是历史记忆中的脚注而已。相较于历史的惊涛骇浪，他们的际遇不过是浪尖上无足轻重的泡沫。然而无可否认的是，“历史的回忆成为集体身份认同的源头”（《回忆空间》81）。对于犹太民族身份的集体认同感强化了赫索格的忧患意识。对于赫索格而言，这是历史性的代际创伤，他们重蹈了先人的命运。可是这又不仅仅是历史性的代际创伤，同时也是家族性的创伤的代际传承。正因为如此，赫索格认为自己有责任记忆下来。这不仅仅只是父亲乔纳作为个体的犹太人遭受的苦难，更代表了所有犹太人的命运。赫索格渴望铭记父亲的受难史，因为这是他作为儿子传承家族史的责任。他从中看到了做人高贵的尊严。

赫索格承袭了来自家庭的代际创伤，深受其影响，并将其纳入历史视野中加以审视。他不仅在面对被背叛的境遇时与父亲乔纳的处理方式如出一辙——回避问题，同时也洞悉到自身深重的身份危机。

二、创伤叙事的真实性与不可靠性

经历代际创伤的赫索格面临着深重的精神危机，从赫索格面对马德琳婚

外情带来的心理创伤时的应对措施可以发现他经历了几个不同的阶段：回避问题、自我否定、创伤叙事、找寻自我，其中创伤叙事对于疗救赫索格的精神危机尤为重要。这部书信体小说上承欧洲文学史上书信体小说的写作传统，下启现代书信体小说之先河，作者将现代派的叙事手法与其相融合，创新精神蔚为可观。赫索格通过书信表达言说的创伤叙事既具有真实性，同时也有着不可靠性，而这恰好反映出人性意蕴的复杂矛盾。

如果说回避问题在相当程度上源自于赫索格的代际创伤造成的影响的话，那么在这之后，赫索格被迫承认自己被欺瞒受伤害并进入到第二阶段——自我否定。赫索格对自己、他人和世界的信任感全面瓦解，他的自尊心被羞耻感、自卑感和负罪感无情地践踏碾压，已经丧失掉处理亲密关系的能力。不仅之前与外界建立的有序联结被摧毁。他的自我认知也发生了逆转。他从亲情、爱情、友情以及才智、灵魂等各个方面对自己进行了全方位的否定，甚至对自己予以了严厉的道德批判：“道貌岸然，坏事做绝，他写道，伪装正经”（29）。这种自我贬低除了加深他的精神危机和自责感之外并无益处。

前两个阶段的赫索格面临着创伤后精神的全面崩溃，之后，他开始重新建立与外界的联结，由此进入了第三阶段，通过四处写信来倾诉烦恼和忧伤，这事实上是创伤叙事。赫索格需要宣泄、释放创伤带给他的愤怒、痛苦和焦虑种种负面情绪。然而必须指出的是，赫索格不是一个完全世俗化了的普通犹太移民后裔，他具有多重身份：犹太移民后裔、美国公民、高级知识分子、大学教授，身份的复杂多元将他与庸常之辈区别开来。赫索格有着深邃丰沛的精神世界，他对于现实生活的体悟和感受要比他人深刻得多。正因为如此，在现实生活中赫索格找不到可供自己倾诉并与之深度交流的对象，只有将目光转向了精神世界中的人们，在由书信构建的虚拟空间中尽情地单向度的表达自我。“与他人分享创伤经历，是重建生命意义的先决条件”（赫尔曼 64）。小说中他总共写了 119 封未曾发出的信，身为大学教授、知识分子，赫索格内在的精神世界无限宽广复杂，他的收信人上至上帝、总统、哲学家，下至死者、服务生，遍及社会中的三教九流，无所不包，而他的论题包罗万象，涉及政治、历史、记忆、经济、文化、哲学、人口学、精神病理学、伦理道德、爱情、婚姻、家庭等诸多领域。赫索格以自己的方式与外界进行沟通交流，他期望以此探究自身族裔身份的渊源、家庭记忆和历史记忆施加于人身上的深刻影响。然而虚拟空间中的人们毕竟无法与赫索格达成真正的共识，他所有的表达得不到任何的回应。显然赫索格对于是否得到呼应并不在意，因为他写就的是不曾发出的信。他需要的仅仅只是书写和表达本身，这已然成为意义之所在。从积极的方面来看，赫索格天马行空的自由想象恰好提供了自我治愈的手段，使得他不再仅仅专注于婚外情事件带给他的创伤，暂时逃离了卑微渺小的自我。尽管赫索格一直深陷精神的牢笼，受到囹圄之苦，然而一旦认识到创伤造成的毁坏不是永久性的，那么赫索格也就有了重构身份及

其新生活的可能。

赫索格过往的生活被摧毁，价值观和人生观亦遭到创伤事件的破坏。他必须自我调整，在创伤叙事中表达出最真实的感受。赫索格在现实的观照中深感作为知识分子的挫败和无足轻重，他甚至无法对任何人解释自己的遭遇。实际上，他的困惑与愤慨并存，不得不面对两个无解的难题：为什么？为何是自己？世间任何现存的伦理道德和律法秩序都无法给予公正的答案。赫索格意识到，过度的思虑与焦灼无济于事，马德琳的不忠与格斯贝奇的背叛的确已经对他造成了无可挽回的精神创伤。然而补救之道在于行动，赫索格最终必须面对真实的自我。作为离异中年男子，赫索格不再拥有家庭的归属感和安全感，这不仅意味着他需要思考创伤后的生活价值，还要重建正义、秩序和伦理，更重要的是必须面对加害者和背叛者马德琳与格斯贝奇，重构新的自我以及与他人之间的联系。119封书信如同一种治疗仪式，这是赫索格的精神自白，给予他复原的力量，恢复从前感知情感的能力，赋予生命新的意义和价值。在赫索格的创伤叙事中，屈辱和羞愧终将为尊严所取代，发掘出坚不可摧的内在生命力。

赫索格的创伤记忆的固然真实可感，之后的创伤叙事也有其真实性的一面，然而需要特别指出的是，由于作者采用了第三人称有限视角进行叙事，换句话说，小说以赫索格的视角在观照世界，因而读者只能以赫索格的眼光看待其他人物，无从得知他人的真实想法，只能据此推测。赫索格的创伤体验诚然是真实的和个性化的，然而由于叙事视角的局限，我们无从知晓在同一事件中除赫索格之外其他人的创伤经历和真实体验。从这一角度而言，赫索格的创伤记忆具有不可靠性。“回忆的进行从根本上说是重构性的；它总是从当下出发，这也就不可避免地导致了被回忆起的东西在它被召回的那一刻会发生移位、变形、扭曲、重新评价和更新”（《回忆空间》22）。人的记忆是有自我防护机制的，同时也是有选择性的。选择的同时也意味着对于其他未被选择事件的遮蔽和掩饰。因为人们的经历可能相同，但是经验却并不一致。这也就意味着在赫索格的回忆空间中存在大量的空白有待他人填补。赫索格曾经在第一段婚姻中出轨数次，然而在他的回忆中对于前妻戴西毫无愧疚之心，也完全没有考虑同样遭遇背叛的戴西是否与自己一样深受精神创伤的困扰和影响。经历第二段婚姻的赫索格由欺骗者变成了受骗者。实际上，读者是通过赫索格的视角看到这桩婚外情事件，却听不到婚姻中的另一方作为妻子的马德琳的声音，无从知晓马德琳是否也在婚姻中经受了精神创伤，所以才借由格斯贝奇逃离赫索格的掌控。在某种程度上她是赫索格经由创伤叙事构建的回忆空间中丧失了话语权的女人。因此，赫索格的创伤叙事有其不可靠性。

无可否认的是，创伤叙事有助于赫索格减少回避性行为以及对痛苦的过度关注和唤醒。这不仅能够使得他将这段经历整合到自己的人生中去，更重

要的在于他无需以此界定自我,评估自己的行为。在经历了伦理两难后赫索格最后选择放弃对加害者格斯贝奇的复仇并不意味着不再寻求公义,恰好相反,这象征着创伤复原的开端,由此他能够摆脱创伤带来的羞辱、愤怒、痛苦和悲伤情绪。

三、创伤复原与家庭记忆的代际传递

经过回避问题、自我否定和创伤叙事这三个阶段历练之后的赫索格开始面对着真实的自我,他真正进入到创伤复原的阶段,最终治愈了精神创伤,与自我、他人、世界之间达成了和解。而令赫索格得到解脱,帮助他治愈精神创伤并找寻自我的是他的家人以及早年全部的家庭记忆,后者以代际传递的方式影响着赫索格的伦理选择并重新建构了他的身份。家庭记忆的代际传递对赫索格精神创伤的复原起到了至关重要的作用。

有学者指出,“受创者会用许多不同的形式,从家人、情人、好友身上寻求情感上的支持,而且会随着创伤处理过程的变化而改变”(赫尔曼 57)。赫索格最初在情人雷蒙娜身上找寻安全感和信赖感。但是,赫索格遭遇的代际创伤促使他在后来的亲密关系中实施自我防御机制。对于那些痛苦经历刻骨铭心的回忆有助于人们“避免日后重现痛苦、危险和担惊受怕的情形”(转引自德拉埃斯马 22)。出于对创伤事件的恐惧感,他一方面有着寻求保护者和依附于他人的渴望,另一方面又竭力避免任何唤起创伤记忆的伦理关系。赫索格正是在自我隔离和渴求依附之间摇摆不定。这种矛盾冲突不仅使得他的内心世界永远处于躁动不安的状态,更影响到他与他者之间亲密关系的积极建构,使得他与雷蒙娜之间只能形成热切然而不稳定的情人关系。赫索格显然并未将雷蒙娜视为平等的约会对象,只不过将其当作性伴侣。同时对她怀有很强的戒备心理,这种戒心在相当程度上源于赫索格经历的离婚事件带给他的创伤记忆。

由此赫索格寻求庇护的对象从情人转向了家人。当他在离婚事件中备受折磨之时,家庭记忆起到了强大的保护、支持和安慰作用。有研究者提出,“人的安全感,或基本的信赖感,是在人生的最初阶段与第一位照顾者的关系中获得。这种信赖感源于生命本身,并将跟着一个人走完人生旅程。它是所有关系与信念系统的基石”(赫尔曼 47-48)。这种信赖感将帮助个体与他人之间建立起良好的人际关系,从而能够与社会和谐共处,促进自我的统一性和连续性发展。显然,信赖感的产生与最初照顾者的关系密不可分。小说中写道:“下出租汽车时,他想起了母亲,想起当时她怎样用嘴沾湿手帕给他擦脸。……他没有忘记,那一年夏天的早晨,在加拿大那个空荡荡的火车站里,他母亲手帕上唾液的香味”(53)。嗅觉记忆和触觉记忆引发了赫索格的情感联想,母亲给予他无限的爱令他永生难以忘怀。他一直是被照顾得无微不至的孩子,得到母亲全身心的关爱和保护。这形成了赫索格情感中的依恋模

式，而他在成年之后与他人的相处中也一直在追寻和模仿这样的模式。

家庭记忆铸造了赫索格的身份认同感，与其他兄弟姐妹相比，他更加重视亲情，对于原生家庭有着不同寻常的依恋情感，并且形成了依恋模式。每当赫索格遇到伦理困境或者精神危机时，他总会从原生家庭中寻求解救之道。当赫索格他面临牢狱之灾时，打电话给哥哥威利请求帮助，最终是威利将他保释了出来。赫索格从家庭里汲取温暖的力量和爱的关怀。成年之后的赫索格回忆起童年时代以及家族里的每一位成员，尤其是他的祖父。赫索格没有见过祖父，并没有关于祖孙共处的回忆以强化彼此之间的情感联系和伦理关系。但他无数次看到祖父和亲人们寄来的信件。阿莱达·阿斯曼曾指出：“阅读父亲和祖父的文字意味着：将自己置身于他们的境地；通过接受他人的视角。这里发生了一种情感的换位，一种在距离中的再次经历，因为这里经受的是他人与自我在认知和情感上的不一致”（《记忆中的历史》70）。在父母的信件阅读中赫索格发生了情感上的置换，不仅真切地感受到父亲作为儿子听到老父亲倾诉死后身躯无处安放的痛苦，无法亲自陪伴其右的悲伤，也亲眼目睹了母亲接到兄长死讯时的可怖反应。赫索格在祖辈和父辈的回忆中发现了自我存在的根源，这是无法回避的家族史，每一个个体都置身其中，成为生命链条中的重要一环，连接着过去和未来。个体生命存在本身的意义之一就在于传承古老文化。

赫索格的家庭记忆也展示了每一个成员社会地位与身份的变迁。叙述者采用了回顾性视角在叙事，成年的赫索格多年后站在旁观者立场回首往事，对于自己的家庭，特别是兄弟姐妹有着深刻的洞察和犀利的评价，然而所有这些个性上的缺失并不妨碍赫索格对家人倾注了满腔的温情与关爱。这正显现出幽微人性的真实复杂。亲情从来不单纯，交织着纷争吵闹、利益争斗和彼此的厌弃，也夹杂着真心实意的爱护与温存。从叙述中可以看到，赫索格所需要的是来自家庭内部的情感：夫妻之情、父子之情、母子之情以及手足之情。而这种“家庭的情感也不是用母亲的照看、父亲的天赋权势，或者兄弟姐妹日常的共居就能解释的。超越并支配所有这些因素的，是实际当中起作用的一种情感，它既模糊又精确，仅在家庭内产生，并且也只能由家庭来解释”（哈布瓦赫 98）。事实上，赫索格家庭成员在长大成人后走上了各自的生活道路，瑞拉和威利作为第二代犹太移民后裔顺利完成了美国化的进程，他们成为拜金主义的百万富翁。赫索格则更多地保留着犹太性的一面。这并非指他遵循犹太文化传统成为犹太教信徒，恰好相反，他与兄弟姐妹们都成为了世俗的犹太人。赫索格的身上展现出来的对于家庭记忆的眷恋和依赖正是犹太性的一个侧面。

赫索格具有复杂多变的伦理价值取向，由犹太传统伦理与美国实用主义伦理混杂而成，当他面临不同的困境和利益冲突时，不同的伦理取向会占据上风。事实上，赫索格在回忆中将个体的遭遇和命运纳入到了古老的犹太伦

理秩序之中，“在这种秩序里，单个的人并不把自己看作个人，而是看作一个姓氏的承载者，一个链条中的一环。他从全体那里得到他的身份认同，也是全体的一部分。个人是转瞬即逝的，而家族留传的血脉和姓氏却是永生不死的”（《回忆空间》79）。赫索格认同源远流长的犹太民族身份，他的名字摩西正是最为突出的表征。摩西原型体现了圣经文学中富有献身精神的希伯来英雄，而贝娄笔下的摩西·赫索格印证了20世纪美国文学中的反英雄人格。这二者之间存在着深厚的文化关联。

综上所述，赫索格对于世界最初的信任和联结源自于家庭，这是他生命的本源之所在，而他最终也仰赖于此获得拯救。赫索格不再是孤立无援的离异男人，也不再是单枪匹马面对困境的失败者，关键时刻他的兄弟姐妹们都伸出了援助之手。“家庭一般来说总是能够成功地激发起成员之间的互爱，即使彼此分离，即使远隔千山万水也不能阻断这种爱，而且，家庭成员也把他们的主要的感情力量都投入到家庭的怀抱里，这已经够不同寻常的了”（哈布瓦赫 99）。必须指出的是，赫索格不得不自己承担创伤复原的责任。的确不公平，但这是行之有效的发挥主体能动性的方式。赫索格摆脱了自我蔑视的心理状态，不再自怨自艾，重新找到了自我，重建了与他人之间的信任，修复了受损的自尊。

正如有学者指出的那样，“被回忆的过去永远掺杂着对身份认同的设计，对当下的阐释，以及对有效性的诉求”（《回忆空间》85）。赫索格对于创伤进行的回顾性叙事就本质而言是他追寻自我、重构身份的过程。在赫索格的无意识深处，隐藏着对于犹太祖先们历史创伤代际传递的审视与悲悯，同时也经由犹太史观照赫索格家庭乃至自己的受难史，其中贯穿着对于复杂多变人性的思考。整部小说就是关于大学教授摩西·赫索格如何治愈精神创伤的回顾性书写，结尾处赫索格不再对任何人发出任何信息。“没有，一个字都没有”（438）。这意味着他与周遭世界的和解，心灵创伤的愈合以及回归田园生活的安宁祥和。赫索格克服了精神创伤带来的消极作用，自我与现实终于能够和谐共处。

Works Cited

- 阿莱达·阿斯曼：《记忆中的历史：从个人经历到公共演示》，袁斯乔译。南京：南京大学出版社，2017年。
- [Assman, Aleida. *The History in the Memory: from One's Experience to Public Demonstration*. Trans. Yuan Siqiao. Nanjing: Nanjing UP, 2017.]
- ：《回忆空间：文化记忆的形式和变迁》，潘璐译。北京：北京大学出版社，2016年。
- [—, *Memorial Space: the Forms and Changes of Culture Memory*. Trans. Pan Lu. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2016.]

索尔·贝娄：《赫索格》，宋兆霖译。石家庄：河北教育出版社，2001年。

[Bellow, Saul. *Herzog*. Trans. Song Zhaolin. Shijiazhuang: Hebei Education Press, 2001.]

