

ISSN 2520-4920 (Print)

ISSN 2616-4566 (Online)

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 4, Number 2

June 2020



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

**Volume 4, Number 2
June 2020**

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*, 6 East Building, Zijingang Campus, Zhejiang University, 866 Yuhangtang Rd, Hangzhou 310058, P.R. China. Tel:+86-571-8898-2010

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

- 1-15 Approaches and Challenges in Children's Literature: An Interview with
Lissa Paul
Zhang Shengzhen
Lissa Paul
- 16-38 Poetry and Psychoanalysis: The Ethics of Desire in W. B. Yeats's Poetic
Discourse
Youngmin Kim
- 39-59 The Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels after 1986
Nguyen Anh Dan
- 60-73 Universality and Locality in the Landscape of "World Literature": An
Exploration of Sinologist Idema's Research Path of the Chinese Baojuan
Li Yongping
Qiao Xianrong
- 74-88 Martha Nussbaum's View on Compassion: Controversies, Analysis and
Reflections
Chen Fen
Su Hui
- 89-101 An Ethical Interpretation of Jealousy: On the Brain Text and Ethical
Choice in Julian Barnes's *Before She Met Me*
Tang Yili
- 102-114 The Ethics in Desires of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*
Li Changting
- 115-124 Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice: An Ethical Literary Study on Liu
Hong's Novel *The Magpie Bridge*
Xiao Chunduan
- 125-134 Ethical Critical Approaches to Pascal Quignard's Novels
Ge Jinling
- 135-145 The Ecological Ethical Dilemma and Choice in *Fish King*
Zhou Lu

- 146-154 Goddess, widow, whore: The Ethical Identity Constructed in Seicho Matsumoto's *The Red Lottery*
Cao Yajie
Namigata Tsuyoshi
- 155-162 Amélie's Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice in *Métaphysique des tubes*
Song Ge
- 163-173 Overinterpretation: Subjectivity in Acceptance of Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel Theory
Ye Lin
Yao Tingting
- 174-179 Innovation in the Study of Bernard Shaw's Plays: A Review of *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays*
Nie Zhenzhao
- 180-183 Faith Is on the Road: An Introduction to *A Writer for the Liberal Tradition: Jack Kerouac*
Gong Gang
- 184-188 Reflection and Potentiality on Literature Studies: A Review of Jüri Talvet's *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the "Other"*
Li Zhuo

目 录

- 1-15 儿童文学批评方法、发展与挑战：丽莎·保罗访谈
张生珍
丽莎·保罗
- 16-38 诗歌与精神分析：叶芝诗性话语中的欲望伦理学
金英敏
- 39-59 1986 后越南农村小说中的伦理选择
阮英民
- 60-73 “世界文学”景观中普适性与地方性：汉学家伊维德中国宝卷研究
路径与伦理身份
李永平
乔现荣
- 74-88 玛莎·努斯鲍姆的同情论：争议、辨析与反思
陈 芬
苏 晖
- 89-101 嫉妒的伦理阐释：论朱利安·巴恩斯《她过去的爱情》中的脑文本
与伦理选择
汤轶丽
- 102-114 《查泰莱夫人的情人》中欲望的伦理表达
李长亭
- 115-124 刘宏小说《鹊桥》中的伦理身份与选择分析
肖淳端
- 125-134 帕斯卡·基尼亚尔小说的伦理批评的审视
葛金玲
- 135-145 《鱼王》的生态伦理困境与伦理选择
周 露

146-154 女神、未亡人、娼妇：论松本清张《红签》中被建构的伦理身份

曹雅洁

波瀾剛

155-162 《管子的玄思》中阿梅丽的伦理身份与伦理选择

宋 歌

163-173 过度阐释：巴赫金复调小说理论接受的主体性研究

叶 林

姚婷婷

174-179 萧伯纳戏剧研究的创新：评刘茂生教授的《社会与政治的伦理表达：

萧伯纳戏剧研究》

聂珍钊

180-183 信仰在路上：《自由主义传统的书写者：杰克·克鲁亚克》论要

龚 刚

184-188 文学研究的反思与未来构想：评尤里·塔尔维特《世界文学、比较文学与他者》

李 卓

Approaches and Challenges in Children's Literature: An Interview with Lissa Paul

Zhang Shengzhen & Lissa Paul

Abstract: Lissa Paul has authored, edited or co-edited seven books, including *The Norton Anthology of Children's Literature* (2005) and *Keywords for Children's Literature* (2011), has chapters in another nineteen and publishes and speaks widely internationally. She edited the *Lion and the Unicorn* between 2002 and 2009 and inaugurated the “*Lion and the Unicorn Award for Excellence in North American Poetry*” in 2005. Her research is generously funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) of Canada and her new monograph, *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist* was published by the University of Delaware Press in 2019. She is currently working on an edition of Fenwick's letters, and as an outgrowth of her research, Lissa is also working on projects related to the fugitive slave ads in the *Barbados Mercury Gazette* (1783-1828). As Lissa was a co-applicant on a winning British Library Endangered Archives Programme grant to digitize the papers, she is now doing archival research using the digitized versions of the *Gazette*. A second, more international edition of *Keywords for Children's Literature*, co-edited with Philip Nel and Nina Christensen, is scheduled for publication by New York University Press early 2021. Zhang Shengzhen, a Fulbright visiting scholar at New York University (2019-2020), interviewed Lissa Paul on a wide range of topics in the field of children's literature, including critical approaches and new challenges in children's literature, Canadian children's literature, her editing career in children's literature, and her original research in *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*. Prof. Paul also argues the challenges arising from “education gone bad,” as well as the importance of developing a global community of scholars in the field.

Key words: approaches, development and challenges, children's literature

Authors: **Zhang Shengzhen** is Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Language and Culture University (Beijing, China 100083). Her areas of research include children's literature, British and American literature, and comparative literature (Email: zhangshengzhen@blcu.edu.cn); Lissa Paul, Professor at Brock University in the Niagara region of Ontario, Canada, is a literary scholar specializing in children's literature, particularly in children's poetry, as well

as in cultural studies and more recently, in the eighteenth century and Caribbean literary studies (Email: lpaul@brocku.ca).

标题：儿童文学批评方法、发展与挑战：丽莎·保罗访谈

摘要：丽莎·保罗独立出版过数本著作，此外还编辑并与他人合作出版了数本书，包括《诺顿儿童文学选集》（*The Norton Anthology of Children's Literature*, 2005）和《儿童文学关键词》（*Keywords for Children's Literature*, 2011）。此外，丽莎在国际学术交流领域著作等身，撰写了十九本书中的部分章节。2002至2009年间，她担任《狮子与独角兽》杂志的编辑，并在2005年创立了“狮子与独角兽：北美最佳诗歌奖”。受惠于加拿大社会科学人文研究理事会（SSHRC）的资助，保罗教授新著《伊莉莎·芬威克：早期现代女权主义者》（*Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*）由美国特拉华大学于2019年出版。目前，她致力于研究芬威克书信集。基于此项研究，丽莎还参与了《巴巴多斯水星报》（*Barbados Mercury Gazettee*, 1783-1828）上涉及逃亡奴隶追缉令的相关项目。丽莎还与他人合作申请了大英图书馆濒危档案项目，旨在将文献资料数据化。由菲利普·内尔和尼娜·克里斯坦森合作编辑出版的第二版《儿童文学关键词》更加国际化，将由纽约大学出版社在2021年初出版。张生珍利用从事富布赖特学者项目（2019-2020）之机，对保罗教授进行了访谈，内容涉及儿童文学领域的诸多问题，包括儿童文学批评方法、国际学术合作、儿童文学研究前沿问题、以及保罗教授新著等。此外，保罗教授对“教育变糟糕”所造成的文学教育窘况甚为担忧，呼吁国际儿童文学领域形成共识和合力，以期走出困境。

关键词：批评范式；发展与挑战；儿童文学

作者简介：张生珍，北京语言大学英语学院教授、博导，主要从事外国儿童文学研究、英美文学和比较文学研究。丽莎·保罗是位于加拿大安大略省尼亚加拉半岛的布鲁克大学的文学教授，主要研究领域为儿童文学。保罗教授在儿童诗歌和文化研究等领域颇有造诣，最新研究聚焦十八世纪文学和加勒比海地区文学。本文是2017年国家社科基金重点项目“英国儿童文学中的国族意识与伦理教诲研究”【项目编号：17AWW008】和2019年国家社科基金重大项目“《世界儿童文学百科全书》翻译及儿童文学批评史研究”【项目编号：19ZDA297】的阶段性成果。

Contributions on Editing

Zhang Shengzhen (Zhang for short hereafter): Let's get started with your work in editing. You and Philip Nel edited the 2011 version *Keywords for Children's Literature*, which is very helpful for those interested in this field. What is the

motivation for this work? What are the differences between the 2011 version and the new version?

Lissa Paul (Paul for short hereafter): Keywords for Children's Literature was Phil Nel's idea. He'd gone to a presentation on Keywords for American Cultural Studies edited by Bruce Burgett and Glenn Hendler in, I think, 2007, around the time of its publication by New York University Press. Predicated on the idea of a specific, discipline-driven updating of Raymond Williams's groundbreaking *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (1976), Phil recognized instantly that a keywords volume specific to children's literature was an inspired idea. Phil, incidentally, is always awake to timely good ideas, and he also has the organizational skill and insight to make them happen.

In keeping with Williams's original, "keywords" concept of mapping "conflicted or contested" terms in a field, Phil says that he immediately started jotting down potential "keywords" used in studies in children's literature. Not long after beginning to think about the viability of a volume of keywords for children's literature, Phil and his wife Karin Westman, were in Toronto (where I live) for a conference and we'd gone out to dinner together. Phil slipped me the bit of paper with his initial thoughts on what a volume of keywords for children's literature might look like and asked if I'd be interested in co-editing. At the time, I was trying to write what became *The Children's Book Business*, but Phil's idea was so compelling that I knew from the first that I wanted to do the project with him.

I loved working with Phil. In the initial stages, we just tried to figure out what words were potential keywords, words with conflicted or contested meanings in the field or words that were used in difficult or interesting ways. We also thought through our potential lists of authors for the essays. We knew that we'd need established scholars, people with a clear grasp of the breadth and depth of their subjects, people who could write clear and coherent prose. That's how the first edition of *Keywords for Children's Literature* came into existence in 2011, with forty-nine entries, written by an extraordinary range of American, Canadian, British and Australian scholars in literature, information studies, education and psychology, people well-known in studies in the field: Peter Hunt, Sandra Beckett, Richard Flynn, Marah Gubar, Michael Joseph and Katherine Capshaw Smith among others. We were also thrilled to have Philip Pullman's essay on "Intention" in our volume.

Phil and I worked well together, and we gradually got better at understanding how to optimize the relatively short (roughly twenty-five-hundred-word essays) of the first edition. We learned how to focus on the "cartography of fissures in meaning, and the etymological and ideological tensions they produce," and the

explanations of “where a critical idea came from, what it means and why its meanings shift.” We didn’t quite know how to express the essence of a keywords essay that precisely when we started. The definition I’ve just quoted comes from the introduction to our second edition (which won’t be published until the end of 2020 or the beginning of 2021). But even as we completed the first edition, we understood that putting together a keywords essay was much like assembling a particularly complicated jigsaw puzzle—though without the help of the complete picture typically displayed on the box. Fittingly, when the first edition of *Keywords for Children’s Literature* came out, the cover was a little puzzle, a primary-coloured rebus: an image of a key, the number four, a silhouette of a person speaking, a graphic of a boy and a girl (divided by an apostrophe) and a stack of books. It was a perfect little graphic spelling out the title, *Keywords for Children’s Literature*. We loved that the rebus was printed over a yellow on yellow background of some of the words in the volume including “childhood,” “innocence” “picture book” and “class.”

Zhang: I believe almost all the essential key words are included in the first version, though some words are hard to define, especially for a special group of people. There must be creative ideas in rewriting the second edition.

Paul: Encouraged by the success of the first edition of *Keywords for Children’s Literature*, we began to plan for a second edition almost as soon as the first edition was in print. In fact, it was on probably our first outing with the book at a conference in Oslo that we became aware of a need for a new more international edition, though we were initially a little taken aback by the reaction. We’d defined our original volume in the context of Anglophone children’s literature, but in Oslo, we were criticized—sharply—for not addressing an international audience. Although we had deliberately skewed our original volume towards Anglophone, especially American interests, we realized how narrow some of our original terms were. We’d included African-American for example, rather than, say, African-Diasporic. For the new edition, we decided instead on a single essay on “Race,” though we also have a—much revised—essay on “Multicultural.” In the context of other ways in which we rethought the table of contents, you should know that we also revisited terms we had initially decided to leave out. When Phil and I first considered “Fairy Tale” and “Poetry,” we felt that they didn’t meet our “conflicted or contested” requirement. We were wrong. Both are in the new edition. My point is that almost as soon as the first edition was in print, we invited formal criticism personally and at conferences over the next couple of years. We took all the

suggestions about possible revisions seriously.

In 2015 we received the go-ahead for a new edition, partly because of the success of our book, but also because of the success of the other “keywords” volumes published by what became a series for New York University Press. There are now eight volumes, including Keywords for Disability Studies and Keywords for Media Studies. In the process of becoming part of the series, we lost our distinctive rebus cover. We got over it, especially as we realized that our original volume had a broader reach than we’d originally imagined.

Zhang: Could you share with the readers the most important updating of the new version?

Paul: The first thing we did in planning for a second, more international edition, was to decide to invite a third editor to work with us, someone who could help us break out of our North American bubble. We asked Nina Christensen from Denmark to join us, and it was the best decision we could have made. It’s taken us three years of intense work to put together the new edition of Keywords for Children’s Literature. There are now fifty-nine essays in the volume, and though the essays are shorter than the ones in the first volume, they all address our new international mandate. We retired some essays (though they will be available online), had the remaining original ones substantially revised and invited new essays. We also created an international advisory board to help us broaden our mandate. By the end of 2020, if all goes well, the new and much improved second edition of Keywords for Children’s Literature will be in print.

Zhang: That’s great news! I always consult Keywords for Children’s Literature, other dictionaries and encyclopedias, when I need clarification or multiple perspectives. It’s been so helpful and illuminating!

Paul: We’re delighted, especially—as is typically the case when designing a new project—there is no way of knowing how it will be received. You’ll be pleased to know that all three of us think that the new edition of Keywords is distinctly better. The process of writing—and editing—keywords essays was tricky, as each word has its own set of criteria. A keywords essay on “Fairy Tale” for example (a word with a long complex, multilingual and multicultural history), does not look the same as a keywords essay on “Trans” (a word that has only recently come into use). My own new essay is on “Archive.”

In the new edition, Phil Nel’s updated essay on “Postmodernism” includes references to the use of the word in China, to the way it “carries strong connotations

of post-revolutionary” (Phil cites a 1997 by Arif Dirlik and Zhang Xudong from boundary 2 for the reference). Phil also sent me a reminder note, confirming that in the new edition of *Keywords*, there are references to China or Chinese in the essays on “Affect,” “Audience,” “Authenticity,” “Boyhood,” “Children’s Literature,” “Classic,” “Culture,” “Family,” “Fairy Tale,” “Gender,” “Identity,” “Multicultural,” “Postmodernism,” “Race,” “Story,” “Trans” and “Translation.”

Zhang: That sounds very internationalized. We have a large body of readers and researchers in children’s literature in China. More voices are to be heard, and more understanding and cooperation will arise.

Zhang: Besides this new book, *The Norton Anthology of Children’s Literature* (NACL) (2005) which you worked on with Jack Zipes, Lynne Vallone, Peter Hunt and Gillian Avery, is a very influential handbook across the world. If there is updating, what might be changed? And what might be added?

Paul: The NACL was Jack’s idea, and I was thrilled when he invited me to be one of the editors. Part way through the process, as Jack began working on the *Oxford Encyclopedia of Children’s Literature* (2006), he asked Lynne Vallone and me to take over as the Associate General Editors, though he remained as General Editor.

From the first, all five of us as editors, knew that in making a Norton Anthology of Children’s Literature we would be essentially defining what was canonical in the field. We were honored and delighted to be involved and also deeply conscious of the fact that our decisions would define the contours of the discipline. One of our first problems involved figuring out how we were going to organize the volume because we knew that the standard chronological approach that typically structured Norton anthologies (of English Literature or American Literature for instance) wouldn’t work. It was Jack’s idea to organize the volume by genre and then try, at least as far as possible, to organize chronologically within genres. As editors, we each had responsibility for shaping a set of the (eighteen ultimately) genre clusters that made up the volume (my sections were Primers and Readers, Verse, Adventure and Books of Instruction), though Lynne and I also took general editing responsibilities for the whole volume.

We loved working with Norton and appreciated the care, attention and support we received at every level. The composition of headnotes for sections and individual works was an exacting exercise in being able to set up the chronological and critical arc arcs. When the NACL was published in 2005, we were thrilled to have it positively reviewed in the *New York Times Review of Books*.

The world has, of course, radically changed in the fifteen years since the publication of the NACL. Many of the historical texts we made available are now online, and the full texts of children's books that may have been hard to access in print are now available in cheap—essentially weightless—digital editions. Peter and Jack are now more or less retired, and Gillian has, sadly, died.

About two years ago, however, Lynne Vallone and I were approached to think about what a new kind of Norton Anthology of Children's Literature might look like, something for the twenty-first century. With the support of our terrific Norton editors (our original editor, Julia Reidhead is now the president of the company) Lynne and I have been developing a volume to be called, tentatively, *Norton Approaches to Children's Literature*. It will be very different, essentially a core text that could be used for teaching children's literature, though it will have the character of a Norton in that it will define critical elements in the field. We're aiming for publication in 2023, which will be the hundredth anniversary of the W. W. Norton company.

Zhang: I do believe *Norton Approaches to Children's Literature* will be of great interest and value to worldwide researchers as well as general readers of children's literature. Working with different journals and periodicals, how do you evaluate the co-operation in the field of children's literature?

Paul: From the early to middle 1970s, the rise of scholarly journals in children's literature really marked the first steps into creating the field as a discipline of its own. *Signal*, *Children's Literature*, *Children's Literature in Education*, *The Children's Literature Association Quarterly* and *The Lion and the Unicorn*, all date from that period. It was in those journals that scholars beginning to do research in children's literature were able to find venues for their work. Without the scholars nurtured in those journals, the scholarly apparatus that has grown around the discipline—including the NACL and *Keywords for Children's Literature*—would have not been possible. There would be no discipline as we know it today.

I've been very lucky. As a young, beginning scholar, I was fortunate enough to have Nancy Chambers of *Signal* (1969-2003) in the UK, take an interest in my work. While still a graduate student, I'd written what was essentially a fan letter to Nancy, as I'd found in *Signal* exactly the kind of writing I wanted to do. It was elegant, precise, scholarly, original and yet, as Nancy later described it to me, pitched to the "general interested reader." I always read the journal cover to cover. Nancy edited my first published essay. It was on Ted Hughes. My second published essay, "Enigma Variations," was a finalist for the Children's Literature Association's

essay award. I'm always careful to credit Nancy and her husband, author Aidan Chambers, for teaching me to read, write and edit. They also introduced me to other scholars—including Peter Hunt—from whom I've learned a great deal, and to whom I owe a lot of my own academic credibility.

When *Signal* stopped publishing in 2003, I knew I'd particularly miss the *Signal* Poetry Award essays that had appeared annually between 1979 and 2001. It was really through reading the essays that I developed a critical vocabulary for talking about children's poetry as well as access to new poets. In some ways the award—as conceptualized by Nancy and Aidan—was almost a kind of excuse for writing about the year's work in children's poetry. In order to adjudicate the award, Nancy and Aidan invited three judges to consider the year's offerings, and then come together to decide on the winner. Then *Signal* would announce the winner and publish each judge's assessments of the volumes that had been submitted.

As it happened, just as *Signal* was ending in the early 2000s, Jack Zipes invited me to become one of the three new editors (the other two were George Bodmer and Jan Susina) of the *Lion and the Unicorn*, published by Johns Hopkins University Press. In the end, I served as an editor between 2002 and 2009. But almost from the beginning of my editorial tenure, I realized that I could reprise the *Signal* poetry award essays in a new form: a single essay composed by three author/judges. With Richard Flynn, Joseph Thomas (who later became the Poetry editor) and Kelly Hager as the first judges in the 2005, the "Lion and the Unicorn Award for Excellence in North American Poetry Award" was born and it is ongoing. In 2010, Karin Westman, David Russell and Naomi Wood took over the editing of *The Lion and the Unicorn* and they've been doing a terrific job. For the 2018 issue, Richard, Joseph and I composed our final essay, called "A Last Word."

On the general question of co-operation in the field of children's literature, I would say that it is informed by generosity and co-operation of scholars in the field. There is also strong support for emerging scholars. Established scholars tend to be on the editorial boards of several journals, and we all serve as referees for a range of journals. We're also the ones typically asked to assess promotion and tenure files of scholars in the process of establishing their academic careers.