Briere, John & Catherine Scott. 《心理创伤的治疗指南》，徐凯文 聂晶 王雨吟 张怡玲译。北京：中国轻工业出版社，2009年。

[Briere, John & Catherine Scott. *Principles of Trauma Therapy: A Guide to Symptoms, Evaluation, and Treatment*. Trans. Xu Kaiwen, Nie Jing, Wang Yuyin and Zhang Yiling. Beijing: China Light Industry Press, 2009.]

杜威·德拉埃斯马：《为什么随着年龄的增长时间过得越来越快——记忆如何塑造我们的过去》，张朝霞译。济南：山东教育出版社，2006年。

[Draaisma, Douwe. *Why Life Speeds Up as You Get Older: How the Memory Construct Our Past*. Trans. Zhang Zhaoxia. Jinan: Shandong Education Press, 2006.]

莫里斯·哈布瓦赫：《论集体记忆》，毕然 郭金华译。上海：上海人民出版社，2002年。

[Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Trans. Bi Ran and Guo Jinhua. Shanghai: Shanghai Renmin Press, 2002.]

朱迪思·赫尔曼：《创伤与复原》，施宏达 陈文琪译。北京：机械工业出版社，2018年。

[Herman, Judith. *Trauma and Recovery*. Trans. Shi Hongda and Chen Wenqi. Beijing: China Machine Press, 2018.]

彼得·莱文：《创伤与记忆》，曾旻译。北京：机械工业出版社，2017年。

[Levine, Peter A. *Trauma and Memory*. Trans. Zeng Wen. Beijing: China Machine Press, 2017.]

Tedeschi, R. G., & Calhoun, L. G. "The Posttraumatic Growth inventory: Measuring the Positive Legacy of Trauma." *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 9 (1996): 455–71.

赵静蓉：《创伤记忆的文学表征》，《学术研究》1(2017): 144-151, 178。

[Zhao Jingrong. "Literature Representation in Traumatic Memory." *Academic Study* 1 (2017): 144-151, 178.]

白人至上主义的宣言书：释读托马斯·狄克逊“三部曲”中的优生学种族主义思想

The Declaration of White Supremacy: A Study on Eugenic Racism Reflected in Thomas Dixon's "Trilogy of Reconstruction"

王业昭 (Wang Yezhao)

内容提要：以美国内战后的“南方重建”为背景，托马斯·狄克逊创作了三部种族主义题材小说，即“重建三部曲”。在杜撰的故事情节中，狄克逊运用优生学种族主义理论诠释白人种族优越论，定性黑人为劣等种族，并着力体现两者的种族特质均植根于各自进化过程中的世代遗传，后天因素无法从根本上加以改变。鉴于此，白人理应是美国社会的统治者，而黑人只能居于臣服、从属地位。优生学种族主义理论是披着科学外衣的伪科学，但“重建三部曲”却将其作为替种族歧视和 3K 党暴行辩护的科学依据。

关键词：托马斯·狄克逊；优生学种族主义；3K 党；《豹纹》；《同胞》

作者简介：王业昭，文学博士，合肥工业大学外国语学院副教授，主要从事美国文化研究，本文系中央高校基本科研业务人文社科项目“美国种族主义理论渊源研究”【JS2015HGXF0077】阶段性成果。

Title: The Declaration of White Supremacy: A Study on Eugenic Racism Reflected in Thomas Dixon's "Trilogy of Reconstruction"

Abstract: On the background of Reconstruction after American Civil War, Thomas Dixon has written three racism themed novels, namely "Trilogy of Reconstruction." In the made-up plots, Dixon applies the theory of eugenic racism to interpret White supremacy, and define Black as an inferior race. Moreover, the superiority of Whites and the inferiority of Blacks both originate from the genetic inheritances in the history of evolution of the two races, and acquired dispositions can never completely change the racial nature of Black and White. Therefore, The White is destined to be the ruler while the Black must be subject to them. Eugenic racism is a fake theory in disguise of natural science, but in his "Trilogy of Reconstruction," Dixon uses it as the theoretical foundation to justify racial discrimination as well as the savage acts of Ku Klux Klan.

Key Words: Thomas Dixon; eugenic racism; Ku Klux Klan; *The Leopard's Spots*; *The Clansman*

Author: Wang Yezhao, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of the School of Foreign Studies, Hefei University of Technology. He is mainly engaged in American cultural studies (Email: wangyezhaol1@126.com).

托马斯·狄克逊 (Tomas Dixon) 1864 年生于美国北卡罗来纳州，兼具牧师、作家等身份于一身。同时，狄克逊又是一个典型的种族主义者，推崇白人至上主义。内战后，黑奴制得以废除，联邦政府赋予黑人一定公民权，并主导了让他们融入美国社会的“南方重建”(Reconstruction)，黑人的民族身份意识和社会地位在此过程中都得以提升。当时的文学界，以《汤姆叔叔的小屋》为代表，一批文学作品旨在唤起整个美国对黑人悲惨遭遇的关注，从而让他们能尽快获得平等的社会地位。面对如此局面，狄克逊要用自己的方式维护白人至上主义。20 世纪初，以“南方重建”为背景，他连续创作三部小说《豹纹：1865-1900 年间白人忍辱负重史》(1902)、《同胞：3K 党传奇史》(1905) 和《背叛者：隐形帝国陨落史》(1907)。因三部小说都旨在反映“南方重建”破坏了美国南部原有的社会体系；获得权利的黑人处处“为非作歹”；以 3K 党为代表的白人对抗黑人“暴民”、捍卫盎格鲁-撒克逊文明，故学界称之为“重建三部曲”或“3K 党三部曲”(下文简称“三部曲”)。虽然“三部曲”的主旨与其它种族主义文学作品无异，但在表达形式上，作者大量运用优生学理论来阐释白人种族优越论，而黑人的劣等种族性决定其只能居于社会从属地位。

一、优生学种族主义棱镜下的“三部曲”

优生学是一门旨在提高人口素质的现代科学，但种族主义者则利用其基本理论，阐释种族之间存在优劣之分。西方社会的种族天生优、劣思想自古有之，而将其与现代科学直接关联的则是达尔文进化论。以“自然选择”法则下从低到高这一生物进化理论为基础，达尔文在《人类的演变》(*The Descent of Man*) 中阐释了自己的优生学思想。他指出，在家禽、家畜的饲养过程中，没有人会通过特殊照顾让那些存在身体缺陷的动物生存、继续繁衍。但在人类社会，医疗、社会福利等手段不但让那些有身心缺陷的人存活下去，而且还让他们结婚生子 (Darwin 205-206)。关于优、劣种族在社会中的地位，达尔文更是明确指出：如果睿智审慎者不积极生儿育女，而愚昧莽撞者人丁兴旺，那劣等人群将成为社会的主导。鉴于此，虽然“自然选择”法则会引发一些负面效应，但人类社会健康发展的前提是对这一原则的遵守 (Darwin 945)。对于达尔文，人类社会的发展原则与其它生物的繁殖规律无异，遗传因素在提高人口素质中发挥关键作用。以此为基础，19 世纪后期，

弗朗西斯·高尔顿 (Francis Galton) 最终将优生学思想上升到体系化的理论高度。

作为现代优生学之父，高尔顿的核心观点是人的身心素质主要源于遗传，与生俱有，而非后天培养可以根本改变。他接受达尔文进化论思想，认为优、劣种族是人类社会在“自然选择”下生存竞争的结果，优、劣种族特质非后天因素所能改变。高尔顿从希腊语衍生创造了 *eugenics* (优生学) 一词，并对其做出明确界定：作为一门科学，优生学旨在研究影响提升不同种族天生禀赋的因素，以及那些可以将这些禀赋发展至最佳状态的诱因 (Galton 1)。优生学的主要目标是动用一切可能手段，让社会中的优等族群多生多育，这样他们就能在提高人口素质上发挥超出其所占比例的作用 (Galton 3)。总之，以进化论、遗传学等为基础，高尔顿将“优等”族群视为社会发展、人类进步的基石。

客观上，优生学是全面提高人口素质的科学理论。但 19 世纪后半叶，欧、美的优生学家基本都是白人至上主义者，而美国更是优生学种族主义的主阵地。他们将种族主义思想融入优生学理论，并据此划分、诠释优、劣种族，为种族歧视提供理论依据，优生学种族主义从而得到快速发展。对于美国的优生学种族主义者，白人的优等种族特质和黑人的劣等种族性均植根于各自的世代遗传，环境、教育等后天因素无法从根本上加以改变。同时，社会的发展、文明的进步要求优等种族必须居于统治地位。“劣等”种族要么臣服、从属于前者，要么消亡。上述即构成了优生学种族主义的核心思想，也成为“三部曲”替种族主义进行辩护的重要理论武器。

“南方重建”过程中，联邦政府赋予黑人选举权，及其它公民权，但南方的种族主义者无法接受黑人与自己“平起平坐”，于是采取各种形式阻止黑人成为与自己平权的美国公民。3K 党是奉行白人至上的种族主义组织，起初主要由内战中南方军队的退役士兵组成。他们采用威胁、私刑、暗杀等暴力手段，不但要阻止黑人获得、行使公民权，而且还要让黑人在思想上接受自己属于劣等种族，必须永远从属、臣服于白人。3K 党的反人类恐怖主义行为虽令人发指，但狄克逊的“三部曲”却为其大唱赞歌。首部小说《豹纹》描写北卡罗来纳州新获公民权的黑人“为非作歹”，黑人男性更是将其视作摧毁白人文明，侮辱白人妇女的工具。白人“民不聊生”，开始奋起反抗，3K 党就此应运而生，最终摧毁了黑人“暴政”，捍卫白人文明；《同胞》讲述了北方的斯通曼 (Stoneman) 和南方 (南卡罗来纳州) 的卡梅伦 (Cameron) 两大家族子女间爱情故事。小说在情节突出南、北方的纯种白人人才是美国社会的主人，而 3K 党在镇压黑人“暴民”、恢复南方社会秩序过程中发挥了无可替代的作用，并让白人重新成为社会发展的主导者；《背叛者》故事发生在 19 世纪 70 年代的北卡罗来纳州，描写在完成历史使命后，3K 党就地解散。作者之所以如此安排故事情节，是因为一方面，在不断的交易和妥协之后，

共和党于 1876 年正式终止“南方重建”。另一方面，20 世纪初 3K 已演变成一个极端恐怖组织，其各种暴力、血腥活动遭到多数美国人反对，联邦政府亦通过相关法律实施镇压。《叛徒》中，北卡州 3K 党已被领袖约翰·格拉汉姆 (John Graham) 解散，但史蒂夫·霍伊尔 (Steve Hoyle) 等投机者们却为一己私利而重组 3K 党，并在随后以暴力方式实现目标，犯下累累罪行。显然，在 3K 的行为已人神共愤的情况下，狄克逊创作《叛徒》继续为其辩护。在他看来，以格拉汉姆为代表的 3K 党是应对黑人“暴政”，捍卫白人文明的“正义”组织，他们在完成历史使命后已退出历史舞台。至于以后的 3K 党恐怖主义活动，那些只是以霍伊尔为代表的投机者冒用 3K 党旗号的个人行为，与“正义”的 3K 党无关。

“三部曲”中，《背叛者》反映 3K 党内部矛盾。虽然小说中亦大量描写黑人的愚昧与野蛮，但故事情节主要围绕 3K 党内部斗争展开，故优生学种族主义未有突出体现，而在《豹纹》和《同胞》中，优生学种族主义的核心观点则成为作者定性优、劣种族，替种族歧视和 3K 党暴行辩护的最主要理论依据。

二、纯种遗传，种族特质的决定性因素

遗传的族群特质通常情况下恒定不变，而这种恒定性与动物所处的进化阶段成正比关系。具体而言，外部环境较易改变低等动物的遗传特质，即动物的进化级别越高，遗传特质就越难以改变。人类处于所有物种进化的最高阶段。虽然营养、教育等是人类成长过程中的重要影响因素，但它们对遗传特质的影响十分有限 (Popenoe, Johnson 2-3)。上述是优生学种族主义在遗传决定种族特质上的核心观点。优生学种族主义者认为黑人是进化不完全的劣等种族，遗传使其劣等种族性世代相传。人类现已处于进化的高级阶段，故教育等外在因素无法根本上改变黑人的劣等种族性。

理查德·卡梅伦 (Richard Cameron) 是《同胞》中南卡州一名德高望重的医生，也是作者笔下旧南方高贵白人的代表。当谈及黑人的劣等民族性，卡梅伦称：“自人类历史发端，黑人就拥有美丽富饶的非洲大陆。虽然脚下遍地黄金、钻石，但在白人教会他们开采之前，黑人从未发现这些珍宝；非洲大陆遍布各种动物，黑人自己从未想过去驯养它们；在一个林木充裕，巨石遍野的大陆，黑人不知道用它们去建造房屋；非洲拥有广阔的海岸线，但黑人只知道听浪、看潮，却从未想过去航海；黑人世代只知道掠食、抢夺、相互残杀，满足于猿猴般蹦跳、嚎叫的野蛮生活” (*the Clansman* 292)。在卡梅伦这些种族主义者眼里，黑人的劣质性源于他们在非洲大陆的不完全进化，现今也只是半人半兽的野蛮族群，根本不具备文明人类的素质。内战后，黑人在各个社会层面落后于白人是客观事实。废奴主义者认为，通过文化教育、职业培训等手段，黑人能够成为合格的美国公民。优生学种族主义者则

坚信,民族特质由先天性因素决定,后天因素根本无法改变。《同胞》中,借用林肯总统之口,狄克逊明确表达这一思想。

在内战后如何处置南部叛乱州问题上,林肯与国会领袖奥斯丁·斯通曼(Austin Stoneman)展开激烈辩论。林肯称:“作为自由民,黑人已在美国北方的土地上生活了上百年,但他们中却无人成长为法官、市长、州长、大学校长……”(the *Clansman* 46)。林肯通常被视为解放黑奴的英雄,但在“三部曲”中,狄克逊却将他塑造成一个种族主义者。其中缘由,一方面,虽然林肯领导的内战废除了黑奴制,但他仍无法摆脱所处时代局限性,即认同白人种族优越论。更为重要的是,林肯出生在位于美国南方的肯塔基州,而“三部曲”将所有南方白人界定为盎格鲁--撒克逊文明的守护者。借林肯之口,作者是要表达即使在黑奴制早已废除的北方,黑人仍无法成为社会栋梁,这完全是劣等种族性使然,而不同人种在同等条件下所取得成绩的巨大差异更能体现出种族的优、劣性。追溯历史,造成黑人全面落后白人这一局面的根源是他们无法获得与白人平等的条件和机遇,但种族主义者却对此置若罔闻。

《豹纹》中,核心人物约翰·达勒姆(John Durham)是北卡罗来纳州汉姆布莱特地区(Hambright)的知名牧师。狄克逊将他塑造成集虔诚、睿智、仁爱于一身的完人。达勒姆既是优秀南方白人的化身,也同样是南方原有价值体系的坚守者。纵观整个故事情节,作者将他作为自己的喉舌来表达思想。内战后,大批废奴主义者奔赴南方,试图通过改革南方的教育体系来全面提升黑人的素质,并计划将优秀的黑人儿童带到北方进行教育,从而把他们培养成能够引领社会发展的栋梁之才。对此,达勒姆嗤之以鼻。“黑人受到的教育越多,他们越不可能在民主社会里找到适合自己的位置。难道书本能改变黑人的肤色,厚重的嘴唇,心脏的跳动频率……”(The *Leopard's Spots* 460)。种族特质一旦形成,教育手段无法从根本加以改变,这是典型的优生学种族主义思想。

优生学种族主义者还认为,不但教育不能改变种族特质,其它任何因素亦无法做到,其中就包括不同种族间的通婚。美国20世纪初著名的优生学家麦迪逊·格兰特(Madison Grant)指出,长远来看,一旦优、劣种族间通婚,其后代比父母中的任一方都更加低能、弱智。白人与印第安人通婚生育的子女肯定比印第安人更低能(Jackson, Weidman 72-73)。可见,优生学种族主义者不仅认为遗传决定种族特质,而且突出优等种族性的传递必须通过纯种遗传才能实现。换言之,混血儿同样属于劣等种族。从现在科学角度来看,上述观点是十足的谬论,但狄克逊却在“三部曲”中浓墨重彩地表现这一点。

约翰·达勒姆直言:“黑人类似驴子,你可以训练他们,但决不可能将他们变成千里马。如果让驴和骏马交配,它们的后代是大块头的驴,也就是骡子,其物种属性无法改变”(The *Leopard's Spots* 460)。教育无法让黑人摆脱愚昧,通婚的结果只能是“骡子”。这样,为维护白人的“优等”种族性,

优生学种族主义者坚决反对黑人与白人之间有任何形式的通婚行为。对此，达勒姆称：“一滴黑人的血液足以将整个白人变为黑，因为这点血能蜷缩白人的头发，扁平白人的鼻子，加厚白人的嘴唇，熄灭白人的智慧灵感，点燃白人的野性”（*The Leopard's Spots* 242）。依据这一逻辑，白人种族主义者决不允许自己的家族与黑人产生任何血缘上的联系。