Zhang: All these are leading journals in promoting research and writing in children's literature. These journals are highlighted in China as well. Compared with the English circle, there are no specific journals specializing in children's literature in China, but some journals, such as *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*, *Foreign Literature Studies*, sporadically publish insightful articles in this field. But there are

steady growing demands for publication from researchers and writers in China.

Paul: That's good news. Throughout our work on Keywords, we recognized that we didn't have enough representation from China—or Korea or India—or a host of other countries. As a way of consoling ourselves we tried to remind ourselves that our project was always going to be partial. The IRSCJL journal too, incidentally, is explicitly dedicated to increasing the international reach of scholarly work in the field. Kim Reynolds is the current editor. We recognize the importance of developing a global community of scholars.

Zhang: That's fabulous! These years witness the growing voices of Chinese scholars working in the field of comparative literature, English literature or Chinese literature, internationally recognized. We are eager to be heard, to work with scholars across the world.

Critical Perspectives in Children's Literature and Literary Theory

Zhang: "Ethical literary criticism," put forward by Nie Zhenzhao, is a theory and methodology for reading, interpreting, understanding, analyzing and evaluating literature from an ethical standpoint. It argues that "literature is a historically contingent presentation of ethics and morality and that reading literature helps human beings to reap moral enlightenment and thus make better ethical choices. The mission of ethical literary criticism is to uncover the ethical value of literature" (Nie, 24&248). How do you elaborate on the application of ethical literary criticism to children's literature?

Paul: In Anglo-European traditions of children's literature, the transmission of "moral enlightenment" has been historically important, partly because the origins of the genre itself are typically traced to the late Enlightenment of the eighteenth century. The historical tag line was, of course, "to instruct and delight." By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, with the rise of high fantasy (Alice in Wonderland, for example), literature of the earlier period was being dismissed as "didactic," and "imagination" became the desirable quality. F. J. Harvey Darton's 1932 monumental *Children's Books in England*, established that narrative historical line. It proved difficult to displace primarily because it fitted so well with the Romantic views of children and childhood as innocent: ignorance is, however, the unspoken dark side of innocence. By the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, with the Romantic innocent (and ignorant) child becoming a thing of the past, and the construction of the thinking, knowing, socially responsible child on the rise, morality and ethics are again in the ascendant. In

2014, Claudia Mills, an excellent children scholar, edited an essay collection, *Ethics and Children's Literature*, published by Ashgate. The opening section is, in fact, titled, "The Dilemma of Didacticism: Attempts to Shape Children as Moral Beings." Increasingly, as "didacticism" loses its historical bad rap, it is being reconsidered in the light of books for children that do wrestle with complex ethical issues. Clémentine Beauvais, for instance, does just that in her lovely essay on "Didactic" for our forthcoming edition of *Keywords for Children's Literature*. She concludes with reference to a terrific Cambridge-based scholar, Louise Joy, and her recalibration of the aesthetics of didactic children's literature in her new book, *Literature's Children: The Critical Child and the Art of Idealization*.

The basic point I'm making is that as the construction of the twenty-first century thinking, knowing, socially responsible child takes shape, both literature for children and scholarship in the field are increasingly concerned with the ethical dilemmas facing us at the moment: the climate crisis, as well as social inequities and injustices are at the top of the list.

Zhang: Yes. How to tackle with the ethical dilemmas facing us is one of the missions with the scholarship of ethical literary criticism. I remember you are greatly concerned with children's education recently, why do you think "Education Gone Bad" struck a chord?

Paul: My (relatively) recent work with Elizabeth (Beth) Marshall on "Education Gone Bad," was really a case in point of scholars of different generations working together. Beth is a terrific, innovative scholar, now working at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. She produced a wonderful essay on "Gender" for the new edition of *Keywords for Children's Literature*.

I was honored when Beth asked me to work with her to develop a proposal (based on an IRSL panel from 2014 she'd organized) for a special issue in *Children's Literature in Education* (published in March 2018). Between proposal and publication, the world had changed radically: the "Trump effect" and "Brexit" had become part of a new vocabulary that hadn't even been on the horizon when we proposed the special issue in 2015. Although we initially thought we were addressing some of the issues related, for instance, to inequities in education and to school shootings, we realized that by 2018, the issues to which we'd pointed had been exacerbated. As I'm writing my responses to your questions in May 2020, in the midst of the global shutdown caused by COVID-19, no children—at least no children in North America—are in schools. Inequities in education are now even more obvious in that while middle-class children who live in relatively large and

comfortable spaces are likely to have computers of their own, access to strong internet connections, as well as dedicated space and time for education, the chances of poor children having those options are limited.

Zhang: That's true! Inequities in education has never been so painfully acknowledged as today. Would you like to share a bit of your concerns about the influence of the "badness" on children's literature?

Paul: Initially we had thought primarily about the deadening effects of test-driven schooling on the imaginative lives of children, and on teachers. In our original paper call we invited papers tackling "difficult or unsuccessful pedagogical relationships and on representations of schools that turn from the benign towards the dystopian, the violent, or the monstrous." My own concern—for a long time now—has been on ways in which literacy has pushed literature out of the curriculum. It breaks my heart to see the undergraduates I teach being indifferent to the idea that a children's book might make sense, that it might mean something, that it might have emotional or intellectual complexity—that it might be worth reading and remembering. Literacy education has reduced books for children to a series of constituent parts—the presence or absence of colour or morals or sight vocabulary words. Education in a time of COVID has become even more fractured, with online instruction increasingly removed from the possibility of discussion or the investigation of nuanced interpretive possibilities in any subject.

Zhang: What are issues related to "challenging the authority of texts"? How do you evaluate "Children's Literature and Literary Theory"? What are the critical perspectives including feminist theories, semiotics, post-colonial discourse, reader-response theories, new historicism and on cultural studies?

Paul: When I started teaching those courses—or variations of them—early in my career, the idea of using post-structuralist theoretical approaches being developed in literary criticism and applying them to children's literature was considered novel. Historically, when Leavisite or New Critical Approaches of the mid-twentieth century held sway, they provided few insights into the analysis of children's literature, primarily because they privileged the "authority" of texts (so the emphasis on theme, structure, setting and the like). The application of post-structuralist theories to children's books, however, initiated entirely new ways of looking and understanding, new kinds of analysis.

In the courses I teach, I try to introduce students both to theoretical approaches (that might otherwise appear daunting), and to ways in which those approaches

illuminate works of children's literature. I might, for instance, use Louis Althusser's ideas about ideology and the ideological state apparatuses when teaching Marjane Satrapi's *Persepolis*. Or I might use some of my own early work on feminist theory (from *Reading Otherways*) to teach something about the power dynamics in *Snow White In New York* by Fiona French. Or I'd use semiotic theory (perhaps some Umberto Eco) in reading Anthony Browne's *Voices in the Park*, in order to speak to the ways in which the red hat of the mother repeatedly "overshadows" her son. Or I might use post-colonial perspectives to contrast colonial poems from Stevenson's *A Child's Garden of Verses* with post-colonial *Come on into My Tropical Garden* by Grace Nichols. I also used essays from the first edition of *Keywords for Children's Literature* successfully in a cultural studies class a few years ago, and as an exercise, had the students compose their own "Keywords for Education" essays modelled on the published ones they studied. The essays the students wrote were terrific, and included "keywords" on "numeracy," "propaganda" and "innovation." They were published together with "keywords" essays produced by Phil's students in *Brock Education* 27, 2 (April 2018). Phil and I co-edited the issue of the journal (it's available online) and the students all received a publication credit.

Zhang: That's very impressive! But some scholars argue for an ethical turn in the field of children's literature, which means all the lens of society, such as gender, race and class issues should be included and interpreted from a certain literary theoretical perspective. How do you elaborate on this?

Paul: There is no question that issues related to gender, race, and class are now central to literary discussions, though they are often taken together and referred to as "intersectional." One of the reasons that these discussions are available at all is because there is so much more children's literature being published that no longer references a default white, Christian, middle-class Anglo-European construction of children and childhood. Questions of ethics in children's literature are interesting in that they implicitly reference concepts of "suitability" for children. That in turn makes us question what we think children are like and the issues which we deem might be beneficial or instructive—or interesting or entertaining or ethical. I think that the question isn't so much about applying a particular literary theoretical perspective to texts, but rather about recognizing the fact that when looking at a text through a specifically focused specialized "lens" it is possible to see interpretive possibilities that were invisible before. A random example. *The Paper Bag Princess* (1980) by Robert Munsch is typically celebrated because an "active" princess inverts the standard fairy tale trope: here the princess rescues the prince

instead of the other way around. But if looked at more closely through a feminist lens, the story doesn't quite work as a feminist text. The reason the princess drops the prince in the end is because he is vain and cares only about his clothes. That is, as his flaws are the ones gendered feminine (vanity and attention to clothes), he is rejected because he is too much like a girl.

Beyond Canadian Children's Literature

Zhang: In China, international books such as *Anne of the Green Gables*, are widely read. But other than this novel, many other Canadian classical works are still unfamiliar to Chinese readers. Who are the representative authors and what are the classical books you may recommend to Chinese readers?

Paul: *Anne of Green Gables*, and other books by L. M. Montgomery remain well loved by Canadians. But in terms of "classic" Canadian books that have sustained, I'd say that there is an entire genre of realistic animal stories, the best known being *Wild Animals I Have Known* (1898) by Ernest Thompson Seton. There are a couple of other "wilderness" adventures that used to be well known but given the ways in which Indigenous cultures were represented, they now have faded. The two most important would likely be Farley Mowat, *Lost in the Barrens* (1956) and Roderick Haig Brown, *The Whale People* (1962).

It was really in the 1980s and 1990s that Canadian children's authors really hit their stride, supported by new and wonderful publishing companies, especially ones such as Kids Can Press, Groundwood and Tundra. *The Hockey Sweater* (1979) by Roch Carrier, published by Tundra, is a Canadian classic. From that period, I'd also recommend Tim Wynne-Jones, especially *The Maestro* (1995), a young adult novel, and *Zoom at Sea* (1983), a picture book. *The Root Cellar* (1981) and *Shadow at Hawthorne Bay* (1986), both young adult novels by Janet Lunn, also stand out. Four recent books will, I think, become classic: *Coyote Columbus* (1992), a picture book by Tom King; *Sidewalk Flowers* (2015), a wordless picture book by JonArno Lawson; *The Marrow Thieves* (2017) a young adult novel by Cherie Dimaline; and a quirky counting book, *Count Your Chickens* (2017) by Jo Ellen Bogart.