《豹纹》中的乔治·哈里斯 (George Harris) 是黑白混血儿，受过良好的教育，因而受到北方政客的青睐，参议员埃弗雷特·洛厄尔 (Everett Lowell) 更是对他大力扶植。由于和洛厄尔家族接触频繁，哈里斯爱上了参议员的女儿海伦·洛厄尔 (Helen Lowell)，并向其父提出迎娶海伦的想法。闻听此言，老洛厄尔怒目圆睁，如猎豹般准备随时咬断猎物 (哈里斯) 的脖子。哈里斯试图说服这位参议员，让他明白黑人与白人生而平等，无优劣之分，但洛厄尔却说：“为了种族血统的纯洁，为了自我保护，我不在乎你的文化水平、天赋、社会地位。无论如何，我绝不允许你靠近我女儿，让我的家族融入黑人血液”（*The Leopard's Spots* 390-391）。他还称：“你身上一滴血足以让我们家族史后退 3000 年。即使你赢得我女儿的芳心，我也会亲手杀死她，而不会让她陷入一个黑鬼的世界”（*The Leopard's Spots* 394）。“三部曲”塑造了一批像埃弗雷特·洛厄尔这样的北方政客。这些人在公开场合往往将种族平等挂在嘴边，但这只是他们获取私利的违心之举。当种族问题直接考验自己的切身利益之时，他们会毫不留情将黑人踢开。为获得更大的政治权力，洛厄尔参议员在内战后大肆倡导种族平等，但哈里斯求婚事件充分体现其深入骨髓的白人至上主义思想。追溯历史，狄克逊塑造的此类人物确实在当时的美国社会大量存在。他们一方面在公开场合替黑人摇旗呐喊，另一方面却从未将黑人视为与白人平等的种族，这也是为何种族歧视长期困扰美国的根源之一。

白人纯正血统绝不能受到“玷污”的情节同样在《同胞》中上演。玛丽安·勒努瓦 (Marion Lenoir) 是南卡罗来纳州一位 16 岁白人少女。她的父亲死于内战，与母亲珍妮·勒努瓦 (Jeannie Lenoir) 相依为命。黑人士兵格斯 (Gus) 在一个夜晚强奸了玛丽安。之后，玛丽安先沐浴，再穿上一件洁白无瑕的连衣裙。然后，她和母亲走上悬崖。这时，母亲有些犹豫，央求女儿道：“真的别无它途吗？我们可以走得远远的，到一个没有任何人认识我们的地方生活，生命多么宝贵啊！”玛丽安的回答却异常决然：“我们无处可逃，坟墓是温暖的归宿。如果活着，每一天都将充满煎熬、羞辱，只有仇者才愿意看到我们继续苟活”（*Clansman* 306）。作者设计这一情节的目标是展现：不但有权有势的洛厄尔参议员埃不能容忍自己的家庭血统受到“污染”，而且像玛丽安母这样的普通白人同样不能容忍自己的优等血统被“染黑”。优生学种族主义者相信，在正常途径无法实现与白人女子结婚的情况下，黑人男性想以暴力手段，通过混血儿来改变自己的种族劣根性。为了维护自己“高贵”血统免受玷污，白人女子可以不惜一切代价。所以在作者笔下，死亡是玛丽

安·勒努瓦唯一的选择。

为进一步验证黑白混血儿确实劣根性不改，难堪大任，狄克逊在《同胞》中塑造了塞拉斯·林奇 (Silas Linch) 这一人物。黑白混血儿林奇受过良好的教育，被国会领袖斯通曼任命在南卡州负责具体实施重建计划。40 来岁的林奇部分继承了白人优秀的体型轮廓，但厚重的嘴唇、硕大的鼻子、粗壮的颈脖、突出的额头并未改变其类人猿的基本身体特征。同时，在他那粗黑眉毛下面，一双黑黄色的眼睛闪烁着非洲丛林般的寒光。林奇受过良好的教育，有着“凯撒般聪慧的脑袋，非洲丛林般野蛮的眼神” (*the Clansman* 93)。在作者笔下，尽管拥有白人血统，但林奇在身、心上仍无法改变其劣等种族性。利用老斯通曼的信任和给予的权力，他假公济私，企图将南方建成一个黑人王国。虽然表面上对斯通曼家族毕恭毕敬，但嗜血、残暴特性会不经意间流露出来。例如，在和老斯通曼女儿埃尔西·斯通曼 (Elsie Stoneman) 套近乎时，林奇无意间释放出“放肆的笑容，赤裸裸的眼神，使得埃尔西不寒而栗 (*Clansman* 208)。优生学种族主义者认为，通婚或许能够让黑白混血儿拥有更加智慧的大脑，但其野性不会丝毫消退。良好的教育或许能让混血儿表面上文明儒雅，但其与生俱有的愚昧不会丝毫改变。

优秀的种族特质源于纯种遗传、混血儿心智能力更弱，这一论断毫无科学依据，是十足的伪命题，但当时却受到优生学种族主义者的追捧。事实上，人类文明的孕育、发展、走向辉煌往往是不同种族间不断接触、融合的结果。因为有更多的优秀基因融合在一起，混血族群可能具备更强的生命力，能够创造出先进的人类文明，但他们却对此置若罔闻。

三、黑人从属于白人，社会“健康”发展的需要

《豹纹》的尾声，求婚遭遇让乔治·哈里斯感受到参议员洛厄尔的欺骗，于是愤然从他安排的政府职位上辞职。但在随后的求职过程中，哈里斯处处碰壁，没有任何一个地方愿接纳这个黑白混血儿。这时，他开始明白，不管出于何种目的宣扬种族平等，北方白人对黑人的歧视同样深入骨髓。最后，他发出了绝望的呼喊：“南方白人以直白的方式表达黑人的劣等种族性，这种不加掩饰的方式或许对我们是仁慈的。你们（北方白人）对待黑人的方式精心包装、遮遮掩掩，结果却更加残酷。良好的教育让我有能力像白人一样去了解世界、认识世界，但你们却毁灭一切我对自由、平等的认知，这是更残忍的折磨” (*The Leopard's Spots* 393)。借哈里斯之口，作者强调废奴主义者只是为一己私利才宣扬种族平等，而他们的伪装会给黑人带来更大的伤害。

因无法靠体面的工作生存，哈里斯只能混迹赌场从事各种犯罪活动。哈里斯的母亲是内战前从肯塔基州逃亡北方的黑奴，最终，他回到南方，处处见到黑人忍饥挨饿、抛弃妻子、尸横遍野。通过对哈里斯这一人物的塑造，作者要表现黑奴制虽已废除，但南方仍然是黑人的归宿。黑白之间的从主关

系亦不能改变，黑人要继续在南方充当白人的苦力与奴仆。否则，失去白人的“保护”，他们将无法生存。劣等种族性使得黑人根本没有资格获取与白人平等的公民权，他们的从属地位既是自己得以生存的基础，也是美国社会“健康”发展的需要。

“三部曲”中，林肯是南方的同情者，坚信黑人必须从属于白人。丹尼尔·沃思（Daniel Worth）是《豹纹》中南方军队的将军。内战结束后，他在家乡父老前宣读了林肯总统写给他的信。“沃思将军，你必须团结现在处于危险境地的南方人民。关于种族平等问题，我从未以任何方式宣称白人和黑人的社会地位完全平等；从未支持黑人获得选举权、担任各级政府官员。此外，如果黑人与白人生活在一起，他们的社会地位一定有高低之分，而白人是优等种族。这是我，以及绝大多数共和党人的观点”（*The Leopard's Spots* 67-68）。通过杜撰林肯的信，狄克逊要告诉黑人，在捍卫优等种族地位上，南、北方的白人会团结一致，共同维护自己的社会统治地位。《同胞》开局，当国会领袖斯通曼质问总统是否承认人人生而平等之时，林肯回答道：“白人与黑人之间身体上存在差别，这就使得两者永远不能平等地生活在一起，任何此方面的尝试也会注定失败”（*Clansman* 45）。虽然允许黑人在内战期间参军，但战后，林肯认为必须解除黑人武装。“任何企图继续让黑人士兵存在的尝试都是疯狂之举。只要黑人穿着军装、拿着武器行走在南方的土地上，美国将永无和平”（*Clansman* 45）。林肯是黑人心目中的英雄，而狄克逊笔下，他却是一个十足的优生学种族主义者。这样的人物塑造可谓“用心良苦”，作者的目的是用权威的声音来突出黑人是劣等种族，这就决定其不能与白人平权。

虽然黑奴制已废除，但黑人仍必须臣服于白人。其实，在宣读林肯来信之前，沃思就已直白地说明了黑人的身份和社会地位。“如果你们（黑人）保持诚实、顺从、耐心、勤劳，南方白人会成为你们的朋友，南方仍然需要你们的劳动。回到自己原来的工作岗位，用劳动去建造自己的安身之所，去积蓄属于自己的财富”（*The Leopard's Spots* 66）。后黑奴制时代，黑人仍要为自己以前的主人劳作，原有的社会等级、秩序仍将继续。如果他们胆敢去颠覆，必将受到最严厉的惩罚。经过两百多年的引导，内战前美国黑人已基本信仰基督教。由于缺少受过良好教育的黑人牧师，众多白人牧师经常去黑人教堂进行布道，约翰·达勒姆就是其中一员。但因黑人在“南方重建”中的种种“越轨”行为，他拒绝再去黑人教堂。问及原因，达勒姆说：“过去（内战前），我的确常为黑人祈祷。那时我面对的是一群品行端正的人。他们的身份是木匠、泥瓦工、农夫、车夫，主人忠诚的奴仆。现在，我见到的黑人是一群窃贼、罪犯、娼妓”（*The Leopard's Spots* 308）。这样的情节无非就是要说明，劣根性使得黑人只能充当苦力、奴仆。一旦他们离经叛道，不仅会受到肉体的惩罚，还会在精神上遭到白人的抛弃。

“三部曲”中的林肯总统不愿制定任何“报复性”政策来破坏南方原有的社会体系。对于那些宣扬种族平等，推动“南方重建”的北方政客，狄克逊将其称之为“投机犯”(carpetbagger)。这些人利用南方混乱局势谋取私利，而黑人只是他们实现目标的工具。《豹纹》中，主导北卡州“南方重建”的政客阿兰·麦克莱德(Allan McLeod)直言：“我支持黑人就是因为他们代表着我所需要的选票。统计票数时，黑人的投票和白人的投票没有区别。这些黑鬼就是我飞黄腾达的跳板”(The Leopard's Spots 261)。

国会领袖奥斯丁·斯通曼架空总统，成为“南方重建”的领导者，从而达到自我政治权力的顶峰。当然，除了斯通曼这样的顶层设计者，“南方重建”还有一批具体政策的实施者，西蒙·勒格雷(Simon Legree)便是其中的代表。《豹纹》中，勒格雷内战前是一名黑奴监工(slave driver)。利用“南方重建”政策，他组织黑人操纵选举，从事各种犯罪活动，用暴力手段大肆攫取白人财产，弄的北卡州坎贝尔市民不聊生。后来，3K党摧毁了黑人的暴民统治，“投机犯”们则带着大批掠夺的财富逃回北方，勒格雷一人抢夺的总资产高到500万美元。利用这些钱，他在华尔街开办了公司，并在纽约证券交易所贿赂到一个职位，继续发大财。当自己成为纽约呼风唤雨的企业家后，勒格雷变回了黑奴监工的本来面目，对黑人无丝毫怜悯和同情。

《同胞》中，在联邦政府“选民工作处”主导下，南部各州新获解放的黑奴参加了第一次政治选举，主要任务是选出各级立法机构的代表。主推“南方重建”的“投机犯”们为了更好地操控各州的地方政府，公开以40英亩土地和一头骡子为条件，诱导黑人按照他们的意愿投票。黑人选民在这种蝇头小利的驱动下，将亚力克(Aleck)这样的目不识丁的黑人地痞、酒鬼选为州议员。在南卡罗来纳州议会，黑人占据了124议席中的101个，州政府的重要职位几乎全被黑人占据，而塞拉斯·林奇这些“投机犯”则成为政府权力的实际掌控者，肆意操纵黑人谋取私利。新议会举行的首次会议演变成乌合之众、政治流氓们争吵、分赃的大会。此次会议通过的法规包括：招募、装备8万黑人士兵；禁止任何人称黑人为“黑鬼”(nigger)；黑、白儿童同校读书；黑白通婚……(Clansman 268-269)。现在看来，南卡州通过的上述法规是消除种族歧视，实现种族平等的基本措施。但对于当时的种族主义者，这些规定则是对白人的侮辱与毁灭。通过杜撰黑人官员愚昧、渎职、贪污等情节，作者就是为突出他们不具备管理国家、经营政府的理性与智慧，给予他们政治权利就意味着将南方，甚至整个美国推下万丈深渊。

综上所述，在种族主义者看来，黑人的劣等种族性使得他们愚昧无知，没有资格成为与白人平等的美国公民。“投机犯”给予黑人参政权，其目的就是在幕后任意操纵他们，让他们成为攫取自我私利的工具。黑人所谓的平等公民权不但不能促进社会的公平发展，反而会导致社会动荡，民不聊生。这样，为阻止黑人“暴民”和“投机犯”毁灭南方，毁灭盎格鲁-撒克逊文明，

毁灭整个美国，南方白人必须采取行动，3K党即是在这样的背景下应运而生。

四、3K党，盎格鲁-撒克逊文明的“捍卫者”

“三部曲”中，“投机犯”主导着“南方重建”，而愚昧的黑人则是他们的爪牙和工具。在他们的操控下，黑人成为一群目无法纪的“暴民”，从事各种犯罪活动，整个南方白人生活在“水深火热”之中。“三部曲”大量着墨黑人肆意践踏白人的财产、尊严、乃至生命，“被压迫”的白人在别无它选的情况下组建了3K党。对于3K党的产生，狄克逊的文字饱含兴奋与期待。“白袍加身的盎格鲁-撒克逊骑士（3K党成员）是文明人类对有组织犯罪的回应。他们保护弱者，以及那些在战场上献出生命勇士们留下的孤儿寡母，将‘投机犯’赶出南方，消灭那些作奸犯科的黑鬼，恢复南方原有的文明与秩序”（*The Leopard's Spots* 150）。蒂姆·谢尔比（Tim Shelby）是《豹纹》中黑人“暴民”的首领，作者将其塑造成利用白人政客给予的权力无恶不作，侮辱白人妇女的恶棍。最终，在一个夜晚，3K党将他绑到当地法院前的广场上，施以绞刑，而后用锋利的刀子将其吐出的舌头划开，贴着一纸公告，上书：这是盎格鲁-撒克逊族群对于敢于侮辱白人女性黑鬼的回应。在3K党“执法”的夜晚，父母们安心地哄孩子们上床睡觉，并感受到内战后从未有过的安宁。3K党也让黑人“暴民”立马变得老实、顺从（*The Leopard's Spots* 150-151）。可见，作者将3K党的残暴行径界定成维护社会稳定的正义之举。不经公开审判，用私刑残忍地处死嫌疑人，这是典型的恐怖主义行为。但在狄克逊笔下，白布遮裹全身的3K党匪徒成为白袍加身的骑士，残忍的杀戮成为维护社会安定的“正义之举”，可谓极尽溢美之词。

为能够彻底颠覆“南方重建”所建立的社会秩序，3K党首领梅杰·达默龙（Major Dameron）和达勒姆牧师密谋在下一轮的北卡罗来纳州政府选举中彻底推翻“投机犯”所掌控的政府，而他们的手段就是阻止黑人参与选举。达勒姆直言：“你（达默龙）要通知每位3K党成员在选举前一晚做好充分准备。你们要警告每个还想活命的黑鬼，让他们远离投票箱，更不能在受人操控下进行投票。每一张选票上面都有鲜血，胆小鬼就呆在家。这是对民族性的测试，看看谁才有资格成为这片土地的主人”（*The Leopard's Spots* 160）。用这种恐怖主义手段，南方白人重新夺回了州政府的控制权。黑人继续充当白人的奴仆，南方原有的白人与黑人间的主从关系再次确立，3K党自然成为盎格鲁-撒克逊文明的“捍卫者”。

《同胞》中，玛丽安·勒努瓦和母亲跳崖身亡后，内战中南方军队的陆军上校本杰明·卡梅伦（Benjamin Cameron）和父亲理查德·卡梅伦医生一起“查明”真相，而后决定用自己的方式来捍卫白人文明，3K党就此产生，本杰明则成为首领。小说中，狄克逊用大量笔墨描写3K党如何组建、如何捕捉、处死格斯，并采取一系列行动来捍卫盎格鲁-撒克逊文明（*Clansman*