Zhang: Would you like to share with us your recent publication *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*. What is the motivation of your research of Eliza Fenwick? What are the contributions of Eliza Fenwick?

Paul: I've been working on what I've been calling my "Eliza" project for a number of years now. When I was still a professor at the University of New Brunswick I'd stumbled on *Visits to the Juvenile Library*, Eliza's 1805 product placement novel

on an upmarket London children's book shop, Tabart's Juvenile Library. Eliza's novel ultimately became the structural core for *The Children's Book Business: Lessons from the Long Eighteenth Century* published by Routledge in 2011. I'd also gone on to discover some of her other innovative books for children, including *Rays from the Rainbow*, a paint-by-number, parse by color grammar book (it was reproduced in a facsimile edition by the Osborne Collection) and a few others. I also found her 1795 novel for adults, *Secresy* (still in print in a modern edition) and a collection of letters she had written to author Mary Hays between 1798 and 1828, published as *The Fate of The Fenwicks* in 1927. When I arrived at Brock in 2005, I realized that although there was nothing definitive, there were hints (in the introductions to the letters and to *Secresy*) that Eliza had moved to Upper Canada (the colonial name for Ontario) in the 1830s. I realized that I loved Eliza's work and was intrigued by the fact that she'd moved from the intimate circle of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin in the radical London of the 1790s (she'd attended the birth of Mary Godwin—later Shelley—and the death of her mother Mary Wollstonecraft) and travelled via Barbados to North America. I wrote a grant application to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) more or less asking what Eliza, who had been so much a part of literary London life in the 1790s was doing in Upper Canada in the 1830s. At the time, I can now admit, I was worried that the question might have been rhetorical. I won the grant and got lucky, very lucky. I found an unreferenced, apparently unknown cache of manuscript letters Eliza and her granddaughter had written primarily from Niagara and Toronto to friends in New York in the 1830s—telling me exactly what she was doing in Upper Canada. The funding enabled me to do the research for my biography. What I ultimately discovered was an astonishing transnational story of “an early modern feminist.” Eliza was, for most of her adult life, a single working mother, then grandmother, supporting her family on her own. Her letters are riveting.

Zhang: It seems a long-time ago story. We know more of “her the intimate circle of Mary Wollstonecraft and William Godwin, and later Mary Shelley (Paul, 3)”, but we know so little of Eliza. What are your other findings?

Paul: I loved doing the research on Eliza, and it did require a huge amount of painstaking archival digging. In the context of children's literature, one of the things I was able to discover is that Eliza was the likely editor for Tabart's *Songs for the Nursery* (1805). One of the nursery verses, “Arthur O'Bower,” was, according to the Opies, first published in that volume. And there is a note, from

Charles Lamb, confirming receipt of the poems from Dorothy Wordsworth and saying that he had sent them to “the bookseller” (Tarbart), who had, in turn, paid Eliza for them. *Songs for the Nursery*, as the Opies explain, was one of the texts used by Halliwell for what became the definitive edition of English nursery verse.

One extraordinary outgrowth of my work on Eliza, was the research I did in Barbados, initially using crumbling microfilm copies of the Barbados Mercury Gazette. Eventually, I was a co-applicant on a winning British Library Endangered Programme grant to digitize the Gazette (1793-1828). The material on which I spoke in Princeton on the children of the fugitive slave ads, came out of the research I've done using the newspapers and it is part of an ongoing project.

Zhang: I have read *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*, which is illuminating, exhaustive and documentary. It is the painful but invaluable way of digging out those hidden but prominent writers. You did a tremendous job! Thank you for the interview!

Works Cited

- Paul, Lissa. *Eliza Fenwick: Early Modern Feminist*. Newark: University of Delaware, 2019.
- Nie, Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.

Poetry and Psychoanalysis:

The Ethics of Desire in W. B. Yeats's Poetic Discourse

Youngmin Kim

Abstract: Man in the modern world becomes aware of strange areas of knowledge both within and around him and uncertain of his identity. For a source of order, he turns to the “mysterious” formal properties of language, which Foucault terms as “a profound historicity,” a “historical form coherent with the density of its own past.” This turn to “mysterious” forms for representing modern complexities stimulate the modern poets to seek for a strategic medium. The Freudian “Unconscious” is the most efficient medium for revealing and hiding the thick “density of its own past” of “profound historicity.” In this context, my objective in this essay is to construct a post-Freudian poetics of unconscious desire. Since both psychoanalysis and analysis of literary texts follow the logic coming from the unconscious, signifiers coming from the dream is crucial in constructing the interpretation of both the patient’s discourse and the literary discourse of the speaking/writing subject. Lacan’s poetics of the unconscious desire and the discourse of sublimation provides a theoretical model for analyzing Yeats’s poetic discourse. On the one hand, Yeats’s poetry demonstrates effectively the fundamental mechanisms of Freudian dream work. On the other hand, poet’s unconscious desire comes from “elsewhere,” from the mysterious formal properties of language in relation to the Foucauldian historical form. Based upon these two rationales of dream rhetoric and historical narrative, Yeats’s unconscious text of the poetic discourse will be dealt with in the context of the ethics of desire.

Key words: psychoanalysis and poetry; ethics of desire; sublimation and unconscious discourse; empty speech and full speech

Author: **Youngmin Kim** is currently Distinguished Research Professor of Emeritus of English at Dongguk University and Jack Ma Chair Professor at Hangzhou Normal University, China. His research interest includes 20th and 21st century poetries in English/Irish/Canadian/British/American literature, comparative and world literature, digital humanities, Lacanian psychoanalysis and critical theory (Email: youngm@hznu.edu.cn, youngm@dongguk.edu).

* This work was supported by Global Research Network program through the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (Project Number: NRF-2017S1A2A2050414).

标题：诗歌与精神分析：叶芝诗性话语中的欲望伦理学

内容摘要：在现代世界中，人类意识到自己内部和周围陌生的知识领域以及不确定的身份。为了获得秩序，他转向了语言的“神秘”形式属性，福柯称之为“深刻的历史性”，“一种与它自身的过去的深度相一致的历史形式”。这一代表现代复杂性的“神秘”形式转向激励了现代诗人寻求策略性的媒介。弗洛伊德的“无意识”是揭示和隐藏“自己过去深度”的“深刻的历史性”的最有效媒介。在此背景下，本文旨在构建无意识欲望的后弗洛伊德诗学。由于精神分析和文学文本分析都遵循来自无意识的逻辑，因此，在建构关于口语/写作主体的患者话语和文学话语的解释时，来自于梦的能指至关重要。拉康关于无意识欲望和升华话语的诗学为分析叶芝的诗性话语提供了理论模型。一方面，叶芝的诗歌有效地展示了弗洛伊德梦工的基本机制；另一方面，诗人的无意识欲望来自“其他地方”，来自于和福柯历史形式相关的语言的“神秘”形式属性。基于梦修辞学和历史叙事这两个基本原理，本文将在欲望伦理学的语境中分析叶芝诗性话语的无意识文本。

关键词：精神分析与诗歌；欲望伦理学；升华和无意识的话语；虚言和实言

作者简介：金英敏，韩国东国大学荣誉教授、中国杭州师范大学马云基金讲座教授。他的研究兴趣包括 20 世纪和 21 世纪英国/爱尔兰/加拿大/英国/美国文学中的诗歌，比较和世界文学，数字人文，拉康精神分析学和批判理论。

* 本文得到大韩民国教育部和韩国国家研究基金会的全球研究网络计划的支持【项目编号：NRF-2017S1A2A2050414】。

Michel Foucault, in his “Preface” to *The Order of Things* (1970), articulates the paradigm shift in “the field of Western knowledge” in a succinct paragraph:

In this way [of archaeology], analysis has been able to show the coherence that existed, throughout the Classical age, between the theory of representation and the theories of language, of the natural orders, and of wealth and value. It is this configuration that, from the nineteenth century onward, changes entirely; the theory of representation disappears as the universal foundation of all possible orders; language as the spontaneous *tabula*, the primary grid of things, as an indispensable link between representation and things, is eclipsed in its turn; a profound historicity penetrates into the heart of things, isolates and defines them in their own coherence, imposes upon them the forms of order implied by the continuity of time; the analysis of exchange and money gives way to the study of production, that of the organism takes precedence over the search for taxonomic characteristics, and above all, language loses its privileged position and becomes, in its turn, a historical form coherent with

the density of its own past. (xxiii)

Foucault further sees that man in the modern world becomes uncertain of his identity and newly aware of strange areas of knowledge both within and around him. For a source of order, he turns to the “mysterious” formal properties of language, which Foucault defines in terms of “a profound historicity” or “a historical form coherent with the density of its own past” in the quoted passage. This turn to “mysterious” forms for representing modern complexities stimulate the modern poets to seek for a strategic medium through which he can justify his faith in his visionary perception of the world, inviting readers to participate an imaginative echo chamber of literary communion.

One way to understand the mysterious formal properties of language is provided by the Freudian “Unconscious” which reveals and hides thick “density of its own past” of “profound historicity.” It was Jacques Lacan who initiates his return to Freud from the convergent perspective of linguistics, structural anthropology, psychology, and topology, and articulates the psychoanalytic nature of the Unconscious with his famous mottos of “The Unconscious is structured like a language” and “Desire is interpretation.”

In the realm of the contemporary literary theory and criticism, psychoanalysis provides a unique lense for rereading literary texts, giving us the pleasure of reading latent texts or unconscious texts, which were left unknown and unread. Nevertheless, few critics or theorists have attempted to employ the psychoanalytic approach to modernist texts, in particular, poetic texts, and their analyses of modern poetry were incomplete, failing to establish a coherent discourse in dealing with complex and fragmentary aspects of the unconscious discourse of fragmentary modernist texts. My objective in this essay is to construct a post-Freudian poetics of desire in terms of Jacques Lacan’s fundamental concepts, focusing on the formal properties of language in analysis. Since both psychoanalysis and analysis of literary texts follow the logic coming from the unconscious, signifiers coming from the dream is crucial in constructing the interpretation of both the patient’s discourse and the literary discourse of the speaking/writing subject.