315-326)。随后,在卡梅伦父子的领导下,3K党逐步发展强大,“白色风暴”席卷整个南卡罗来纳州,内战前的社会秩序得以恢复。

“三部曲”反复强调,白人血统容不得黑人血液的半点杂糅,这是盎格鲁-撒克逊文明和整个美国社会健康发展的前提,也是3K党存在的主因。

《豹纹》的灵魂人物约翰·达勒姆牧师直言:“美国的未来就是要在盎格鲁-撒克逊人和黑人以及黑白混血儿之间做出选择。如果种族间界限被打破,白人的高贵文明沦丧到杂交、混血阶段,那美国将走向毁灭”(The Leopard's Spots 198)。这是优生学种族主义者核心观点之一。他们认为纯种白人是美国社会发展的柱石,一旦黑人或混血儿掌权,盎格鲁-撒克逊文明将被摧毁,美国也将彻底失去希望。按照此一逻辑,解放黑奴,让他们与白人平权就是要毁灭美国,毁灭盎格鲁-撒克逊文明。鉴于此,达勒姆极力助推3K党在南方的各种行动,并对参与“南方重建”的北方白人痛恶至极。苏珊·沃克(Susan Walker)是一名来自波士顿的传教士,在参与“南方重建”过程中受到3K党攻击。对此,达勒姆却质问沃克:“为何你们这些北方人要劳民伤财帮助黑人,他们在这场战争(内战)中几乎毫发无损。你们对可怜的南方白人,雅利安人的后裔,自己的血肉同胞熟视无睹。他们的先辈和你们先辈一起来到北美大陆,在艰苦的环境下开疆拓土”(The Leopard's Spots 48)。可见,达勒姆将参与“南方重建”的白人视为民族叛徒,理应受到3K党的惩罚。但同时,纵观整个“三部曲”,作者还是认为南、北方白人间的血肉同胞关系无可改变。在《同胞》开篇,狄克逊即描绘了他们血脉相连的场景。

本杰明·卡梅伦是南卡州3K党的领袖。他曾在内战中受伤倒地,生命危在旦夕,而将其从战场解救下来的正是老斯通曼的儿子菲尔·斯通曼(Phil Stoneman)。虽然老斯通曼主导着“南方重建”,但他的儿子却同情南方,并最终加入3K党。在描写解救本杰明这一场景时,作者借菲尔之口发出惊呼:“上帝啊,快看!他和我长得真的十分相像,他倒下时我感觉就像自己中枪一样”(Clansman 8)。狄克逊把他们描绘的像孪生兄弟,唯一的区别就是头发颜色的深浅。这样的情节就是要说明南、北方的白人是一家人,黑人则是他们共同的敌人。3K党旨在镇压黑人“暴民”,摧毁黑人“暴政”,是全体白人捍卫盎格鲁-撒克逊文明的“正义之师”,所以北方白人同样应该参与其中。《同胞》中,虽然老斯通曼是“南方重建”的主导者,但他的一双儿女却和理查德·卡梅伦医生的子女相爱。小说围绕着南北方两个家族四个年青人的爱情展开,并集中表现这四个人“并肩战斗”,最终通过参与3K党活动恢复了南卡州白人主导的社会秩序。在狄克逊笔下,南方原有社会体系的恢复是南、北方白人精诚团结的结果,这大概也是他命名小说为《同胞》的真正意图。

总之,“三部曲”强调因为“南方重建”,南方原有的“文明社会”被黑人“暴民”所破坏,而“投机犯”所操控的地方政府根本无法保护白人。在

此背景下，3K党便成为盎格鲁-撒克逊文明的“捍卫者”。同时，盎格鲁-撒克逊文明是美国社会的根基，所以南、北方的白人必须团结一心，共同参与到3K党活动之中。

结语

“三部曲”中，狄克逊一方面全力论证在南方的农业文明中，黑人的被统治地位是社会发展的必然。另一方面，他也要让北方的读者明白，摆脱枷锁的黑人同样会伤害他们所创造的工业文明（Bloomfield 392）。这是作者在警告北方白人，获得解放的黑人不但破坏南方原有的白人文明，而且会直接威胁整个美国社会的繁荣稳定。事实上，他实现了自我的创作目标，“三部曲”当时反响巨大，平均每8个美国人就拥有一本《豹纹》。一定程度上，托马斯·狄克逊在黑、白种族关系上的影响力远远超过此时的美国总统（Williamson 158）。以《同胞》为蓝本的电影《一个民族的诞生》（*The Birth of a Nation*）于1915年上映，更是让狄克逊和他的“三部曲”家喻户晓。可见，在20世纪初种族隔离体制下，白人对黑人的歧视与压迫已渗透到美国社会的方方面面。优生学种族主义是披着科学外衣的伪科学，但通过杜撰的故事情节，“三部曲”将这一复杂的理论通俗化，使之成为替种族歧视和3K党暴行辩护的重要依据。从文学创作角度，“三部曲”并无出彩之处，其大受欢迎不是作者创作的成功，而是美国当时种族主义甚嚣尘上的真实写照。

Work Cited

- Bloomfield, Maxwell. "Dixon's 'The Leopard's Spots': A Study in Popular Racism." *American Quarterly*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (1964): 387-401.
- Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, 2nd ed. London: Murray, 1896.
- Dixon, Thomas. *The Leopard's Spots: A Romance of the White Man's Burden—1865-1900*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1902.
- . *The Clansman: A Historical Romance of the Ku Klux Klan*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1905.
- . *The Traitor: A Story of the Fall of the Invisible Empire*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1907.
- Galton, Francis. "Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope, and Aims." *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (1904): 1-25.
- Jackson, John P. & Nadine M. Weidman. "The Origins of Scientific Racism." *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, No. 50 (2005): 66-79.
- Popenoe, Paul & Roswell Johnson. *Applied Eugenics*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.
- Williamson, Joel. *Crucible of Race: Black-White Relations in the American South Since Emancipation*. New York: Oxford UP, 1984.

莎士比亚研究新路径：评陈红薇教授的《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》

A New Approach to Shakespeare: A Review of *Shakespeare in the Post-war English Drama*

聂珍钊 (Nie Zhenzhao)

内容提要：《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》（陈红薇著，北京大学出版社，2019年4月）以当代英国戏剧中的十六部莎剧改写作品为研究对象，从改写理论的角度，对战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚改写创作进行研究，以探讨后现代文化背景下莎士比亚在当代英国戏剧乃至当代西方文化中的独特存在。从研究性质上讲，该书属于跨学科研究，涵盖了战后英国戏剧研究、莎士比亚文化研究、改写理论研究、跨媒体叙事研究四个领域；从内容上来讲，该书共包括四个部分——“何为改写？为何改写？”、“改写/再写：与莎士比亚的批判式对话”、“莎氏遗风在战后英国戏剧中的演绎”、“谁写了莎士比亚？”。通过研究，本书旨在论证，当代作家对莎剧的颠覆性改写非但没有抹杀莎士比亚在当今文化中的存在，相反，通过剧作家们的改写之笔，莎士比亚获得了一种前所未有的生命力和诗学存在。

关键词：莎士比亚；战后英国戏剧；改写创作；陈红薇

Title: A New Approach to Shakespeare: A Review of *Shakespeare in the Post-war English Drama*

Abstract: Taking sixteen Shakespearean adaptations by eight playwrights as the object of study, Chen Hongwei's book *Shakespeare in the Post-war English Drama* (published by Peking University Press in April, 2019) carries forth an analysis of the forms of Shakespeare's presence in the Post-War English drama from the aspect of contemporary adaptation theories. In Methodology, the research is an interdisciplinary study which covers drama study, culture study, adaptation theory study and cross-media study. In contents, the book is composed of four parts, including "What is adaptation? Why do we make adaptation?", "Adaptation/rewriting: critical dialogues with Shakespeare," "Variations of Shakespeare's remains in the English drama" and "Who writes Shakespeare?". Through its research, the book argues that though the critical consensus on the Bard's authority has been crumbled in the past decades with his mythical presence being disrupted

in every possible way, Shakespeare has never been so vigorously alive in the disguised presence of adaptations in the piles of fragments and shatters that he is reduced to.

Key words: Shakespeare; Post-war English drama; adaptation creativity; Chen Hongwei

Author: Nie Zhenzhao is Professor of Literature at Zhejiang University. He also serves as an Editor-in-Chief of two journals in humanities: *Inter-disciplinary Studies of Literature* and *Forum for World Literature Studies*.

《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》是陈红薇教授穷数年之功完成的国家社科基金资助课题的结项成果。该著作以当代英国戏剧家对莎士比亚的改写和再写作品为研究对象，以当代莎剧影视、全球不同文化语境下的莎剧本土化为观照，从改写理论和跨学科研究的视角，探讨了“后现代”文化背景下莎士比亚在当代英国戏剧乃至当代西方文化中的独特存在。这部著作代表了莎士比亚研究的新成果，在我国莎士比亚研究史上具有开拓性的意义。

在世界文学史上，莎士比亚一直被看成是所有时代最伟大的戏剧家。莎士比亚的全部创作具有历史文献的价值。他一生共创作了 37 部戏剧、2 部长诗和 154 首十四行诗，还创作了一些其它不同类型的诗歌。他的戏剧以丰富的想象力、生动的故事性、充满诗意的描绘把历史和现实结合在一起，真实地再现了他所处的历史时代。他通过对爱情、婚姻、友谊等主题的描写，揭示和反映了文艺复兴时期的社会面貌，从而奠定了他在世界戏剧史上的不朽地位。1623 年，莎士比亚的朋友约·赫明和亨利·康德尔编辑出版了第一部对开本莎士比亚全集，卷首印有莎士比亚的肖像和本·琼生的著名题词：“他不属于一个时代而属于所有的世纪！”莎士比亚逝世四百年来，其声誉长盛不衰，其作品被翻译成许多种文字出版，在世界各地的舞台上演出。莎士比亚已经不只是斯特拉福镇人的骄傲，也是整个世界的骄傲。

莎士比亚是英国经典文学的典范，也是世界文学中迄今无人企及的高峰。尽管有许多作家如荷马、但丁、狄更斯、巴尔扎克、托尔斯泰等人的创作早已超越国家的疆界而成为人类共同的文化遗产，但是没有人能够在持久影响力方面同莎士比亚相比。可以说，400 多年来世界文学史上没有一个作家像莎士比亚那样吸引了如此众多的读者和批评家，没有一个作家得到如此深入细致的分析和研究。许多作家在时间的流逝中被遗忘，但莎士比亚却永驻人心。莎士比亚逝世距今已过去了 400 年，时间不仅没有遗忘莎士比亚，相反却将他融化在时光之中，铸成了一座永恒的丰碑。

从 20 世纪尤其是 20 世纪 50 年代之后，莎士比亚的影响又出现了一种新的形式，这就是莎士比亚剧作的改写。用本书作者陈红薇教授的话说，在 21 世纪的今天，作为英国民族文化的象征，莎士比亚已是一个全球性的文化

符号,被不同地区的人们从各个角度反复地认知、修正、误读、重写和挪用。

无论是在国内还是在国外,对莎士比亚的研究都已是浩如烟海。但本书不是把焦点放在莎士比亚的原创作品上,而是另辟蹊径,聚焦于对莎士比亚当代改写的研究上。陈红薇教授以爱德华·邦德、阿诺德·威斯克、查尔斯·马洛维奇、霍华德·布伦顿、伊莱恩·范思坦、哈罗德·品特、彼得·布鲁克和汤姆·斯托帕德等八位剧作家的十六部改写作品为研究对象,展开分析和论证,从而揭示莎士比亚在后现代改写时代中的独特存在。正是陈红薇教授的独特视角,使她的这部学术著作展现出种开创性的价值。

在这部著作中,陈红薇教授对莎剧的改写历史进行了细致的梳理,用大量莎剧改写的实例分析说明莎剧改写的价值,其涉及的作家众多,范围广阔,分析深入,体现出作者的深厚功力。实际上,在世界文学史上,改写的历史十分悠久,最早从荷马时代开始,同一个故事往往经过不同人的改写而流传下来,尤其是以古希腊、罗马神话为母题的不同时代的改写,是文学史上的一种重要现象。德国思想家瓦尔特·本雅明所提出的“故事永远是对故事的重复”的观点可谓是对改写现象的客观概括。不过让人遗憾的是,我国对文学历史上的改写缺乏研究。随着陈红薇教授的《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》这部著作的问世,这种状况将得到改变。

在文学史上,许多作家的文学创作就是文学改写,莎士比亚也不能例外。在陈红薇教授看来,莎士比亚虽然作为戏剧大师早已成为一种文学象征和一种人文价值的符号,但是他的戏剧创作并非绝对的原创。事实上,“拿来主义”式的创作本就是文艺复兴时期的风尚,莎士比亚本人更是一个改写的高手,他在戏剧创作的过程中吸纳了无数起源文化的倒灌。在其创作过程中,莎士比亚为了戏剧、美学、商业或是意识形态的原因,曾和无数当代改作家一样,毫无顾忌地“窃取”那一时期所能触及到的素材,如散文、诗歌、浪漫故事、编年史、中世纪和都铎王朝时期的戏剧,以此为基础创作了一部部惊世之作——包括《哈姆雷特》、《李尔王》、《罗密欧与朱丽叶》在内的伟大经典,无不是莎士比亚对某个或多个资源文本的重新构思和再创作。

陈红薇教授的分析并非是要说明莎士比亚本人是一个改写高手,而是以此说明莎士比亚的戏剧被他人改写的合理性。17世纪以来,莎剧一直被人不断地改写,而正是这些改写,让莎剧长期活在人们的文化记忆之中。实际上,改写已成为理解莎士比亚戏剧的一种新方式,或者是为理解莎士比亚的戏剧文本提供的一种新文本。事实上,在过去的四百多年中,英国戏剧史上共出现了两次莎士比亚的改写高峰:第一次是18世纪,另一次则是20世纪的后半期。在第二次莎士比亚的改写浪潮中,大量西方戏剧家投入到了莎剧改写的创作之中,剧作家、演员、舞台设计和导演通力合作,以莎剧为起源文本对主题进行变奏、演绎和发挥,创作了一大批带有莎剧符号的当代新经典。这些改写作品表现出的解构主义和后现代主义特征,以及演出时在英国乃至

欧洲舞台上所引发的轰动，都为莎剧改写新时代的到来做出了重要的文化铺垫。对莎剧的改写实践一直持续到 21 世纪的今天，已经成为一种全球性的文化和文学现象。以舞台莎剧的改写为开端，改写莎剧的创作之风还从英国和欧洲大陆转向了北美，在加拿大和美国舞台上产生了一系列堪称当代戏剧经典的改写作品。自莎士比亚逝世之后，通过改写莎剧而创作出来的作品不计其数，而在我国对这一现象却缺少系统的梳理、分析和总结。因此，就改写研究而言，陈红薇教授敢为人先，堪称改写研究领域的一位探险者。

在本书中，陈红薇教授按时间顺序对不同时期的莎剧改写进行了系统梳理，使读者看到了莎士比亚戏剧通过改写而存在的一种特殊方式。长期以来，由于缺少理论的支撑，通过改写创作的文学作品往往都被视为原作的衍生产物，一般都要做出是对哪一部作品进行改编的说明。正如陈红薇教授在书中所写，即便是到了上个世纪的八十年代，这一时段对改写实践的研究虽已引入了互文性等后现代文化概念的视角范畴，但整体上讲，人们尚未意识到当代改写是一种有别于传统改写和改编创作的具有后文化特征的创作形式，更没有意识到当代改写是一种独立的创作实践。直到 20 世纪末，改写实践才从原作的附庸中摆脱出来，在理论上逐渐被作为一种文学创作得到承认。

因此，如何评价通过改写而成的文学作品，就成为 20 世纪尤其是战后以来需要回答的重要问题。在影响巨大的后现代主义文化语境中，各种理论如互文性理论、多重语境理论、引用理论、作者理论、叙事学理论、翻译理论、读者反应理论、布鲁姆的修正理论等，不仅为重新界定“改写”的意义及存在提供了前所未有的新视野，为当代改写创作提供了主题动力，也为其提供了超越传统创作艺术的叙述模式。陈红薇教授以丹尼尔·费什林（Daniel Fischlin）和马克·福杰（Mark Fortier）这两位批评家的改写理论为基础，找到了长期以来未能得到解决的改写问题的理论突破口。有关改写理论的探讨，也许是这部著作最为重要的特色。通过对大量的改写理论的讨论和分析，陈红薇教授指出，由这些理论思潮构成的后文化对莎剧改写实践产生了巨大的影响——它不仅改变了莎剧“改写”的基本内涵，也使改写成为一种独立的创作实践，一种不同于传统改编/改写的文学存在。

关于改写的研究，丹尼尔·费什林和马克·福杰在《莎士比亚改写作品集》里提出了改写的“再语境化”观点，认为改写是原文本再语境化的一个过程，既包括对过去作品的演出性更改，也包括再写性作品，因此改写作品实际上就是再写作品，是在效果上能唤起读者对原作的记忆但又不同于原作的新作品。玛格丽特·简·基德尼更是从改写的过程出发，认为改写是一个演绎的范畴，是改写者跳出传统主流，在新文化、政治和语言背景下对原作的再创作，是作品穿越时空从一种接受到另一种接受的变迁。改写的历史表明，首创已非原创，一切创作都是一种叠刻和重写。在后现代文化背景下，战后英国剧作家的再写既是对莎剧前所未有的颠覆，也是用一种新的形式对莎剧当

代价值的确认。通过研究,陈红薇教授在书中提出:从莎剧的改写可以看出,当代改写是衍生而非寄生,属于二次创作而非二手创作。当代改写是被大众接受的独特的文学或文化类别,是一种独立的美学存在,也是一种在后理论文化语境下产生的再写性文学。