The Poetics of the Unconscious Desire and the Discourse of Sublimation in Psychoanalysis: Empty Speech and Full Speech

In his “The Function and Field of Speech and Language in Psychoanalysis” (197-268) of *Écrits*, Lacan defines the structural principle of the psychoanalytic

discourse in terms of “reply and silence.” In “I. Empty Speech and Full Speech in the Psychoanalytic Realization of the Subject,” while touching on the nature of psychoanalytic discourse, Lacan relates the psychoanalytic realization of the subject to “healing, training, or sounding the depths.” He confirms the Freudian principle of psychoanalysis that the heart of the function of the speech lies in the fact that psychoanalysis has only one medium: “the patient’s speech,” and “no speech is without a response, even if speech meets only with silence, provided it has an auditor.” Lacan goes on elaborating this in the same page as follows:

But if the psychoanalyst is not aware that this is how speech functions, he will experience its call [appel] all the more strongly; and if emptiness is the first thing to make itself heard in analysis, he will feel it in himself and he will seek a reality beyond speech to fill the emptiness. This leads the analyst to analyze the subject’s behavior in order to find in it what the subject is not saying. (*Écrits* 206)

In fact, this “call” or appeal the subject was making beyond the emptiness of his words is “the appeal to truth” of the subject, reaching the “unsaid” (“what the subject is not saying”) truth in the unconscious by analyzing “the subject’s behavior.” During the psychoanalytic session, the analysand normally talks in free association, while the analyst silently listens. The function of speech in analysis becomes “empty” when the subject speaks in vain to the analyst who fails to reply or respond to what he desires. That is why in this process of “working through” (the German word “*Drucharbeiten*”), the subject reveals “frustration, aggressivity, and regression” (*Écrits* 207).

The frustration comes from the analyst’s silence in responding to the subject’s “empty speech” in which “the subject seems to speak in vain about someone who—will never join him in the assumption of his desire” (*Écrits* 211). In rhetorical questions, Lacan raises the fundamental issue of “where this frustration comes from”:

Is it from the analyst’s silence? Responding to the subject’s empty speech—even especially in an approving manner—often proves, by its effects, to be far more frustrating than silence. Isn’t it, rather, a frustration that is inherent in the subject’s very discourse? Doesn’t the subject become involved here in an ever greater dispossession of himself as a being, concerning which—by dint of sincere portraits which leave the idea of his being no less incoherent,

of rectifications that do not succeed in isolating its essence, of stays and defenses that do not prevent his statue from tottering, of narcissistic embraces that become like a puff of air in animating it—he ends up recognizing that this being has never been anything more than his own construction [oeuvre] in the imaginary and that this construction undercuts all certainty in him? For in the work he does to reconstruct it *for another*, he encounters anew the fundamental alienation that made him construct *like another*, and that has always destined it to be taken away from him *by another*. (*Écrits* 207).

In fact, Lacan has provided the list of the nature of internal frustration in the mind of the analysand who naturally reveals aggressiveness or resistance against the analyst to fill in the emptiness inside. What the analysand through the process of regression (bringing into the present in the subject's discourse) comes to recognize during his activity of free association is the illusory nature of his identity which results from "his own construction (oeuvre) in the imaginary" which "undercuts all certainty in him," or from "misrecognitions" (*méconnaissance*). As a result of this recognition or misrecognition, the analysand perceives that his own desired object belongs to the Imaginary Other or fantasy. Lacan remarks in relation to this perception:

This ego, whose strength our theorists now define by its capacity to bear frustration, is frustration in its essence. Not frustration of a desire of the subject, but frustration by an object in which his desire is alienated; and the more developed this object becomes, the more profoundly the subject becomes alienated from his *jouissance*. (*Écrits* 208)

Thus, as Lacan perceives, "the subject makes himself an object by displaying himself before the mirror" (*Écrits* 208), recalling the famous "mirror stage" of the "fragmented body." In free association, the subject's speech is filled with his alienating ego (*moi*) identity with the fragmented body before the mirror, thereby becoming "empty" of the subject. The analysand with symptom and "frustration by an object in which his desire is alienated" becomes alienated and fragmented in his objectification process. Lacan's obscure language, nevertheless, provides a succinct and clear context of this in terms of the "drama" of the mirror stage:

[T]he mirror stage is a drama whose internal pressure pushes precipitously from insufficiency to anticipation—and, for the subject caught up in the lure of

spatial identification, turns out fantasies that proceed from a fragmented image of the body to what I will call an “orthopedic” form of its totality—and to the finally donned armor of an alienating identity that will mark his entire mental development with its rigid structure. Thus, the shattering of the *Innenwelt* (the inner world of I) to *Umbelt* (the real world around the I) circle gives rise to an inexhaustible squaring of the ego's audits. (“The Mirror Stage as Formative of the *I* Function,” *Écrits* 78)

Having said this, Lacan's suggestion concerning the analyst's role is definitive:

The analyst's art must, on the contrary, involve suspending the subject's certainties until their final mirages have been consumed. And it is in the subject's discourse that their dissolution must be punctuated. Indeed, however empty his discourse may seem, it is so only if taken at face value—the value that justifies Mallarmé's remark, in which he compares the common use of language to the exchange of a coin whose obverse and reverse no longer bear but eroded faces, and which people pass from hand to hand “in silence.” This metaphor suffices to remind us that speech, even when almost completely worn out, retains its value as a *tassera*. Even if it communicates nothing, discourse represents the existence of communication; even if it denies the obvious, it affirms that speech constitutes truth; even if it is destined to deceive, it relies on faith in testimony. (*Écrits* 209)

In short, the analyst's role is to provide the interruption of the psychoanalytic dialogue so that empty speech of the analysand in free association can make sense when it is punctuated. This punctuation is called the “Lacanian cut,” helping the analysand reach a symbolic interpretation of his own associative discourse. Lacan's dictum, “Desire is interpretation,” can be understood in this context, and the analysand's desire to interpret himself is the aim for the psychoanalysis. Thus, the psychoanalytically realized subject can transform and overcome the empty speech and reach the full speech, by producing a coherent narrative which constitutes a subject and simultaneously reveals the truth of the subject.

Lacan, while referring to and following how Freud measures the validity of the cure in the case of the Wolf Man, claims that “the effect of full speech is to reorder past contingencies by conferring on them the sense of necessities to come, such as they are constituted by the scant freedom through which the subject

makes them present” (*Écrits* 213).¹ These “past contingencies,” as Lacan continues to demonstrate, construct the unconscious which is “the chapter of my history that is marked by a blank or occupied by a lie: it is a censored chapter,” and this chapter “has already been written *elsewhere*.” In literature, this chapter has been written either in the fictional/dramatic discourse or in the poetic discourse or in combination of any.

Psychoanalysis aims to re-find/refine the truth in “elsewhere” which Lacan himself identifies with: 1) “my body” as “monument” in which the hysterical symptom manifests the structure of language, and is deciphered like an inscription which, once recovered, can be destroyed without serious loss; 2) my “childhood memories” as “archival documents” which are impenetrable” “when I do not know their provenance”; 3) “the stock of words and acceptions of my own particular vocabulary” as “semantic evolution” which corresponds to “my style of life and my character”; 4) “the legends which, in a heroic-ized form, convey my history” as “traditions”; 5) last but not least, “the traces [of the unconscious] that are inevitably preserved in the distortions necessitated by the insertion of the adulterated chapter into the chapters surrounding it, and whose meaning will be re-established by my exegesis” (*Écrits* 215). In short, Lacan elaborates the nature of “the unconscious desire” in terms of “the censored chapter” of the analysand’s personal history to be “re-found” and “most often has already been written elsewhere.” When one attempts to interpret or give analysis of the truth of the psychoanalytic subject, the language of the unconscious desire (which is represented either by fictional/dramatic discourse or poetic discourse) is revealed in several features of the analysand’s symbolic behavior: bodily symptoms, childhood memories, particular vocabulary, legends and proto-narratives which provide the keys to the Lacanian “elsewhere.” This is the platform of psychoanalytic analysis which was introduced by Breuer and Freud and named “talking cure” by one of Breuer’s patients, Anna O, the platform which was further developed into the unconscious discourse of “sublimation” by Freud and Lacan.

1 Freud measures the completeness of the cure by the condition of continuity in the “anamnesis,” the condition which is a question of remembering the history of the subject and deciding the meaning to be attached to the early event belatedly. This anamnesis refers to the “reordering of the past contingencies” which belongs to “each turning point at which the subject restructures himself” (or “resubjectivizations of the event”) in remembering the history of the subject. In fact, this Freudian restructuring of the event takes place “after the fact” (*nachträglich*):

Freud declares that he considers it legitimate, in analyzing the processes, to elide the time intervals during which the event remains latent in the subject. That is to say, he annuls the *times for understanding* in favor of the moments of concluding which precipitate the subject’s meditation toward deciding the meaning to be attached to the early event. (*Écrits* 213)

Originally, Freud refers “sublimation” to the process by which the libido is transferred from a material object towards an object that does not have any connection with this physical need, thereby channeling or sublimating the libido into non-sexual activities such as artistic creation and intellectual work.¹ Lacan follows Freud and links sublimation with art and creation. In his “On Creation *ex nihilo*,” *Seminar VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis*, Lacan brings the object of the vase in a figurative sense:

It creates the void and thereby introduces the possibility of filling it. Emptiness and fullness are introduced into a world that by itself knows not of them. It is on the basis of this fabricated signifier, this vase, that emptiness and fullness as such enter the world, neither more or less, and with the same sense.

This is the moment to point to the fallacious opposition between what is called concrete and what is called figurative. If the vase may be filled, it is because in the first place in its essence it is empty. And it is exactly in the same sense that speech and discourse may be full or empty. (“On Creation *ex nihilo*” 120)

Then in the next page, Lacan continues to relate this issue of empty and full in terms of the object:

[A]s an object made to represent the existence of the emptiness at the center of the real that is called The Thing, this emptiness as represented in the representation presents itself as a *nihil*, as nothing. And that is why the potter, just like you to whom I am speaking, creates the vase with his hand around this emptiness, creates it, just like the mythical creator, *ex nihilo*, starting with a hole [. . .] the fashioning of the signifier and the introduction of a gap or a hole in the real is identical. (“On Creation *ex nihilo*” 121)

In fact, Lacan changes the position of the object in the structure of fantasy, relocating the object in the position of the Thing by shifting the libido from the void of the empty signifier of the Thing to some concrete, material object of the Thing, from the empty representation of the Thing to the full representation of the

1 Dylan Evans, in his *Introductory Dictionary to Lacanian Psychoanalysis*, succinctly summarizes the function of Freudian “sublimation” “as a socially acceptable escape valve for excess sexual energy which would otherwise have to be discharged in socially unacceptable forms (perverse behavior) or in neurotic symptoms” (198). He defines Lacanian “sublime quality of an object” not as intrinsic to the object itself, but as “an effect of the object’s position in the symbolic structure of the Thing.”

dignity of the Thing, as we see the issue of the vase in relation to the empty and full speech in terms of the “fashioning of the signifier.” For Lacan, sublimation “raises an object—to the dignity of the Thing” (“The Object and the thing,” *Seminar VII: The Ethics of Psychoanalysis* 112). An object, such as the mother, “raised to the dignity of the Thing,” thus becomes sublime. In this way, Lacan goes beyond the discourse of Freudian sublimation of artistic creation and presents the poetics of the unconscious desire by providing the discourse of “sublimation.”