通过莎剧的改写进而探讨当代改写和再写理论,陈红薇教授的前沿性研究不仅给我们提供了重要启示,而且还为我们提供了如何研究的范例。她把莎剧的改写放在整个文学的改写历史过程中进行动态考察,从“何为改写?为何改写?”、“与莎氏的批判性对话”、“莎氏遗风的演绎”、“谁写了莎士比亚?”四个方面研究莎剧在战后英国戏剧中的各种呈现,条分缕析,钩沉发微,梳理改写观念发生、建构与演变的过程,揭示改写理论发挥作用的机制,探讨研究改写理论的路径。同以往的研究相比,她的研究显得更加开放、全面、厚重、新颖。莎剧的改写研究既是一个当代课题,也是一个历史课题,既要求有莎剧改写的历史实证性,也要求有理论的思辨性。陈红薇教授打破学科的界限,查阅了大量资料,阅读了大量参考文献,尤其是细读了大量莎剧的改写文本,并通过改写文本的范例分析,说明莎剧改写的当今价值。她选择当代英国最有实力的剧作家之一邦德改写的《李尔王》便是一例。在邦德看来,李尔在世人们心中早已被神话为一种传统悲剧的原型,一个集个人悲剧、政治悲剧和国家悲剧为一体的元悲剧化身。他打破悲剧原型的束缚,重新塑造李尔并把他打造成“邦德式”暴力政治主题载体的“社会的镜子”。莎士比亚在《李尔王》中把李尔塑造成理性缺失而导致受罚的国王和父亲的形象,而邦德在《李尔》中则把李尔塑造成一个暴力政治的代表。戏剧落下帷幕之前,李尔爬上了城墙,试图用铁锹拆除曾寄托了他所有政治梦想的象征,最后被打死。在作者看来,邦德拆除城墙是要打破李尔自己所代表的“秩序”观念和这种观念所掩盖的暴力政治和道德哲学。正如陈红薇教授所说,通过改写,邦德的解构之笔直逼莎氏所体现的价值标准,在其神话的瓦砾上,建构出新的与时俱进的时代主题。除了邦德的《李尔》,陈红薇教授还详细分析了其它一些通过改写而来的莎剧,如威斯克的《夏洛克》(又名《商人》)、布伦顿的《第十三夜》、英国女性戏剧组集体创作的《李尔的女儿们》、布鲁克的实验戏剧《暴风雨》和斯托帕德的《罗森格兰兹和吉尔登斯敦已死》等。

通过对大量从莎剧改写而来的戏剧进行分析研究,陈红薇教授表面上似乎是为了证明和强调以莎士比亚为代表的经典作家在当今社会的存在价值,但实际上却是为了探讨莎士比亚在当代社会中存在的核心问题,即在后现代、全球化、符号化的今天,莎士比亚究竟以何种形式存在着。她通过对大量莎剧改写文本的阅读以及对舞台表演和影视改编的分析,证明以改写形式在“当代文学创作中出现的对莎剧的颠覆和解构非但没能抹杀莎士比亚在当今英国戏剧及世界文化中的参与,相反,通过战后剧作家的‘重写’之笔,莎士比亚获得了前所未有的生命力、存在感和影响力。”她坚实的研究得到了让我

们信服的结论，那就是“当代改写者对莎剧无穷尽地‘再写’，非但没能将莎士比亚从崇高者行列中抹去，‘再写’本身恰恰反证了莎士比亚在被历史“拭去”过程中的不断彰显，更反证了莎剧作为原型文学的经典地位。”事实证明，莎士比亚在时间的长河中不仅以他原创的作品存在，还通过大量的改写获得新生。陈红薇教授说得好：不管莎士比亚如何被时代化、大众化、通俗化，如何被赋予各种层面上的符号意义，在千禧年后的 21 世纪里，他仍将作为一个符号焦点存在于全球的文化视野中，而世界文学和文化仍将会掀起一轮又一轮“重写”和“再访”莎士比亚的热浪，使这位诗人剧作家成为“永远的莎士比亚”。

陈红薇教授这部专门研究莎士比亚改写的学术专著，给我们提供了很有价值的新资料和新文本，尤其是她在方法上把文学、戏剧表演、影视改编融合在一起，把大量改写的莎剧作品为一个动态的历史建构过程予以全方位考察，建立起二十世纪战后莎剧改写的文学史框架。她所有的分析和研究结论都以翔实可靠的文本阅读和文献参考为基础，用充分的证据材料支撑自己的学术观点。这项成果不仅对于莎士比亚的研究具有十分重要的理论价值，而且对于西方文学经典流传与影响的研究也具有十分重要的参考意义。我们完全有理由说，陈红薇教授这部长期潜心思考和研究的专著——《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》，是一部资料翔实、论析深入、见解独到的研究莎剧改写的开拓性著作。这部著作不仅是莎士比亚戏剧改写研究的先导，同时也开辟了我国文学改写研究的新领域，其重要的学术价值和理论价值值得珍视。

Work Cited

陈红薇：《战后英国戏剧中的莎士比亚》。北京：北京大学出版社，2019 年。

[Chen, Hongwei. *Shakespeare in the Post-War English Drama*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2019.]

历史性与文学性的冲突与融合：评露西娅·波尔德里尼的《他人的自传：历史主体与严肃小说》

The Conflict and Integration of Historical Factuality and Literary Fictionality: A Review of *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction* by Lucia Boldrini

袁雪生 (Yuan Xuesheng)

摘要：露西娅·波尔德里尼教授在《他人的自传：历史主体与严肃小说》中将传统的以历史人物为主人公的小说、诗歌视为传记作品——他传，在更广阔背景下论述了以历史主体为传主的他传中的乌托邦建构、他传中的暴力与法律、他传中的文献与身体的美学、他传与责任感、以及他传中的对话与历史等内容，涉及到传记/自传写作中的历史性与文学性、真实性与虚构性、伦理与道德、法律与政治等诸多问题。作者选择了戴维·马洛夫的《一种想象的生活》等六个文本为研究对象，探讨了传记/自传历史主体的人生历程，分析了传主身份建构中的双重自我的话语叙述，阐述了一种内在的伦理关系。该书视角独特、观点新颖，拓展了传记/自传研究的边界和视野。

关键词：露西娅·波尔德里尼；他传；边界；双重自我；伦理

作者简介：袁雪生，文学博士，南昌大学外国语学院教授，主要从事美国族裔文学、美国传记文学及文学伦理学批评研究。

Title: The Conflict and Integration of Historical Factuality and Literary Fictionality: A Review of *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction* by Lucia Boldrini

Abstract: The author discusses the monography *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction*, in which Lucia Boldrini analyzes the construction of the utopia of man, the relationship between violence and the law, the document and the aesthetics of the body, the narration and responsibility, and the dialogue and history in heterobiographies of historical characters, involving the problems of historicity and literariness, truth and fictiveness, ethics and morality, and law and politics. The book interprets the historical auto/biographer's life

experiences, “double I” narration of identity construction, and a kind of inherent ethical relationship in literary works such as *An Imaginary Life* with a special critical perspective and refreshing ideas, which broadened the generic boundaries of auto/biography studies.

Key words: Lucia Boldrini; Heterobiography; boundary; double I; ethics

Author: Yuan Xuesheng, Ph.D., is Professor of English of Nanchang University (Nanchang, 330031, China). His main research interests are American Ethnic Literature, American Auto/biography, and Ethical Literary Criticism (Email: xshyuan@163.com).

传记是一种古老的文类，诞生于《圣经·旧约》，虽然历史悠久，但是无论传记写作还是研究都相对落后。里昂·艾德尔曾经感叹传记理论的匮乏，“我很遗憾地认为，没有任何传记批评值得一提，批评家早已学会如何评价诗歌、小说和戏剧，但对传记却无能为力”(Edel 32)。鉴于此，他提倡建立传记诗学，并发表了大量有关传记研究的论文。如果说西方现代传记理论萌芽于约翰生，创建于伍尔芙、莫洛亚，那么到了艾德尔就开始走向成熟并全面发展。传记/自传研究成为研究热点，研究论著成倍增加。有学者甚至说，“如今自传所占据的地位就是昔日新批评盛期诗歌所占据的地位”(Folkenflik 11)。伦敦大学英语系教授露西娅·波尔德里尼的《他人的自传：历史主体与严肃小说》（以下简称《他人的自传》），是一本研究传记/自传的学术专著，她选择了戴维·马洛夫的《一种想象的生活》、彼得·凯里的《凯利帮的真实历史》、翁达杰的《比利小子》、吉尔伯特·阿戴尔的《作家之死》、安娜·班蒂的《阿特米西亚》、曼努埃尔·蒙塔尔班的《佛朗哥的自传》等六部作品，详细论述了以历史主体为传主的他传中的乌托邦建构、他传中的暴力与法律、他传中的文献与身体的美学、他传与责任感、以及他传中的对话与历史等内容，涉及到传记/自传写作中的历史性与文学性、真实性与虚构性、伦理与道德、法律与政治等诸多问题。该书将传统意义上的一些小说、诗歌视为传记作品——他传，在更广阔背景下研究传记主体的人生历程，并论述了传主身份建构中的不同的话语叙述，阐述了一种内在的伦理关系。该书视角独特、观点新颖，给人耳目一新的感觉。

露西娅在《他人的自传》中开篇指出，传记/自传本质上是个体声音的画像。她引用了戴维·马洛夫在《一种想象的生活》后记中所说的一段话，“我们对奥维德的一生知之甚少，正是这种事实的缺乏使他成为了我叙事的中心人物，并且让我拥有了创造的自由，因为我想要写的既不是历史小说，也不是文学传记，而是基于各种可能事件的小说”(Boldrini 1)。马洛夫的小说究

竟是怎样的呢？它既不宣称有着传记的准确事实，也不是基于历史真实可靠性的历史小说。但是，它依然可以说基于事实的逼真，尽管没有文献记载，却是很大可能的，如同一部现实主义的小说。这种在历史性和文学性之间的冲突与融合的显著特征，很大程度上界定了二十世纪中期以来出版的大量小说，这些小说仿佛就是历史人物的自传——它们以实际行动展示了历史真实和文学想象、事实和虚构的关系，由此也带来了传记最根本的结构、叙事和伦理问题，这正是传记 / 自传研究的核心所在。

露西娅首先探讨了他传作为文类的普遍性的边界问题，界定了他传的定义。读者明白这些文本不是自传：他们并没有推销他们自身，封面上的作者名字并不是叙事者和人物的名字，因此读者无法期待作者受到自传契约的约束，就像勒热讷所说的自传作者、叙事者和主人公的一致，这样的契约牵涉到所有的叙事和伦理问题，比如叙事者或作者必须跟读者讲真话。“在某种程度上说，任何文本内在的事实都是基于读者对人物历史性的认可，就如同他们使读者认识到自传和传记的基本分界——第一人称书写和他人书写、历史性和文学性的区别”(Boldrini 2)。露西娅随后进一步讨论了写作中的主体的地位问题：在一个历史人物的文学自传中，语法层面的第一人称成为了舞台上的主角，介于历史的、虚构的和作者的主体性之间的微妙关系在那里得到了充分的展示和揭露，自传作者和讲述历史人物事件的“双重自我”、叙事者和历史人物的“双重自我”之间建立了复杂的关系。如何才能以他人的名义为另一个人说话？这种身份的欺骗明显带来不安和紧张，但也令读者向往。这也涉及到自传和死亡书写的关系。马洛夫写了奥维德的“离开”时刻，翁达杰的比利小子一开始就死了。佛朗哥的自传能够以他人口吻书写，因为命令者已经死了。他传存在着一种源于死亡的权威，濒临死亡的人的话语对活着的人而言，有一种力量来自他们最终的结局，来自他们接近时光终点而无以为继的那一刻。遗嘱作为一种超越死亡的声音，将活着的人与他们的愿望结合在一起。他传也存在着一种源于历史、过去以及不再改变的往昔的权威。这些作品探索和揭示的正是这种权威，它们揭示了传记和自传在结构上的普遍区别，前者是一个健在的人书写另一个人，后者是由健在的我书写过去。从根本上说，自传总是不完整的，因为只有“我死了”这种自传性表述才能说明自传的完整，但这是不可能说出来的。露西娅探讨的这些文本，很多都将主体置于死亡的边缘，这样能让死去的人物说出“我死了”的话语，只能通过别人作为代理人，由此实现自传无法达到的完整性，却是自传主体所希望的。露西娅所使用的“他传”，非常恰当地解决了这个问题。

从传记文类边界问题的探讨可以看出，这些作品被认为是介于真实和虚构之间的模糊界线上。通常被认为是历史的 / 传记的小说加以研究，用琳达·哈琴的话说，“历史传记元小说”，米德克和胡贝尔称之为“传记小说”(Biofiction)，劳拉·萨武称之为“作者小说”，雅各布斯称之为“新小说

传记”，露西娅曾经使用“自传性小说”来命名，但不久用回了“他传”，“他传”能够更好地描述作家的主体意识如何渗入人物之中，以及在历史真实和文学虚构、个体生命和自传文本之间保留一种本体论的、批评的、符号学的界限。“他传”理应描写传记本身，描写另一个人的生命书写，用“他传”来命名这些文本或者这类重要的文学现象，这是因为其自发的共鸣以及与自传的比较，强调与另一个人的关系。可以说，他传是在符合事实的假象下以他人名义说话，可以看做是一个人的身份转移到另一个人身上，恍如一种清醒的疯狂，一种超越或离开理性车辙之外的任务，这便是这些作品的中心，也有益于对历史主体的哲学本质的探寻。

二

露西娅随后追溯了传记/自传的历史主体研究的批评语境。评论家娜奥米·雅各布斯回顾了早期现代主义小说中的历史人物；法兰森更进一部，追溯了古典时期的作品。舞台成为了一种展示历史人物的恰当方式，它戏剧化地展现主体面对冲突的需求时的道德和思想的两难处境。以罗伯特·布朗宁的戏剧独白为例，这种很接近他传的第一人称叙事，使读者在诗歌里听到了一种声音，看到了一个说话的主体跟听众演讲，读者在说话者自己的话语中注意到了听众的反应。许多诗歌人物都被赋予一种历史和现代的声音，既从心理层面也从语言维度探索了自我表现。罗伯特·伦博姆论述了存在于同情和道德判断之间的一种冲突，目睹了人物日常话语中的明显的可怕力量。他传中的双重自我的隔阂，内在于文学重构中的人物的历史性中。罗伯特·格雷夫注意到了一种可能的分界线，存在于以第一人称叙事的历史小说中，它对叙事复杂性、虚构和历史的“我”、以及形式本身的暗指漠不关心，却非常关注历史的个体及其存在方式，由她所生活的社会处境所授予或拒绝的自主权利，以及主体通过写作创造或探索的方式。也就是说，这些小说在传记/自传形式的暗示中赋予了一种对自我叙事的特别关注。

露西娅指出，这些作品中历史主体的自我叙事，跟早期的以历史人物为中心的第一人称叙事存在着区别。在假装以另一个人的声音来叙事的过程中，作品中的自我认可、甚至自我意识的隔阂内在于他们所处的双重自我中。就如同在传统的历史传记中，有着历史可信的文本和个体的重构，然而正是对那种隔阂的探索，不断改变的自我概念，写作、历史和主体性彼此之间的关系以及思想范畴，影响了读者的理解。这些作品审视了现代主体的地位、结构、概念，以及存在形式。他们不仅探索了个体的自我，而且揭示了如何历史地定义作为哲学范畴的人类/人，思考了“谁”和“怎样”的自传性话语。这些文本虽然已有一些有价值的评论，然而在很大程度上而言还是不为普通大众所知的文学现象，书写另一个人的自传能够成为一种很有力的文学样式和思想工具，从而反映人类的文化、历史和哲学的建构，也反映了个人身份，

以及通过与他人的对话所体现的身份的再现和建构,反映了从社会和法律上定义自传主体的各种关系的影响力,反映了声音背后的伦理以及文学实践的道德蕴涵,因此,也体现了作家的社会、政治和文化的功用。

露西娅还对历史人物为主体的他传批评史进行了回顾。娜奥米·雅各布斯考察了文艺复兴以来的文学作品中的历史人物的出现;劳拉·萨武也思考了作者身份、死后出版以及重写之间的交叉问题;伊娜·夏伯特把作者和人物之间的充满同情的身份认同看作小说/传记事业的成功标准,并含蓄地拒绝了后现代主义对技巧性、主体的碎裂和不稳定、以及恢复历史存在的不可能性的强调;利·吉尔摩探讨了历史性和虚构性之间的“界限案例”,她聚焦于创伤受害者在自传/传记中的再现,以及他们如何获得一系列生命书写的策略,如自传、传记、杂志、访谈等,以及虚构化手法,审视了自传传统的界限。米里亚姆·福克斯也将自传与创伤结合,将自传的介入看做是灾难的出现所引起的,福克斯所关心的是自传性叙事所响应的写作主体找到自身的创伤情境。露西娅认为,小说和自传/传记的关系,从现代主义向后现代主义的文类演变,都集中在传记和自传文类内在的形式的、理论的和思想的诸多问题。她从本体论范畴的模糊争论转向更广阔视野,不仅在地域上选择了不同国家的用不同语言书写的作品,而且关注了这些作品中自传叙事所揭示的哲学、法律和伦理的问题。