The Imaginary: The Context or Genealogy of the Poem, “The Cap and Bells”

Lacan’s post-Freudian poetics of the unconscious desire provides a theoretical model for analyzing Yeats’s poetic discourse. On the one hand, Yeats’s poetry demonstrates effectively the fundamental mechanisms of Freudian dream work. Freud said, “A dream is a rebus” in his *The Interpretation of Dream*. Lacan comments on this and stresses on the primacy of the signifier over the signified, asking rhetorically “the signification manifest in its images falls away, having no other scope than that of conveying the signifier that is disguised in it?” (“The Situation of Psychoanalysis and the Training of Psychoanalysis in 1956,” *Écrits* 394). Lacan’s argument is that the subject, fostered by the alienation, is captured by the primacy of the signifier. Thus, language fails because of the gap between the signifier and the signified in the form of disguise. In fact, Lacan’s motto, “The unconscious is structured like a language” is based upon the Freudian theory of the dream work that involves the mechanisms of condensation and displacement, working between the manifest material and the latent dream thoughts. In the language processing of the unconscious, the metaphoric and metonymic mechanisms are synchronized with the functioning of the primary processes of condensation and displacement at the same time. In this context, symptom has a metaphoric structure of condensation and is represented by “the return of the repressed” in which the signifier of the signified is repressed by the consciousness of the subject, whereas desire has a metonymic structure of displacement and is represented by “a diachronic movement from one signifier to another along the signifying chain, as one signifier constantly refers to another in a perpetual deferral of meaning” (Evans 114). In relation to desire and symptom, Freudian syntactic displacement and semantic condensation constitutes the rhetoric of the dream. On the other hand, Yeats’s poetic discourse originates from the Lacanian “elsewhere” which can be relocated in the following loci of historical turning points of personal life-history re-presented in the symbolic language: bodily symptoms, childhood memories, particular vocabulary, legends and proto-narratives. Poet’s unintentional intentionality which is represented by his unconscious desire comes from “elsewhere,” from the

mysterious formal properties of language, recalling the list of the aforementioned Foucauldian “historical form coherent with the density of its own past.”

Seen from these two rationales of dream rhetoric and historical narrative, Yeats's poetic discourse will be different from what we used to read and interpret, since we are analyzing and interpreting in terms of Freudian “overdetermination” which is tied to the multiple meanings inherent in the analyst's free associations. Let us now delve into Yeats's unconscious text in terms of dream work and symptom which are structured like a language. First of all, let us start with Yeats's poetic text, “The Cap and Bells,” which was written in 1893. Yeats himself gave the following remarks concerning this poem in relation to “dream” in a footnote to the poem in a manner of Freudian restructuring of the event: “*nachträglich*” (after the fact):

I dreamed this story exactly as I have written it, and dreamed another long dream after it, trying to make out its meaning, and whether I was to write in prose or verse. The first dream was more a vision than a dream, for it was beautiful and coherent, and gave me the sense of illumination and exaltation that one gets from visions, while the second dream was confused and meaningless. The poem has always meant a great deal to me, though, as is the way with symbolic poems, it has not always meant quite the same thing. Blake would have said, “The authors are in eternity,” and I am quite sure they can only be questioned in dreams. (*Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* 455)

While trying to understand the meaning of his dream, the poet himself reveals his desire to interpret his own dream which is obscure in its meaning. According to Lacan, desire is interpretation. In fact, this “symbolic poem” manifests itself as the unconscious text (“what is unsaid”) which expresses the subject's desire.

The title “The Cap and Bells,” written in 1893, was published in *National Observer* in 1894 as “Cap and Bell,” and the original title was used in *The Wind Among the Reeds* (1899). What is at stake in dealing with the manifest dream text in grappling with the latent dream thoughts, one needs to resort to memoirs, autobiographies, letters, legends, and proto-narratives of the writer. Yeats has been prolific and prophetic in producing the articulation of his moods, feelings, and emotions in his writings such as fictions, plays, poetry, memoirs, autobiographies, letters, fairy tales and legends. As we understand from the Lacanian “elsewhere,” we as the readers can “re-find” the nature of “the unconscious desire” in “the censored chapter” of the personal history. We can give analysis of and interpret the truth of the speaker/writer by

close listening or close reading of the language of the unconscious desire.

The “cap and bells” was mentioned in Yeats’s essay, “The Queen and the Fool,” written and published in *The Celtic Twilight* (1893) which is a collection of the Irish supernatural tales of country beliefs, folk tales, and legends, and was later expanded to *Mythologies* (1959). In a footnote to the poem, “The Cap and Bells,” Yeats quotes the following image of Aengus from *The Celtic Twilight*:

I knew a man who was trying to bring before his mind’s eye an image of Aengus, the old Irish god of love and poetry and ecstasy, who changed four of his kisses into birds, and suddenly the image of a man with a cap and bells rushed before his mind’s eye, and grew vivid and spoke and called itself ‘Aengus’s messenger.’ (*Yeats’s Poems* 516; *Mythologies* 115)

An image of Aengus is retrieved in poet’s eye, and that of the jester with “a cap and bell” in the poem can be located in the fragmentary heroic legends of “Aengus, the old Irish god of love and poetry and ecstasy, who changed four of his kisses into birds.”¹ Another image of “a white fool in a visionary garden” is retrieved in the same passage:

And I knew another man, a truly great seer, who saw a white fool in a visionary garden, where there was a tree with peacocks’ feathers instead of leaves, and flowers that opened to show little human faces when the white fool had touched them with his cockscomb, and he saw at another time a white fool sitting by a pool and smiling and watching images of beautiful women floating up from the pool. (*Mythologies* 115)

Yeats has already provided the context of this narration of Irish mythological legends, quoting the words of a witch-doctor: “that ‘in every household’ of Faery ‘there is a queen and a fool,’ and that if you are ‘touched’ by either you never recover, though you may from the touch of any other in Faery” (*Mythologies* 112). The motif of “touch” is what’s at stake in the story.

1 According to old Irish mythology, Aengus is the otherworld god of the Tuatha Dé Danann (the race of Danu). In the legend of Aisling Aengusa (Dream of Aengus), Aengus falls in love with a girl he has seen only in a dream, and being in love-sick, he eventually discovers that he can find her called Caer Ibormeith (yew berry) along with one hundred and fifty other girls in Tipperary during Samain (Irish-Scottish Gaelic seasonal festival). These girls will change into swans. When he arrives there, she sees all the swans including Caer, and he also changes into a swan and flies with her back to Bruig na Báinne where he was born and there they act as protectors to lovers (Smyth 15-16).

These images were sublimated “*nächträglich*” (after the fact) to a poetic tale of magic fantasy in another poem, “The Song of Wandering Aengus,” written in 1897:

I went out to hazel wood,
Because a fire was in my head,
And cut and peeled a hazel want,
And when white moths were on the wing,
And moth-like stars were flickering out,
I dropped the berry in a stream
And caught a little silver trout.

When I had laid it on the floor
I went to blow the fire aflame,
But something rustled on the floor,
And some one called me by my name:
It had become a glimmering girl
With apple blossom in her hair
Who called me by my name and ran
And faded through the brightening air.

Though I am old with wandering
Through hollow lands and hilly lands,
I will find out where she has gone,
And kiss her lips and take her hands;
And walk among long dappled grass,
And pluck till time and times are done
The silver apples of the moon.
The golden apples of the sun. (*Yeats's Poems* 93-94)

Touching the idea of the Irish mythology of legendary metamorphosis in which the tribes of the goddess Danu (The Thustha de Danaan) can take all shapes, (those in the waters often taking the shape of fish), the poet presents a condensed silvery poetic spark of “a little silver trout,” displacing the swan of the legendary Aengus into a fish in a metonymic way. Desire is metonymy. Therefore, the poet's Freudian dream rhetoric of syntactic condensation and sematic displacement is evident here, revealing the poet's unconscious desire of longing for the beloved, demonstrating a typical symptom of obsessional neurosis.

In the poem, “The Cap and Bells,” however, the image of Aengus of the Irish mythology who transformed himself into a swan has been displaced into the image of “a jester.” This image of the jester has been reversed from that of “a white fool in a visionary garden” in the mythological tales. Instead of giving the touch and a stroke which we can never recover, the jester himself was fatally given “the touch” and became a love-sick soul. In the poem, the first image of the tale is contiguously displaced and condensed into a poetic spark of the image of the jester with “cap and bells” who is in a symptomatic state of love-sickness for the queen who has been transformed from “a silver trout” into “a glimmering girl/ With apple blossom in her hair” in the poem, “The Wandering of Aengus.” In fact, the poet/speaker wears a mask of Aengus, falling into a fantasy, and reveals his unconscious desire to win the heart of the lady in question, the queen in the poem, “The Cap and Bells.”

The Symbolic: Interpretation of the Poem, “The Cap and Bells”

In the first three stanzas, the first proposal was initiated:

The jester walked in the garden:
The garden had fallen still;
He bade his soul rise upward
And stand on her window-sill.

It rose in a straight blue garment,
When owls began to call;
It had grown wise-tongued by thinking
Of a quiet and light footfall;

But the young queen would not listen:
She rose in her pale night-gown;
She drew in the heavy casement
And pushed the latches down.

The image of “A jester walked in the garden” provides the readers with both the *Innenwelt* (the inner world of I) and *Umbelt* (the real world around the I) of the speaking subject. The jester is being obsessed with the object desired which is the queen and walking in the garden which had fallen still. In this poem, the speaking subject expresses his unconscious desire, while revealing his behaviors projecting his persistent love proposal. A jester in relation to “his soul” re-presents the *Innenwelt* in

the speaking subject's Imaginary order, and the garden represents Umwelt in his Real Order. But this image falls to a standstill, and becomes a symbol, thus entering the Symbolic Order. The language of the soul reaches the wisdom by imagining "a quiet and light footfall." When the owl, the metaphor of wisdom, began to call, the soul "rose in a straight blue garment" up to the pure soul. The jester wears the mask of desire which deeply demands the recognition from the queen. This mask of desire is colored by the straight blue garment. Despite this eager passionate proposal of the jester, the queen's reply is meager silence, and she punctuates jester's action with her symbolic acts of "drawing in the heavy casement/ And pushed the latches down," expressing her negation not to accept the jester's proposal. The jester in frustration fails to translate the meaning of this. In fact, the jester never raises a question, "what does she want?" or "what does a woman want?"

When his song of the soul does not get response from the queen, the jester attempts a second try with his heart:

He bade his heart go to her,
When the owls called out no more;
In a red and quivering garment
It sang to her through the door.

It had grown sweet-tongued by dreaming
Of a flutter of flower-like hair;
But she took up her fan from the table
And waved it off on the air.

The jester lets his heart sing to the queen through the closed door in "a red and quivering garment," of a passionate and agonizing tune. The song is that of heart's desire, although desire becomes alienated from the biological need. The jester's heart possesses the passion/Passion which "had grown sweet-tongued," "by dreaming/ Of a flutter of flower-like hair." The jester translates the metonymic images of the queen in the Imaginary Order into the sweet language of the dream in the Symbolic Order. However, the queen simply "took up her fan from the table / And waved it off on the air."

Final scene/session is a drama of frustration and aggressivity of the mirror stage. The jester becomes frustrated internally and reveals aggressivity externally against the queen to make up for what he felt inside. The jester contrives a desperate solution by sending the queen all he has, that is, "cap and bells":

‘I have cap and bells,’ he pondered.
 ‘I will send them to her and die’:
 And when the morning whitened
 He left them where she went by.

After all, he blurts out the saying that he will send them to her as the ultimatum and die, by changing his position from the jester in the Imaginary Order into the speaking subject in the Symbolic Order, finally. When the morning becomes white as if it were the omen for death, the jester left “the cap and bells” (IT /Ça) where she went by. Then, the final scene of consummation is performed:

She laid them upon her bosom
 Under a cloud of her hair,
 And her red lips sang them a love-song
 Till stars grew out of the air.

She opened her door and her window,
 And the heart and the soul came through,
 To her right hand came the red one,
 To her left hand came the blue.

They set up a noise like crickets,
 A chattering wise and sweet,
 And her hair was a folded flower
 And the quiet of love in her feet. (*Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* 65-66)

The queen embraces “the cap and bells” (“It” or “Ça”) of the jester “upon her bosom/ Under a cloud of her hair.” She opens wide every nook and cranny of her house with “her door and her window” through which “the red heart and the blue soul” of the jester came, while singing a love-song with her sensual red lips until the evening. Love fulfilled.

As we have seen in the symbolic language of Yeats’s poetic representation in the poem, the three scenes/sessions are dramatically constituted of the psychoanalytic discourse and situations between the jester and the queen. The interpretation of the poem produce a coherent narrative which constitutes a subject and simultaneously reveals the truth of the jester’s desire. Now, the poem has become a “beautiful and coherent” narrative, as we recall the first dream in a footnote to the poem, “The Cap

and Bells.” This poem provides “more a vision than a dream,” giving “the sense of illumination and exaltation that one gets from visions.”

What, then, about the second dream which was “confused and meaningless” (*Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* 455). One needs to turn to the Real, the location of life and love of the real people.

The Real: Love

Who are the jester and the queen, then? Yeats's own autobiography and the biographical information about Yeats¹ present vividly Yeats's “high way of love,” and the history of the proposals structures the unconscious text of poet's proto-narratives. Yeats met for the first time in Bedford Park in 1889, fell in love with her immediately. In 1891, he proposes her in vain, and Maud Gonine went to Paris. In 1894, he again proposes her without success. In 1898, however, Yeats and Maud Gonine experienced the spiritual union at the Nassau where “for the first time with the bodily mouth,” Maud kissed Yeats (*Memoirs* 132). The failure, nevertheless, went on. In 1899 and 1900, Yeats proposes and suffers from rejections again in Paris and London. These are the historical turning-points of the speaking subject's proposals during the decade between 1889 and 1900.

What happened in the Real world between Yeats and Maud Gonine? In his “Autobiography,” Yeats refers to his first impression about Maud Gonine who visits his father, John Butler Yeats at Bedford Park in January 30, 1889, four years before this poem was written. Yeats records his first meeting vividly, starting with the statement: “I was twenty-three years old when the troubling of my life began” (*Memoirs* 40):

In after years I persuaded myself that I felt premonitory excitement at the first reading of her name. Presently she drove up to my house in Bedford Park with an introduction from John O'Leary to my father. I had never thought to see in a living woman so great beauty. It belonged to famous pictures, to poetry, to some legendary past. A complexion like the blossom of apples, and yet face and body had the beauty of lineaments which Blake calls the highest beauty because it changes least from youth to age, and a stature so great that she seemed of a divine race. Her movements were worthy of her form, and I understand at last why the poet of antiquity, where we would but speak of face and form, sings, loving some lady, that she paces like a goddess. (“Autobiography,” *Memoirs* 40)

¹ See Yeats's *The Autobiography of William Butler Yeats* (1965), *Memoirs: Autobiography-First Draft Journal* (1972), and Terence Brown's *The Life of W. B. Yeats* (1999) for further reference.

First impressions of Maud Gonne as “the highest beauty” “of a divine race” with “a complexion like the blossom of apples,” “pacing like a goddess,” are sensational. The impression of goddess-like Maud Gonne is strongly imprinted in the memory reservoir of Yeats the poet.

Nevertheless, Yeats with “a clairvoyant perception” predicts his future of miserable frustration and desire:

I felt in the presence of a great generosity and courage, and of a mind without peace, and when she and all her singing birds had gone my melancholy was not the mere melancholy of love. I had what I thought was a ‘clairvoyant’ perception ..., I can see now, but an obvious deduction of an awaiting immediate disaster ... I was in love but had not spoken of love and never meant to speak, and as the months passed I grew master of myself again. ‘What wife would she make,’ I thought, ‘what share could she have in the life of a student?’ (“Autobiography,” *Memoir* 42-3)

Yeats recalls the event of his first proposal in July 1891, when Yeats and Maud Gonne met at a little hotel in Nassau Street, Dublin:

At the first sight of her as she came through the door, her great height seeming to fill it, I was overwhelmed with emotion, an intoxication of pity. She did not seem to have any beauty, her face was wasted, the form of the bones showing, and there was no life in her manner. As our talk became intimate, she hinted at some unhappiness, some disillusionment. The old hard resonance had gone and she had become gentle and indolent. I was in love once more and no longer wished to fight against it. I no longer thought what kind of wife would this woman make, but of her need for protection and for peace. (“Autobiography,” *Memoir* 45)

In the next page of the “Autobiography,” the story goes after this: Then he left Dublin “next day” and spent “a week or ten days,” and presently came from Maud a letter “touching a little upon her sadness, and telling of a dream of some past life,” a letter stating that she and Yeats had been “brother and sister somewhere on the edge of the Arabian desert, and sold together into slavery,” and that she had “an impression of some long journey and of miles upon miles of the desert sand.” Yeats received this heart-rending letter from Maud, and “returned to Dublin at once.” And “that evening but a few minutes after [they] had met,” Yeats asked her to marry him. Yeats is touching on the Real, the Real which is the very thing impossible to say, the impossible

story of the “cri du coeur” (the cry of the heart):

I remember a curious thing. I had come into the room with that purpose in my mind, and hardly looked at her or thought of her beauty. I sat there holding her hand and speaking vehemently. She did not take away her hand for a while. I ceased to speak, and presently as I sat in silence I felt her nearness to me and her beauty. At once I knew that my confidence had gone, and an instant later she drew her hand away. No, she could not marry--there were reasons--she would never marry; but in words that had no conventional ring she asked for my friendship. (“Autobiography,” *Memoir* 46)

What can Yeats say to Maud at this point? Nancy Cardozo, a biographer of Maud Gonne, reports on this event from Maud Gonne's perspective:

A few moments after he arrived at the Nassau Hotel he asked her to marry him. He hardly looked at her but sat “holding her hand and speaking vehemently.” The request, which he considered unconventional, was not meant to be cruel or capricious. Maud depended on him for understanding and sympathy, the closeness she had once known with Tommy. Yeats was exceptionally intuitive about women's feelings, and she felt as easy with him as if he had been a brother. Still, she did not dare tell him about her life in Paris, her troubles with Millevoeye, her delight in her little son. Willie could not be trusted to keep a secret, and fear of grave damage to her reputation, as well as her need for his friendship, kept her from telling him the truth. She told him only that she would never marry, and she was relieved that he did not press her to become his mistress. (Cardozo 98)

There is no way for Yeats to know this secret heart of Maud Gonne.

It was in 1898 belatedly that Yeats came to know the revelation of Maud Gonne's secret heart ironically at the moment of the so-called “spiritual marriage,” as if life is a “confused” and incoherent dream. Yeats recalls this event of December 6, 1898:

I woke up in my hotel somewhere near Rutland Square with the fading vision of her face bending over mine and the knowledge that she had just kissed me. I joined her after breakfast in the Nassau Hotel. We were to spend the day together and visit in the afternoon the old Fenian leader, James Stephen. She said, “Had you a strange dream last night?” I said, “I dreamed this morning for the first time in my life that you kissed me.” She made no answer, but last night when

dinner was over and I was about to return home she said, "I will tell you now what happened. When I fell asleep last night I saw standing at my bedside a great spirit. He took me to a great throng of spirits and you were among them. My hand was put into yours and I was told that we were married. After that I remember nothing." Then and there for the first time with the bodily mouth, she kissed me. ("Autobiography," *Memoir* 131-132)

So far, the life is a magic and romantic.

However, a dramatic change has happened suddenly within a day, reminding us of the Real in which life is unpredictable and confusing.