三

在《他人的自传》里,露西娅以上述六个文本为研究对象,分别探讨了他传中的历史主体所面临的流放、暴力、法律、伦理等重要问题。她在第一章中对戴维·马洛夫的《一种想象的生活》进行详细的探讨,这本诗意的小说记载了奥维德在黑海流放的最后几年时光,以及奥维德的大都市观念同帝国边缘的野蛮生活之间的分歧,他逐渐接受了这种生活的真实和自然。露西娅分析了这位罗马诗人被贬的人生、最终的死亡如何被再创造,也将马洛夫的作品列入奥维德几个世纪以来的被神秘化的漫长历史中,再现了奥维德在帝国边缘的流放,代表着这部澳大利亚小说中的现代后殖民边缘主体;而且更为重要的是,语言的运用、第一人称的使用、作品的结构安排指向的不仅仅是对其个体的探究,而是对人类的探讨,以及我们如何给人类定义、划界,如何历史地处理人类的问题。正是因为难以确切地定位,她称之为人类的乌托邦。

露西娅在第二章专门研究了彼得·凯里的《凯利帮的真实历史》中主人公的内德·凯利。臭名昭著的澳大利亚歹徒内德·凯利写了两封信,他讲述了自己的贫困和受到警察迫害的历史。其中一封信是他写给尚未出生的女儿,她可能直接从她父亲的声音中听到这个故事,知道她的出身。另一封信是写给立法会议员唐纳德·卡梅伦,他不像法律界和警察那样。一方面,内德

的作者身份将传递他的爱尔兰——澳大利亚家庭的文化、历史和个人记忆，以赋予他的女儿对她自身身份的认识；另一方面，法律界听到他的故事会让内德赋予自己被拒绝的法律主体身份。第一封信在道德上要求他说出自己的真相；第二封信在法律上要求他合法地这样做。歹徒使别人遭受的暴力以及他们自己遭受的暴力引发了对身体作用、法则边界和各种感觉的议论，通过这种方式同世界建立了联系。凯里选择一个充满暴力的歹徒作为自传主体，其自传性写作呼唤着一种政治、法律和伦理的认可。

她在第三章研究翁达杰的长诗《比利小子》中的杀手，读者发现这个半文盲的男人被赋予了一种声音，他们的故事使生命叙事的所有权问题和自传/传记、暴力、伦理和法律的关系问题得到了很好的展示。翁达杰的作品让人想起对身体遭受扒皮和解剖的描述，这种方式建立了一种受伤身体的美学，这也是对扒皮的文学和视觉再现的悠久历史的一部分，就像森林之神马亚西斯所遭受的那样。这都促进了进一步的讨论，即对他传如何同文学艺术史上的关于身体和主体性的各种形式的再现确立联系。美国身份、边疆生存、身体暴力，所有这些都反映了翁达杰通过比利小子的他传对现代身份的本质和根源的探索。

对个体生活的历史状况的反映和对主体概念的理论探究所引起的矛盾对立，进一步引发了两个相关的问题。第一个问题关注的是解决难以逾越的，被后结构主义所假定的词语和指涉之间的理论僵局的可能和不可能。第二个问题讨论理论和历史、语言和责任之间的辩证关系，通过研究自传/传记同专制的、遭受战争破坏的20世纪欧洲史的联系，从而将争论建立在写作的具体历史状况下。她在第四章主要探讨吉尔伯特·阿戴尔的《作家之死》，它的主人公和叙事者斯法克斯披着德曼的薄面纱，卷入校园小说的犯罪惊悚片，他以巴特式的方式被谋杀了，依然以死去的作者第一人称在写作。同样的是，小说发挥了批评家的责任感的作用，不仅要求生活和写作的同形度，而且质疑对传记事实轻率的利用，回避缜密思想的需要，探讨自传与忏悔、伦理之间的关系。

露西娅在第五章讨论了他传与历史的交叉，这是20世纪欧洲被战争和专制制度所严重破坏的历史，以及暴政下的同步的必然性和调和与对话的不可能性。安娜·班蒂的《阿特米西亚》1947年首次出版，基于文艺复兴时期的画家阿特米西亚的生活。曼努埃尔·蒙塔尔班的《弗朗哥的自传》在他们的传记作家/叙事者和他们的他传主体之间建立了一种对话，导向了对传记作家和自传主体之间关系的考察以及他人人生伦理问题的再现。在战争和法西斯主义的背景下，以第一人称说话和写作的可能性与必要性问题成为了关注的中心，作家的责任问题被重新审视。根据对知识分子的伦理、社会和政治作用的争论，要求作家以毫不含糊的话语来明确立场，扫除压迫和鼓吹的晦涩，治愈病态的语言。

从根本上说,自传处理的就是一对矛盾对立:一方面是苏格拉底式的“认识你自己”的必然性;另一方面是那喀索斯的诅咒禁止对自己的了解。因为那喀索斯,苏格拉底式的要求无法完全实现;因为苏格拉底,那喀索斯的要求无法完全实现。自传的意义不是由过去所决定,却是通过当下的叙事强加的结构所决定。“自传不时地深陷与人生轨迹相同而又不断地分叉,处在其中而又永远地偏离;自我与他者的不同,审视的同步性和重新赋予意义的暂时性。自传始终摇摆 in 历史的真实性和文学的虚构性之间,也处在神话性和哲理性之间”(Boldrini 23)。露西娅选择的这些他传文本,既突出了自传的真实性,也反映了自传两难的解决办法,这不是通过说出“我了解自己”和“我是那个人”的愿望,而是需要具备说出和证明“我是那种人”的能力。自传始终追求解决这种两难的办法,他传将其假设为传主身份探究的基础。自我和他者、主体和客体的隔阂,源于对传记/自传主体的反思,也内在于任何的叙事行为。他传的“双重自我”的叙事,恰如其分地和解了上述的冲突和分歧,也将历史的真实性和文学的虚构性融合在一起。他传的历史主体,再现了特定时代的历史、道德、伦理和法律。

Works Cited

- Boldrini, Lucia. *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction*. New York: Taylor and Francis, 2017.
- Edel, Leon. *Writing Lives: Principia Biographica*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1987.
- Folkenflik, Robert. "Introduction." *The Culture of Autobiography: Construction of Self-Representation*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993.

跨界、交融与创新：《跨界的非自然叙事：跨国与比较视域》介评

Transborder, Intercommunication and Innovation: A Review on *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*

李敏锐 (Li Minrui)

内容摘要：尚必武教授新著《跨界的非自然叙事：跨国与比较视域》（2019）作为劳特利奇“中国视野”的丛书之一而隆重出版，这标志着中国学者在非自然叙事学研究领域的一个重大突破。该书首先详细介绍和分析了当下西方非自然叙事学的核心命题和批评争议，然后从跨国与比较视域对非自然叙事学的非自然因子诸如非自然的事件、非自然的人物、非自然的时间、非自然的空间和自然的越界等问题进行了深入探讨，接着具体以中国当代的穿越小说、六朝时期的志怪故事和伊拉克当代著名作家哈桑·布莱希姆的短篇小说为范例，详细演示和阐述了欧美文学之外的中、伊文学中的非自然传统及其非自然性表征。此外，该专著还在现有的非自然叙事学各层面的基础之上讨论和分析了一个被西方学者所忽视的非自然因子，即非自然的情感问题，作者指出这是一个亟待开垦与挖掘并具有重要价值的非自然叙事层面。最后，该书对非自然叙事学的未来发展、前景和相关问题都做出了富有创见的预测和剖析，也为今后非自然叙事学进一步地向纵深发展指出了可能的进路。

关键词：《跨界的非自然叙事：跨国与比较视域》；非自然叙事学；跨国与比较视域

作者简介：李敏锐，博士，华中农业大学外国语学院副教授，主要研究兴趣为叙事理论，文学伦理学批评和当代英美文学。本文系华中农业大学自主科技创新基金资助的“高水平科研论文培育项目”【项目编号：2662019PY038】和国家社会科学基金重大项目“当代西方叙事学前沿理论的翻译与研究”【项目编号：17ZDA281】阶段性成果。

Title: Transborder, Intercommunication and Innovation: A Review on *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*

Abstract: *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives* (2019) by Professor Shang Biwu is a new monograph as one of books

of “China Perspectives” published in the Routledge publishing house. It marks a breakthrough by a Chinese scholar in the field of unnatural narratology. This monograph in the beginning introduces and analyzes the present core issues and critical debates of unnatural narratology, and then explores in depth the unnatural elements such as the unnatural event, character, time, space, and metalepsis from transnational and comparative perspectives. Subsequently, it elaborates the unnatural tradition and characteristics of unnaturalness in the Chinese and Iraqi literature other than European and American ones, coupling with the samples of Chinese contemporary time travel narratives, *Zhiguai* tales of the six dynasties in China and Iraqi contemporary writer Hassan Blasim’s short stories. What’s more, this monograph creatively puts forward and explores the relevant issues on unnatural emotion which is neglected by the western scholars, but the author firmly believes it is a virgin and worthy field to explore. Ultimately, this monograph also ingeniously predicts the future of unnatural narratology, dissects its problems, and tentatively points out the possible ways out for the development of unnatural narratology in depth and width.

Key words: *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*; unnatural narratology; transnational and comparative perspectives

Author: Li Minrui, Ph.D, Associate Professor at School of Foreign Languages, Huazhong Agricultural University. His academic interests are narrative theory, ethical literary criticism and modern English literature (Email: barcocolmr@mail.hzau.edu.cn).

2016年,世界著名文学研究期刊《文体》(*Style*)第四期由“非自然叙事学之父”(Father of Unnatural Narratology)布赖恩·理查森教授(Brian Richardson)发起专刊,探讨了非自然叙事的相关问题,全球近二十位叙事学顶尖专家同时作出了回应,其中包括了杰拉德·普林斯(Gerald Prince)、詹姆斯·费伦(James Phelan)、皮特·罗宾诺维茨(Peter Robinowitz)、玛丽-劳拉·瑞恩(Marie-Laure Ryan)、扬·阿尔贝(Jan Alber)、波特·阿博特(Porter Abbott)、玛丽亚·麦卡莱(Maria Mäkelä)以及中国学者申丹教授等等。正如开篇作者引用现任国际叙事学会主席扬·阿尔贝的话来说,非自然叙事学是“叙事理论中一个激动人心的研究领域”(Alber and Heinze 1),年轻的非自然叙事学自创建以来只不过十来年的时间,但是,随着近年来国内外非自然叙事学者的建构与完善,非自然叙事学已然成为当下“自认知叙事以来最激动人心、也是最重要的新的叙事研究范式”(Alber, Iversen, Nielsen, and Richardson 1)。当然,这里离不开以理查森教授为首的非自然叙事学派的勤耕坚守和创新完善,而在此特别应该指出的是中国学者在这一新领域内的独

有贡献,其代表当属国内非自然叙事学研究的领军学者、上海交通大学的尚必武教授,在继其专著《当代西方后经典叙事学研究》(2013)之后,其最新著作《跨界的非自然叙事:跨国与比较视域》(*Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*, 2019;以下简称《跨界的非自然叙事》)便是中国学者在非自然叙事学领域的一个重大突破。该书是由国际著名出版公司劳特利奇出版社(Routledge)以“中国视野”(China Perspectives)为契机邀请一些中国领军学者(the leading Chinese scholars)就全球话题或中国主题进行探讨而出版的书籍之一,其他几位学者以及出版的著作分别为:袁行霈教授的《中国文学概略》、张炯教授的《当代中国文学与文学批评》、陈思和、周刚和金介甫教授的《全球视野下的沈从文》、胡亚敏教授的《西方文论关键词与当代中国》、加拿大华人叶嘉莹教授的《王国维的〈人间词话〉七讲》和孙赛茵博士的《鲁迅与中国现代文场》。窃以为,尚教授作为其中最年轻的学者,能与这些资深教授并驾齐驱,本身也就印证了作者的才学品行和新著的创新价值,一如王卓教授曾高度评价作者时说,“在这些中国声音中,尚必武教授的声音无疑是最有朝气,也是最有建设性和创新性的一个”(王卓 107),可谓一语中的。

跨界而通融:跨国和比较视域下的非自然叙事学建构

总体说来,《跨界的非自然叙事》分为七个章节,各章节之间逻辑严密,层次清晰,论据充分。全书语言精炼,见解独到,鞭辟入里,深入浅出。首先,这要归功于作者高超的英语水平及其地道的阐述能力,深邃的文学理论在作者洗练的英文表达之下,阅读起来并不拗口而令人费解,反而却给人一种豁然开朗和醍醐灌顶的共鸣之感。其次,作者对于非自然叙事理论及其相关中外文学范本都能熟稔于心、信手拈来,这都为全书整体结构的严密紧凑和行文表达的一气呵成铺垫了坚实的前期基础。

《跨界的非自然叙事》开篇部分具有双重的功能与作用,既为首章又是导言,既有提纲挈领的功能又起钩玄提要的作用。第一章作为全书最重要的理论基础部分,详细介绍和区分了各种不同的非自然叙事的定义并讨论了非自然性、阐释策略、阐释价值以及非自然叙事学与其他叙事学派之间的关系和渊源,也进一步讨论了当下西方非自然叙事学的核心命题和批评争议。具体来说,作者紧紧围绕着“什么是非自然:非自然叙事的不同定义”、“讲述中的非自然:话语层面的非自然性”、“被讲述的非自然:故事层面的非自然性”、“为何需要非自然叙事学:非自然叙事的阐发价值”、“自然化与非自然化:非自然叙事的阐释选择”和“非自然叙事学中的批评争议,抑或不同视角的对话”等相关问题进行了翔实的介绍和论述。至于什么是非自然或什么是非自然叙事?作者分别例举并比较了理查森、阿尔贝·斯蒂芬·伊弗尔森(Stefan Iversen)和亨里克·尼尔森(Henrik Nielsen)四位学者提出的具

有代表性的非自然叙事定义。譬如理查森认为，非自然叙事就是指“那些明显违反标准的叙事形式传统，特别是那些违背口头或书面的非虚构叙事以及建构在非虚构传统叙事模式上的现实主义虚构作品。此外，非自然叙事追随流动的、变化的传统并创建新的叙事模式。在此过程中，非自然叙事使得叙事作品的基本因素有了陌生化的效果”（Richardson 34）。在进一步探讨了理查森的非自然叙事概念之后，作者言简意赅地指出理查森的非自然叙事概念其实显然已经排除了“摹仿叙事”（mimetic narrative）和非摹仿叙事（non-mimetic narrative），“在理查森的非自然叙事概念框架中，‘非自然’实际上就是‘反摹仿’（anti-mimetic）的代名词”（4）¹。然而，阿尔贝认为，非自然叙事就是那些“涵盖了物理上、逻辑上或人类属性上不可能的场景或事件。也就是说，依据规范物理世界的已知规律、抑或业已接受的逻辑原则（如非冲突原则）或标准的人类知识限定来说，这些呈现的情景或事件必须是不可能的”（Alber, “Unnatural Narratology” 449）。表面上看起来两者的概念有很大差异，但是在细致分析了他们二者的概念之后，作者细心地发现他们在本质上都强调了“非自然叙事的反摹仿本质”（5）。随后，作者又考察了伊弗尔森和尼尔森的非自然叙事定义。伊弗尔森的定义比较玄奥，他认为非自然叙事就是“那些呈现给读者的一些冲突，这些冲突发生在规范故事世界的规则和故事世界内的情景或事件之间，并且这些冲突本身又很难阐释清楚”（转引自《跨界的非自然叙事》5）。与伊弗尔森的定义视角不同，尼尔森把非自然叙事定义为“虚构叙事的一个子集，不像众多现实主义或摹仿叙事一样，这就暗示读者采用不同于在非虚构、传统故事讲述中所运用的阐释策略。具体说来，就是这些叙事中的时间、故事世界、心理呈现、叙述行为的构建方式在物理、逻辑、记忆或心理等层面上都是不可能的，或者说在真实世界中这些故事都是难以置信的。但是，这就要求读者通过改变阐释策略，而并非将其阐释为可靠的、可能的和 / 或权威的叙述”（Nielsen 72）。

由此可见，非自然叙事的四种代表性定义不免艰深晦涩，诘屈聱牙。但是，作者凭借其深厚的理论功底，依然能在其间纵横捭阖，探微取精，为读者深入浅出地指出他们之间的异同。就不同之处来说，作者认为“与理查森和阿尔贝相比较起来，伊弗尔森的主要兴趣是围绕‘非自然的心理’进行阐释，而‘非自然的心理’指的是呈现的意识在其功能或实现方式上违反了规范可能世界的原则，在一定程度上它也抵制自然化或规约化’。然而，尼尔森的研究则主要聚焦在非自然叙事的阅读策略之上，他认为阅读非自然叙事的策略与阅读‘规约化的故事’是截然不同的”（6）。然后，作者又进一步归纳了他们的三个共同点：其一，痴迷那些高度不合情理、不可能的、非现实世

1 参见 Shang Biwu, *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, 2019. 原文是英文，引用均为笔者自译，以下引用只标注页码。

界的、反常的、极端的、稀奇的和坚定的虚构叙事与其结构；其二，渴望通过回答潜藏于这些叙事背后的意义并对其作出阐释；其三，有意于审视这些具体叙事与所有其他叙事之间的关系（6）。作者这样条分缕析、言简意赅的比较和分析，为读者清晰准确地把握非自然叙事的定义真可谓是提纲挈领和钩玄提要。

但是，更为值得称道的是，在比较了西方四位领军学者的非自然叙事的定义基础之上，作为中国学者，作者也发出了“中国视野”的强劲声音，提出了非常精彩而又极具创见的学术思想。譬如，就什么样的叙事文本是非自然叙事的问题，作者认为，“一个叙事文本的非自然性（unnaturalness）关涉到程度和层面两个问题。至于程度来说，不同的非自然叙事文本在非自然性上是不同的。……一个叙事文本所包含的‘非自然因子’（unnatural elements）越多，它就越可能被认为是非自然的。而非自然因子又分布在局部层面（较低程度的非自然性）或全局层面（较高程度的非自然性）之中。……不管一个叙事文本是有多么的非自然，它的非自然性以及所包含的非自然因子都可以在故事层面和/或话语层面呈现出来，当然此二者未必会同时呈现”（6-7）。为此，可以这么说，我们平时阅读的很多叙事文本中都可能或多或少地带有非自然性或非自然因子，只不过我们需要从故事层面或话语层面来判断其非自然性程度的强弱，或者分析其所涵盖的非自然因子的多少。但是，这里颇为复杂的是，对于一些人来说有些非自然因子是非自然的，然而对另外一些人来说却是自然的，这就是作者所特别提到的局部层面的“低程度非自然性”，还有普适于所有人的全局层面的“高程度非自然性”。在此，作者实际上是进一步拓展了理查森的“摹仿、非摹仿和反摹仿”理论，使得这些复杂概念和理论更容易理解和把握，也更有利于批评实践和操作。

最后，在第一章的结尾处，作者简明扼要地回答了两个重要的基本问题，也是非自然叙事学存在的合法性问题：第一，既然现已存在经典叙事学以及后经典叙事学的诸多其他分支，我们为什么还要提出非自然叙事学这一理论？作为新范式的非自然叙事学，它有何意义？这也是众多中西方学者所关心的两个问题，对此，作者睿智地例举了五个主要原因和意义：第一，它丰富了当代叙事理论，揭示了诸多叙事作品的非自然性。第二，它揭示了文学的非自然本质。第三，它打破了既已存在的叙事传统，创新了新的叙事策略，从而为文学史的改写提供了阐释的理论基础。第四，非自然叙事为作家实现一些意识形态上的目的提供了非常实用的叙事策略。第五，非自然叙事对于人类认知也具有重要的影响（11-12）。作者本着求真务实和探索真理的精神，继续追问道，“既然非自然叙事学具有如此重要的价值和意义，那么具体的阐释策略或阅读模式又有哪些呢？”（13）为此，作者比较分析了西方盛行的两种主要阅读策略模式，即自然化阅读和非自然化阅读。随后，作者同样指出了它们之间的异同。譬如，自然化阅读内部阵营也有分别从故事层面和

话语层面分别进行阐释的区别(14)。在此,有一点必须注意的是,作者在比较了西方两种主导阐释模式的基础上,为下文提出自己建设性的伦理阐释构想埋下了绝妙的伏笔,作者深谙“比较不是理由”之精髓。

第二章“非自然叙事:跨国与比较视域”。在此,作为对苏珊·弗雷德曼(Susan Friedman)提出的叙事理论跨国转向的回应,作者试图把大家的关注引向当下叙事理论研究的“比较转向”(comparative turn)。该章主要集中回答了叙事理论为何要比较?比较什么?以及如何比较?等诸如此类的问题。在回顾了西方著名叙事学家琼茜·兰达(José Landa)、苏珊·奥妮佳(Susan Onega)、弗朗西斯·乔斯特(François Jost)、琼·皮埃尔(John Pier)和玛利娜·格利莎克娃(Marina Grishakova)等人在此领域作出的贡献之后,作者高屋建瓴地指出“作为后经典叙事学的第二阶段的结果,跨学科、跨媒介、跨文类以及跨国视域为不同分支的叙事学深度与快速地发展提供了相互交织的内在动力,也为我们从全球视域下考察叙事作品和叙事理论提供了难得的机遇,抑或说这也是紧迫的使命”(19)。随后,作者进一步指出“比较叙事学”(comparative narratology)期待在叙事理论领域中去殖民化和颠覆欧洲与英美霸权,同时,也为那些被边缘化的叙事理论和被忽视或被边缘化的叙事作品做好理论基础的铺垫。也就是说,比较叙事学不仅比较不同地区、文化、国家或分支的叙事理论,而且也比较不同国家或地区的叙事作品”(19-20)。为了更好地阐释其理念和理论,作者在随后的几章中特别探讨了中国文学中一类特殊的叙事作品,即“鬼魂故事”(ghost story),以此来说明中国鬼魂故事的非自然特性,同时,也对既已存在的西方非自然叙事的阐释模式进行挑战。

第三章“中国当代时间穿越小说的非自然叙事:模式,价值和阐释选择”。此章探讨了二十一世纪的头十年中国迅猛增长和日益繁荣起来的时间穿越小说(time travel fiction)。作者认为,“这种新式叙事文类的兴起在很大程度上同时受到‘后现代转向’(postmodernist turn)与‘历史学转向’(historiographical turn)的影响,从某种程度上来说,我们已不可能用传统叙事理论来解读此类作品。为此,作者为读者详细介绍并演示了一种把非自然叙事学与伦理叙事学两种方式交融起来的批评阐释模式,也为下文建构伦理阅读模式铺垫了理论和实践的基础,令人耳目一新,非常具有启发性。

第四章“非自然叙事学与中国六朝时期的志怪故事”。此章讨论并分析了跨界的或除英语之外的民族文学中的非自然叙事相关问题。作者借用中国六朝时期的志怪故事旨在解决如下问题:其一,探讨非自然叙事学当中一些颇有争议的概念并呼吁只有秉持历时和跨国的视野或怀着开放的胸襟才能予以解决;其二,通过局部层面的诸如非自然的人物、非自然的时空、非自然的时间等非自然因子来揭示志怪故事当中不可能的故事世界的非自然性;其三,进一步考察全局层面越界故事世界的非自然性;最后,作者对此文类建

设性地提出了一种超越于自然化和非自然化阅读的伦理阅读模式。由此可见,第四、五两章分别从中国当代和古代文学文本入手,运用非自然叙事学的基本理论,从跨国和比较视域出发,并结合伦理学批评的方法,探讨了中国文学中的非自然性及其表征。作者在论述过程中把非自然叙事理论和文本紧密结合,有理有据,简洁明晰,非常具有说服力和创新性。

第五章“探究不可能的恐怖故事世界:哈桑·布莱希姆(Hassan Blasim)短篇小说中的非自然性”。此章通过“死亡叙述者、冲突事件和本体上的越界”(20)等非自然因子探讨了伊拉克当代著名作家布莱希姆不可能的非自然世界的建构策略,探讨了与人物的死亡与尸体的损害紧密关联的非自然的行为。此外,作者还通过聚焦于一种特别的非自然的心理—偏执心理,从而考察了布莱希姆小说中故事人物的极端冲突心理特质。在详细的文本解读之后,作者最后诗意而批判地指出,正是“通过非自然叙事,布莱希姆使得其短篇小说虽然在话语层面上是‘反摹仿的不可能’(anti-mimetically impossible)然而在故事层面上却是‘梦魇般的真实’(nightmarishly real),其小说中的非自然叙事策略不仅产生了陌生化和恐怖的效果,而且也督促我们去思考在这个世界似乎很遥远的某些地方正在发生什么事情?它也时刻提醒着我们需要对人类当下的生存状况给予普遍的关注”(20-21)。

第六章“当代小说中的非自然情感”。这一章与文学批评中的“情感转向”(affective turn)密切相关,也是作者以此作出的回应。该章讨论了在当代先锋或反摹仿叙事作品中的一种物理上、逻辑上和人类属性上不可能的非自然情感,这种非自然的情感不仅凸显了这类叙事作品的虚构性,同时,也产生了一定的陌生化效果。作者在此创新性地结合了自然化和非自然化两种阅读策略,并例证性地分析了当代英国著名作家伊恩·麦克尤恩(Ian McEwan)的短篇小说《既仙即死》(*Dead as They Come*, 1978)和中国当代作家姜戎的长篇小说《狼图腾》(*The Wolf Totem*, 2004)两部叙事作品,既揭示了“两种阐释策略之间的交叉性与互补性”(尚必武,“文学叙事中的非自然情感:基本类型与阐释选择”5),又揭示了潜藏于文本底下那种不可能的、时而荒诞时而真挚的、细腻的非自然的情感。最后,作者归纳总结道,“唯有采用这种阅读模式,才能使得叙事作品既具有可读性同时又不失其非自然性”(21)。显而易见,在这一章中,作者进一步地拓展了非自然叙事理论,并且再一次尝试性地运用其建构的伦理阐释模式进行了批评实践。

最后一章是作者对非自然叙事学未来发展的“思考与展望”(forward thinking)。本章旨在为非自然叙事学未来的进一步发展提出一定的参考性建议。极而言之,作者建议道,“为了非自然叙事学未来发展得更好,有必要谨慎处理好诸如非自然叙事学与经典叙事学、非自然叙事与后现代叙事和非自然性与叙事性之间的相互关系”(21)。在细读作者讨论的这些重要关系之后,我们不难发现,作者的核心思想便是该专著的书名之义:如果我们未

来需要推动非自然叙事学进一步向纵深发展，毋庸置疑，跨国和比较视域是其必由之路。

交融而创新：从跨界的非自然叙事学走向普适的世界叙事学

通过上述笔者管窥蠡测式的简述，但瑕不掩瑜。显然，尚必武教授的新著《跨界的非自然叙事：跨国与比较视域》不仅是非自然叙事学领域的重大突破，也是整个叙事学领域和文学研究领域的重要拓展，它还代表了中国学者对叙事学领域的重要智慧贡献。总览全书，窃以为新著兼有以下几个特点：

第一，作为中国学者的中国视野，新著中有两个主要章节专门探讨了中国文学中的非自然性。作者有代表性地选取了当代的时间穿越小说和古代六朝时期的志怪故事，从模式、价值和阐释策略以及非自然的人物、时间、空间和非自然的情感等角度分析了中国古、今文学中的非自然传统及其特征，也为读者重新阅读这些叙事作品提供了新视角、新方法和新策略。此外，正如新著的副标题“跨国与比较视域”所示，作者不仅打破了以欧美文学为中心的禁锢，跨越了中西之间的沟壑，还考察了中东地区的阿拉伯文学。新著的第五章专门讨论了伊拉克当代著名作家哈桑·布莱希姆采用非自然叙事方式而建构的“恐怖的、不可能的故事世界”，详尽地探讨了在其叙事作品话语层面和故事层面上的非自然性表征及其潜藏于这些非自然特性底下的伦理诉求和道德启迪。为此，可以毫不夸张地说，一方面非自然叙事学推动了当代世界文学的勃兴发展，另一方面世界各地和各民族文学中的非自然性也印证了非自然传统的普适性。然而，我们现有的理论岂能忽略这些普适性的存在？也正因为如此，吕克·赫尔曼和巴特·凡瓦克才说，“叙事理论唯有严肃考察边缘小说才能凸显其价值”（Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck 524）。弗里德曼也呼吁说，我们需要“扩大我们理论化叙事的文档，即走出我们舒适的领地，同全世界范围内的叙事和叙事理论展开交流”（Friedman 24）。因此，突破过往以欧美文学为中心的批评范式，以中国和伊拉克文学作为演示其伦理阅读模式的范本，强调“中国视野”，真正做到了在“跨国中比较”，这便是其特点之一。

第二，尽管非自然叙事学“已然成为叙事理论近年来发展最为突出的一个分支”（Luc Herman and Bart Vervaeck 514），但是它的定义即使是在非自然叙事学派内部也未得到统一，“其画面也仍不够清晰”（Shen, “What Are Unnatural Narratives” 483）。即便如此，作者仍能在众声喧哗、莫衷一是的观点中抽丝剥茧、条分缕析，发现他们的共通和分歧，多种观点相互关照，相互诘问，最终确立了自己独立的学术思想。譬如，作者在经典叙事学、后经典叙事学及其各分支的比较分析中，提出了中国视域下的比较叙事学理念；在探讨非自然叙事作品的归属问题时，作者提出了叙事作品中的非自然性和非自然性的强与弱、局部性和全局性的概念；在自然化和非自然化两种不同

的阅读策略中,又创新地提出了非自然叙事的伦理阅读策略;在面对非自然叙事学蓬勃发展的当下,作者还睿智地指出了其存在的诸多问题以及未来发展的进路等等。因此,始终博观而约取,批评而独立,非人云亦云,不随声附和,真正做到了在“交融中创新”,这便是其特点之二。

第三,新著能够把非自然叙事理论与非自然叙事文本紧密结合起来进行批评演示,既有理论的高度又有批评的深度,让读者既能深入地了解非自然叙事理论,同时,又能在批评实践中掌握这一理论的运用操作。在探讨中国当代的时间穿越小说时,作者具体结合了《寻秦记》、《梦回大清》和《步步惊心》等当代广泛流行的穿越小说;在探讨六朝志怪故事的时候,作者又列举了《搜神记》、《卖鬼的人:六朝志怪故事选》和《中国古典志怪故事》等等文本,这样既进一步阐发了理论又解读了文本,理论与实践紧密结合,克服了理论与批评实践相脱节的批评现象,真正做到了在“实践中批评”,这便是其特点之三。

第四,恰如作者在鸣谢(acknowledgments)中所说,新著各章节虽然不是过往业已发表论文的简单重印,但也是以那些论文为基础的(vi)。那些论文大部分都发表在国际权威或核心期刊之上,例如第一章就是基于作者发表在国际核心期刊《文学语义学杂志》(*Journal of Literary Semantics*)上的论文《非自然叙事学:核心命题和批评争议》,第二章则是基于其发表在国际权威期刊《比较文学研究》(*Comparative Literature Studies*)上的论文《走向比较叙事学:中国视野》,第三、四和六章相关论文均发表在国际核心期刊《世界比较文学评论》(*Neohelicon*)上,而第五章则发表在国际权威期刊《阿卡狄亚:文学文化国际期刊》(*Arcadia: International Journal of Literary Culture*)之上。由此足以可见,作者十数年来心无旁骛地一直致力于非自然叙事学领域的研究,既积累了丰厚的成果,也逐渐确立了自己独特的学术观点,真正做到了在“厚积中薄发”,这便是其特点之四。

第五,新著的语言流畅自然,行文凝练不臃,显示出了作者在中西文学以及语言上的深厚功底与造诣。作者虽是中国学者,但多年在国外访学,并与诸如普林斯、费伦、瑞恩、弗鲁德尼克、理查森和阿尔贝等西方叙事学大家常常保持沟通交流和学术对话,更为难得的是,据作者自己透露,他每天都要保持千字以上的英文原著阅读量,这些经历和品质无疑都有助于作者的英语思维和行文表达,使得新著读起来令人感觉“杂而不乱,繁而不臃,简而不凡,薄而不单”。由此可见,作者不正是谭君强教授所指的“在逐渐成熟的基础上,可以逐步开展以中国作为基础的、与除西方以外的其他语言和文化系统之间的比较叙事学研究”(谭君强 40)的学者吗?真正做到了在“学习中思辨”,这便是其特点之五。

总而言之,当下是“叙事最受重视的时期,也是叙事理论最为发达的时期”(申丹 203)。在叙事理论勃兴发展的新时期,尚必武教授的新作《跨界

的非自然叙事：跨国与比较视域》便是近年来不可多得的成果之一，它不仅推动了非自然叙事学的进一步发展，也拓展了叙事学的研究领域，还为我们的亚非拉等边缘文学走向世界文学的阵营提供了理论基础的支撑。当然，跨国研究只是途径，比较研究也只是手段，真正的目的是实现囊括全球非自然叙事传统的世界文学和世界叙事学。正如作者曾撰文说，“只有在研究对象、研究方法、研究成果上的跨国界交流，才能真正实现叙事学研究的‘跨国界转向’。在这一过程中，可借用比较叙事学的手段，将世界各国的叙事文本和叙事思想纳入考察范畴，突破当下叙事学在研究方法和研究对象上的‘西方中心主义’，进而实现建构普适性的‘世界叙事学’的美好图景”（尚必武，“后经典叙事学的第二阶段：命题与动向” 39）。当然，图景非常美丽，而要实现图景还是要多做《跨界的非自然叙事》这样的工作。

Works Cited

- Alber, Jan. "The Diachronic Development of Unnaturalness: A New View on Genre." *Unnatural Narratives, Unnatural Narratology*. Eds. Jan Alber and Rüdiger Heinze. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011. 42-67.
- . "Unnatural Narratology: The Systematic Study of Anti-mimeticism". *Literature Compass* 10.5 (2013): 449-460.
- Alber, Jan, Stefan Iversen, Henrik Skov Nielsen and Brian Richardson. "Introduction." *A Poetics of Unnatural Narrative*. Eds. Jan Alber, Henrik Skov Nielsen and Brian Richardson. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2013. 1-15.
- Nielsen, Henrik Skov. "Naturalizing and Unnaturalizing Reading Strategies: Focalization Revisited." *A Poetics of Unnatural Narrative*. Eds. Jan Alber, Henrik Skov Nielsen and Brian Richardson. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 2013. 67-93.
- Richardson, Brian. "What Is Unnatural Narrative Theory?" *Unnatural Narratives, Unnatural Narratology*. Eds. Jan Alber and Rüdiger Heinze. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011. 23-40.
- 尚必武：“后经典叙事学的第二阶段：命题与动向”，《当代外国文学》3（2012）：33-42。
- [Shang, Biwu. "Current Trends in the Second Phase of Postclassical Narratology." *Contemporary Foreign Literature* 3 (2012): 33-42.]
- 尚必武：“文学叙事中的非自然情感：基本类型与阐释选择”，《上海交通大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）4（2016）：5-16。
- [Shang, Biwu. Unnatural Emotions in Literary Narrative: Basic Categories and Interpretive Options, *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 4 (2016): 5-16.]
- Shang, Biwu. *Unnatural Narrative across Borders: Transnational and Comparative Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, 2019.
- 申丹等：《英美小说叙事理论研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2005 年。
- [Shen, Dan. *Studies on the Narrative Theory in the American and British Fiction*. Beijing: Pekong UP,

2005.]

Shen, Dan. "What Are Unnatural Narratives? What Are Unnatural Elements?" *Style* 50.4 (2016): 483-489.

谭君强: “比较叙事学: ‘中国叙事学’研究之一途”, 《江西社会科学》3 (2010): 35-41。

[Tan, Junqiang. Comparative Narratology: One Research Way of “Chinese Narratology.” *Jiangxi Social Sciences* 3 (2010): 35-41.]

王卓: 一幅后经典叙事学家族谱系图——评尚必武新作《当代西方后经典叙事学研究》, 《山东外语教学》6 (2014): 107-110。

[Wang, Zhuo. A Genealogical Map of Postclassical Narratology: A Review of *Contemporary Western Narratology: Postclassical Perspectives*. *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal* 6 (2014): 107-110.]

A Review of Perversion's Beyond: Life at the Edge of Knowledge by Torgeir Fjeld

Jørgen Veisland

Abstract: Torgeir Fjeld's book, *Perversion's Beyond. Life at the Edge of Knowledge*, is a tour de force through Freudian and Lacanian theory. The book offers innovative interpretations of major works in world literature and is furthermore written in a lucid style that makes it attractive to the reader interested in philosophy, cultural theory and literature.

Key words: Torgeir Fjeld; *Perversion's Beyond. Life at the Edge of Knowledge*; Freudian; Lacanian

Author: Jørgen Veisland is Professor of Scandinavian, American and Comparative Literature at the University of Gdansk, Poland, where he has been employed since 1992. Previous appointments include The International People's College, Denmark; The University of Wisconsin-Madison; The University of California-Berkeley; The University of Caen, France; Fudan University, Shanghai. He is a member of The International Association for Scandinavian Studies and The International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism. He is the author of numerous articles on Scandinavian, English and American literature and of several books, a.o. *Kierkegaard and the Dialectics of Modernism*; *Mimesis and Metamorphosis: The self in Contemporary American Fiction*; *Drama and Repetition: Time in Selected Plays by Henrik Ibsen, Bertolt Brecht and Samuel Beckett*; *Depression and Utopia. A Study of Selected Works by John Steinbeck*; *The Outcast: Twisting the Plot in Six English Novels*; *Imagism in Laus Strandby Nielsen's Poetry* (Email: finjv@ug.edu.pl).

Torgeir Fjeld initiates his discussion of perversion with a preface and an introduction on Plato, Freud and Lacan, highlighting Freud's pleasure principle and the ethical implications of that principle. The economy of pleasure involves maintaining desire the lowest possible level so as to avoid collision with and obstruction by the ego and the super-ego, thus escaping punishment. Freud's argument may be regarded as ethical in that an excess of pleasure and pleasure-oriented acts may harm others. A Freudian ethics based on this prerogative seems indirect and passive rather than actively directed at others to the purpose of creating

good. Creating good will eventually emerge in Freud's thought as sublimation of the basic life drive, easily diverted, indeed perverted or inverted as a death drive that includes an ominous will to destruct surfacing at sinister points in world history and culminating in Nazism. The wider application of the concept of perversion expands the concept, endowing it with new meaning, specifically anti-orthodox or heterodox, and a proclivity inherent in perversion that may take two directions as Fjeld interestingly argues. One direction is de Sade's Being in Wickedness where exceeding the Law is tantamount to not only pleasure but human experience at a higher level, an enhanced Happiness in Evil, according to de Sade. This form of excess would seem to be limited since it is a forceful, in fact an enforced reaction to the Law and to orthodox origins. The better solution, in the estimation of the present reviewer and presumably in the estimation of the author of the book reviewed here, is Alain Badiou's concept of the new man, an individual conceived as existing beyond origins, dogmas and myths, and hence beyond orthodoxy and perversion, understood as that which transgresses orthodoxy. Perversion's own "beyond" might entail a transcendence that erases reflection and mediation in Plato's sense, giving the individual direct access to the light of truth. Continuing that line of thought in Chapter 1 which concentrates on the Name of the Father, Fjeld presents Freud's analysis of Little Hans where the founder of psychoanalysis and the talking cure brilliantly shows that unlimited engagement in pleasure—and lack of restrictions in the obtaining of pleasure—is a kind of primal, infant source of perversion facilitated by the closeness to the mother and the absence of paternal interference. When the father steps in, prohibition occurs in the form of a symbolic castration of the male child. Symbolic castration becomes the origin of signification, language and the Law, according to Lacan. Analogous to the infant experience of unrestricted pleasure would be, from the perspective of post-Freudian theory, lesbian relations that evade and outright nullify the Father. The philosopher Slavoj Žižek argues that the 'pervert' claims direct access to the "big Other," a universal, transcendent Other, and Fjeld provides examples from literature, a.o. Ibsen's *The Wild Duck* and Hamsun's *Pan*, where leading characters may be said to experience such a direct access. The obverse it true of the position of the human body in a high-technological age interfering with the power and authenticity of the body. In the opinion of this reviewer Freudian and post-Freudian theory remains steeped in a materialistic perspective that omits mind and the spiritually motivated drive to the Beyond, entangling itself in a discourse that mirrors the material-technological age it purports to criticize. Lacan's contrived pun *père-vert* provides no help in this critical predicament.

In Chapter 2 of his book, *Knight time: literary perversions*, Fjeld opens his discussion by referring to Heidegger's concept of *damon*, inspired by Heraclitus. *Damon* is the coming man as the essence of a Being already there and set to unfold itself in the future. Two opposing concepts of time are involved, circular time and linear time, one typical of the agrarian society, the other characteristic of the industrial age. Heidegger's concept of time "*pure self-affectation*" and his concept of being as "*the essence of concerning-itself*" are related to the self being positioned in language and oriented towards the Other, as Fjeld argues. He provides three examples from world literature to illustrate his thesis that the essence of the new man is a re-capitulation of what was always there, following Heidegger, but that this re-capitulation is problematized by the literary protagonist's frustrated efforts to *become* in the sense of being the new man that was there originally. What is there from the beginning is both hidden and revealed. Revelation is obstructed by the protagonist's inability to disentangle himself from a dialectical determinism immersed in a fundamental dualism. This emerges as a problem in Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, Cervantes' *Don Quixote* and Ibsen's *The Wild Duck*. In Conrad's novella Kurtz is portrayed as a character escaping imperialism by turning more imperialistic than the imperialists, thus acting contrary to his initial purpose. His intention was to revert to cyclical time and to a primary darkness in an effort to oppose the linearity of an industrial, imperialistic age. Cervantes' epic presents a knight errant who evades the law of society by embracing the law of desire, escaping the prior law only by embodying the Law of the Other. Ibsen's play presents a character, Gregers Werle, whose purported quest for the truth is a distorted rebellion against his father, Old Werle. The truth of Old Werle's intimate involvement with the Ekdal household—he is the adolescent girl Hedvig's father—is disclosed as a fact secretly known to everyone. Gregers casts himself in the end, Fjeld argues, as a Judas, 13th at table, a victim sacrificing himself so as to bring about the advent of Christ, the disclosing of truth. Fjeld notes that "Hedvig has been bruised by the uncovering of deception" and that "she merely follows the order given to her." As a supplement to the interpretation offered by the author, outlined above, I would suggest that the protagonists of the three literary works are also subject to the rhetorical devices of comedy and irony, comedy being the primary characteristic of Cervantes' epic. Comedy unties the picaresque hero from his entanglement with the self-other dualism, liberating the text from the bondage imposed upon it by the dialectical opposition law of society/law of desire. The opposition seems to me to be dictated by a theoretical preconception that neglects significant literary strategies. Irony plays a profound role in Conrad's and Ibsen's

works, where it produces a metaphysics of *simultaneity* that disrupts the temporal axis, paving the way for a spatial dimension surpassing time. Simultaneity is the *beyond* that works through the rhetoric of irony and comedy, opening plot and character to the narrator's critique by viewing them from a sound distance. The narrator of Conrad's novella may be a disguised or implied author playing light and darkness out against one another and implicitly revealing the duality as a projection and a false historical notion. In Ibsen's drama the critique is voiced by the character Dr. Relling whose role is doubly ironic as he is both the subject of irony and the object of it, since he is secretly jealous of Old Werle. Relling's exposure of the "life-lie" is nevertheless valid as an ironic critique of the illusions that sustain the moral and mental life of the dramatic characters, with Hedvig as the sole exception. She breaks the illusion, or rather, reveals that the wild duck in the attic, a domesticated, acculturated substitute for true wildness, not only represents but embodies *truth and lie*. Heidegger's essay "On the Essence of Truth" puts forward the thesis that truth and lie are complicit and that the way to the truth is indirect, paved by lies that disclose the truth by a process of negativity.

In Chapter 3 Fjeld enlightens the reader with a thorough, well-thought out comment on Lacan's mirror stage, stating that Lacan's concept of the ego is fundamentally different from Freud's. Freud saw the ego as a permanent, universal entity whereas Lacan introduces a temporal aspect, claiming that the moment the six months to eighteen months old child sees its own specular image reflected in the mirror constitutes a particular stage in the history of the child's development. The fragmented self-perception and the disorder of the senses making up the child's psyche and body are unified in a totality in the mirror image which becomes not only a reflected image of the child's total self but a reflection of an outside, the Other as both integrated with the self and external to it. Lacan argues that at this point jealousy appears in the child's consciousness, in form of a feeling of being deprived, unloved, and wanting something that someone else has. One might say that the feeling of being fragmented, split, continues now, only at a higher level. The progression from Lacan's Imaginary through the Symbolic—the entry into language—and on to the Real is a progressive assimilation of a fragmented existence conducive to the ultimate knowledge of the Real as a state of contingency, interdependence, accident and continuous flux. The accidental, non-essential nature of the Real might have prompted Lacan to the conclusion that the Real already existed *as the surface of the mirror* which is there only as a reflecting surface. In itself it is empty. In the opinion of this reviewer this kind of speculative exercise would have brought Lacan closer to the insight and wisdom found in

Eastern metaphysics, i.e. that notions of ego, Self and Other may be discarded as simple illusions. The Real would then emerge as the vacant surface of the mirror which is the mind itself, empty of substantial content, reflecting only a coming and going and the incessant flux of subjects and objects. The separation of inside and outside is abolished and everything relegated to the 'outside' is finally seen as a projection from within. Fjeld's statement that the Other does not exist and that this cognition is conducive to an authentic self is a fair approximation to the idea of the vacant mirror.

"Clandestine jouissance" is the topic of Chapter 4 in Fjeld's work. The author opens his discussion by referring to Jacques Derrida's essay "Before the law" where the philosopher states that there is a law before the law of society and before the law of the Other. This prior law is located in a place where desirable acts coexist with undesirable acts. The issue of ethics is touched upon by Derrida but not resolved, in my opinion, and that is a problem. The idea that national culture is naturally imbued with an ethical consciousness guiding individuals and groups belonging to that culture is currently challenged, as we see, by the notion of another instance of the national, presumably supra-national and multicultural. The thinkers cited by Fjeld, a.o. Schirmacher, describe—in somewhat hazy terms in my opinion—the difference between culture and entertainment produced by the media and art, which according to Schirmacher can produce a "Dionysian process of perception excess." It is not clear to me what exactly this "perception excess" means and why Schirmacher chooses the term Dionysian to qualify it. The decisive factor in regard to art must be the relation between truth and fiction, the imagination and reality. How does a work of fiction and the imagination of the artist conceive and engender a truth or truths that are more real than so-called reality itself? The imagination is that "perception excess" that approximates knowledge *and* ethics at a distinctly higher and qualitatively different level than the technological media can attain. Schirmacher neglects to clarify how this process works and he also fails to explain how ethical worlds are "concealed," as cited by Fjeld. The ethical cannot be concealed. If it is, it is not the ethical. Furthermore, ethics is intimately related to knowledge since the ethical must be conceived as a heightening of subjective consciousness. Fjeld's discussion of the concepts of power and mastery in Heidegger and Foucault is a very lucid presentation of the relation between power and knowledge. The presentation makes it clear to me that Foucault's idea of the complicity between power and knowledge needs revising since knowledge is precisely that which exceeds power and destroys it. Further, the tie between ethics and knowledge is universal, global, for if it were not, the human world

would collapse. The trans-national institutions seem to me to fail when it comes to the integration of a national culture, complete with ethics, values and traditions, with the multicultural world of business corporations and advanced technological media. Fjeld cites Lacan as stating that the pervert is “a crusader for enjoyment,” and presumably such enjoyment is to be conceived as exceeding common ethics, as indeed it does in Nietzsche’s thought. At the same time, as Fjeld points out, the pervert is barred from “the space of desire” by the prohibiting Father. This creates a paradox so that the *jouissance* of the pervert is “clandestine.” The theorists and philosophers referred to by Fjeld do not offer a solution to this paradox. I do not pretend to possess a solution either but I would suggest that the question of the relation between aesthetics, ethics and knowledge needs to be clarified. One way to accomplish this is to recognize that the arts provide us with knowledge and with an ethical perspective that surpasses the enjoyment of the pervert.

In the final Chapter and the Afterword Fjeld discusses once again Lacan’s three stages, the Imaginary, the Symbolic and the Real. The title of Chapter 5, “Beyond the fragment: community, ethics, illusions” promises to seek a solution to the existential, social and ethical problems originating in the *the drive of desire* which, from a Freudian and Lacanian point of view recurs with the force of an aggressive insistence. The Lacanian argument seems irrevocably immersed in a libido theory that threatens to undermine the ethical objective, in my opinion. Aristotle’s comments on the common good, cited by Fjeld, make for a classical formulation of engaging in the good as the only practical and reasonable thing to do. Governed by reason the human subject naturally chooses the good that lies beyond the narrow confines of the ego. The Freudian and Lacanian ego, by contrast, is in the midst of an intensive pursuit of satisfaction that obviates recognition of the good. The ego is posited in between a fragmented chaos and social participation, as Fjeld shows, vacillating between the desire to be reflected in the mirror as a total, unified self, and the desire to experience the chaos of drives and impulses that eventually re-emerge in the Real, an undifferentiated zone in itself characterized by chaos and fragmentation, located as it is beyond language and the social order. Lacan seems to me to be fixated on the ego and its inherent need to safeguard itself at all costs, which really comes down to feeding the ego. The Real is the extimate, as Fjeld points out, relating it to the Greek *ek-stasis*, standing outside, and ecstasy is the qualifying feature of *jouissance*. Here I detect an unwarranted invasion of ego psychology into epistemology that needs to be addressed. I am not comfortable with the distinction between inside and outside, being persuaded as I am that the boundary between the two is non-existing. Several clues in literature corroborate

this view, as for example Kafka's "The Burrow" and "Before the law," which Fjeld refers to. The gate barring the individual from access to the law on the other side is an illusion, a point Fjeld seems to concur with, and the logical consequence of this insight would be to view the gate as an imaginary bar separating inside from outside. The gate *qua* illusion magnifies the inside-outside division, producing a false valorization of what is on "the other side" and endowing the other side with an undue hue of glory, as we may observe time and time again in history where the tendency to glorify and worship takes a tragic turn when it results in religious or ideological warfare. Fanaticism is the sinister outcome of the inside-outside division. It is rampant in the world today. Bakhtin's concept of the chronotype falls into the same trap as it separates the past from the present and the future in a literary theory constructed to prove that the past is irretrievable. Proust's *A la recherche du temps perdu* disproves the theory as the past is retrieved in the present by being re-created and transformed in the here and now, a spatiotemporal movement we may observe in Kierkegaard's work *Repetition* also. The past lives on in an altered sense and is therefore not subject to the process of alienation that grips the ego as it enters language and the social order, as Lacan would have it. Theuth's gift of writing, rejected by the King, includes the gift of art, the value of aesthetics residing in the fact that it overcomes the boundaries ironically exposed in Kafka's stories. Fjeld's citation from Schopenhauer is singularly well chosen to illustrate the diminishing stature of individuality, understood as ego: "Your individuality is not your true and final being, indeed it is rather the mere expression of it."

Dr. Fjeld's book is a tour de force through Freudian and Lacanian theory. The book offers innovative interpretations of major works in world literature and is furthermore written in a lucid style that makes it attractive to the reader interested in philosophy, cultural theory and literature.

Work Cited

Fjeld, Torgeir. *Perversion's Beyond. Life at the edge of knowledge*. New York & Dresden: Atropos Press, 2018.



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920