The next day [December 7, 1898] I found her sitting very gloomily over the fire. "I should not have spoken to you in that day," she said, "for I can never be your wife in reality." I said, "Do you love anyone else?" and she said "No" but added that there was somebody else, and that she had to be a moral nature for two. Then bit by bit came out the story of her life, things I had heard all twisted awry by scandal, and disbelieve. ("Autobiography," *Memoir* 132)

One needs a true story of Maud's deceiving heart. Yeats's version in "Autobiography" is fragmentary, confused, and incoherent. Let us hear Terence Brown's coherent version, a little detached from the Real life of both:

The next she confessed all the facts of her life, some of which Yeats had heard about through innuendo and dismissed as impossible. He heard of how as a girl she had made a pact with the devil if he would give her "control over her own life." Within a fortnight her father had died. He heard moreover how she had been Millevoe's mistress and had borne him two children. He must have been especially shocked when she told him how Millevoe and she had made love in the vault under the memorial chapel where her first born [Georgette] was buried, in the hope that his soul might be reincarnated in another child. He heard about the now four-year-old child of that encounter, the daughter she had named Iseult. ("Autobiography," *Memoir* 102)

Another complication occurs to make the story more confusing. On December 17, 1898, ten days after Maud Gonne's confession, Yeats recalls the real event of "spiritual marriage" when they were sitting together talking about Maud's vision of her Initiation of the Spear:

We became silent; a double vision unfolded itself, neither speaking till all was finished. She thought herself a great stone statue through which passed flame, and I felt myself becoming flame and mounting up through and looking out of the eyes of a great stone Minerva. Were the beings which stand behind human life trying to unite us, or had we brought it by our own dreams? She was now always very emotional, and would kiss me very tenderly, but when I spoke of marriage on the eve of her leaving said, "No, it seems to be impossible." And then, with clenched hands, "I have a horror of physical love." Lady Gregory was in Venice, but had come home at once on receiving from me an incoherent letter. She offered me money to travel, and told me not to leave Maud Gonne till I had her promise of marriage, but I said, "No, I am too exhausted; I can do no more." ("Autobiography," *Memoir* 134)

Refusing to accept Yeats's proposal again in the middle of their so-called "spiritual marriage," Maud mentions "a horror of physical love," leaving Yeats confusing, incoherent and exhausted. If the life is a daydream, then the dream is "confused and incoherent" as in the love story of Yeats and Maud Gonne tells us. These events in 1898 December are moments of revelation about the truth of political Maud Gonne's inscrutable heart for spiritual Yeats. In fact, the second dream which Yeats mentioned in the footnote to the Poem, "The Cap and Bells," seems to refer to the real life of Yeats, although the dream was not yet dreamed but imagined *a priori* and looking ahead, providing this prediction of the future of his star-crossed love with Maud Gonne.

In this context, this dream text written in 1893 marks what Lacan calls "future anterior"--will have been--anticipating the future and regressing into the past, and back to the future, thereby revealing the truth of the speaking subject in the form of the persistent unconscious desire. This poem exposes the symptom of neurotic obsession and provides the symbolic behaviors of the identification and alienation in the imaginary I, anticipating always already the abysmal destiny.

Conclusion

Traces of love between Yeats and Maud Gonne are everywhere or elsewhere in Yeats's past memories, autobiographical proto-narrative and fragmentary heroic legends which

project the here and now of the poem, “The Cap and Bells.”¹ I have demonstrated the images of Aengus and the jester with cap and bells in the Imaginary Order of fantasy, the images retrieved from the archive of the heroic legends of the Irish mythology. This Imaginary Order which is embedded in the memory of the body transformed in the magic has contextualized the symbolic representation of the poetic discourse of poetry. The speaking subject as the symbolic I (je) in the Symbolic Order of the poetic discourse reveals the unconscious desire of the subject in the symbolic narrative, telling the truth in a coherent narrative from the reader’s perspective. The writing subject’s lover story/life-history in the Real Order enables the readers to recognize the unconscious desire of the speaking subject, since this story/history is structured of historical turning points of personal life-history and re-presented in the symbolic language. In short, the Imaginary me (moi) reveals the imaginary identifications in the fictional narrative, the Symbolic I (je) reveals and tells the truth of the subject in the symbolic discourse of the poem, and the Real I reaches the truth of the Real and then disappears at the moment of truth. Attentive readers grasp trans-genre epiphanic revelations of the unconscious desire which appears in the symptom as the truth of the writing subject.

Yeats’s autobiography presents the ups and downs of his-story, his “highway of love” in terms of rejection, and this history of the proposals rejected structurates the unconscious text of poet’s proto-narratives. As we have traced, during the period of 1899 and 1900, Yeats suffers from rejections again and again in Paris and London, with an exception in the case of 1898 the so-called “spiritual marriage.” In 1903, Maud marries Major John MacBride finally. In 1916, when her husband was dead, Yeats proposes Maud in Normandy and she turned it down. In 1917, he proposes both Maud and Iseult Gonne, but was rejected from both. In October 21, 1917, he married not Maud Gonne, but Georgie Hyde-Lees who is 27 years younger than Yeats. These are the historical turning-points of the speaking subject’s emotional life. In the midst of these persistent proposals, what is at stake is the question of “what does a woman want?” To displace this woman question into the questions of “what does the queen want?” “what does the cap and bells mean?” “what are they to the queen?” and “why does the queen embrace the cap and bells?” will provoke further complication beyond the poetics of unconscious desire which I have been grappled with in this article.

1 See Yeats’s *The Autobiography of William Butler Yeats* (1965), *Memoirs: Autobiography-First Draft Journal* (1972), *Mythologies* (1959), and Nancy Cardozo’s *Maud Gonne: Lucky Eyes and a High Heart* (1978), and Margery Brady’s *The Love Story of Yeats and Maud Gonne* (1990) for further reference to the relationship between Yeats and Maud Gonne.

According to Lacan, “sublimation” raises an object to the dignity of the Thing, changing from the empty signifier of the Thing to the concrete, material object of the Thing. The metaphor of “the cap and bells” is the thing which has been raised from the empty signifier of the miserable “abject” thing to the “concrete, material” object of The Thing (It/Ca). Behind the scene, the queen’s hidden thinking has a great potential for the future interpretive venture.

I will conclude with the question of “what does the queen want?” My contention is that the queen functions as the agency in the Real Order, and punctuates with her silence. The queen chooses punctuation or breaks carefully, cuts off the speech of the jester, and helps the jester to reach a symbolic interpretation of his own associative discourse by grasping the gap between the imaginary moi and the symbolic je (the I), and to reach the true meaning of his own statement. In other words, the queen punctuates the indeterminate metonymical signifying chain of the jester’s proposal with her symbolic actions of the Lacanian cut. Thus, the jester becomes a psychoanalytically realized subject who can transform the empty speech into the full speech, thereby transmitting the truth of his desire and love to the queen successfully. This belongs to the ethics of desire. The aim of psychoanalysis, as in the analysis of poetic discourse, is to let the speaking/writing subject analyze and interpret his/her own empty speech by means of the interruption so that he/she could transform and overcome the empty speech and reach the full speech, by producing a coherent narrative which constitutes a subject and simultaneously reveals the truth of the subject. In this way, the discourse of “sublimation” will present the ethics of desire. I will argue that further study of Maud Gonne’s representation of her silence and reply will be rewarding on the question of the ethics of desire and the discourse of sublimation.

Works Cited

- Benvenuto, Bice and Roger Kennedy. *The Works of Jacques Lacan: An Introduction*. London: Free Association Books, 1986.
- Brady, Margery. *The Love Story of Yeats and Maud Gonne*. Dublin: Mercier Press, 1990.
- Brown, Terence. *The Life of W. B. Yeats*. Dublin: Gill & McGillan, 1999.
- Cardozo, Nancy. *Maud Gonne: Lucky Eyes and a High Heart*. New York: New Amsterdam, 1978.
- Dor, Joël. *The Clinical Lacan*. Northvale, NJ & London: Jason Aronson Inc., 1997.
- . *Introduction to the Reading of Lacan: The Unconscious Structured Like a Language*. New York: The Other Press, 1998.
- Ellman, Richard. *The Identity of Yeats*. New York: Oxford UP, 1964.
- . *Yeats: The Man and the Mask*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1948.

- Evans, Dylan. *An Introductory Dictionary of Lacanian Psychoanalysis*. London & NY: Routledge, 1996.
- Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: The Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. NY: Vintage Books, 1973.
- Jeffares, A. Norman. *A New Commentary on the Poems of W. B. Yeats*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1984.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Ecrits*. Trans. Bruce Fink. NY & London: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006.
- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: Book VII The Ethics of Psychoanalysis 1959-1960*. Trans. Dennis Porter. NY & London: W.W. Norton & Company, 1992.
- Lee, Jonathan Scott. *Jacques Lacan*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1990.
- Rabaté, Jean-Michel. Ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Lacan*. Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 2003.
- Smythe, Daragh. *A Guide to Irish Mythology*. Dublin: Colour Books Ltd., 1988.
- Webster, Brenda S. *Yeats: A Psychoanalytic Study*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1973.
- Yeats, William Butler. *The Autobiography of William Butler Yeats*. New York: Macmillan, 1965.
- . *Yeats's Poems*. Ed. A. Norman Jeffares. London: Macmillan Press, 1989.
- . *Memoirs: Autobiography-First Draft Journal*. Ed. Denis Donoghue. London and New York: Macmillan, 1972.
- . *Mythologies*. New York: Collier Books, 1959.

The Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels after 1986

Nguyen Anh Dan

Abstract: Vietnamese novels after 1986, set in a new ethical context, has witnessed its own developments since the war ended in 1975 and the Communist Party initiated Doi Moi (renovation) in 1986. Pastoral life and people became one of the four most prominent novelistic themes along with war, urban, and historical contents. Under the influence of new ethical environment, Vietnamese novelists not only depicted cultural beauties in peasants' lives but also took opportunities to look back on the past, particularly those events that once had a severe impact on people's ethics such as the land reform and farmers' ethical identity in wars. In depicting either the past or the contemporary affair, writers focused on both positive and negative aspects of Vietnamese rural communities and paid particular attention to ethical dilemmas that bring about characters' ethical choices, ethical taboos, and ethical tragedies. Through typical topics such as conflicts between families and clans, the battle between good and evil, the struggle between tradition and modernity, and relations between conservative and progressive thoughts, Vietnamese writers offered a vibrant picture of pastoral life as well as manifested profound edificatory values.

Key words: ethical choice; Vietnam; land reform; pastoral novel; edificatory function

Author: Nguyen Anh Dan teaches at the Literature Department, University of Education, Hue University (Hue 530000, Vietnam), and is currently a PhD candidate at the School of Chinese Language and Literature, Central China Normal University. His main research interests are ethical literary criticism, Japanese literature, Vietnamese literature, and comparative literature (Email: nguyennanhdanhuce@gmail.com).

标题: 1986 后越南农村小说中的伦理选择

内容摘要: 自 1975 年战争结束、1986 年共产党发动革新以来, 1986 年后的越南小说在新的伦理语境下见证其发展。农村生活和农民与战争、城市、历史内容并列成为小说四大主题。在新伦理环境的影响下, 越南小说家不仅描写了农民生活中的文化美, 而且还借机回顾了过去, 特别是那些曾经对人类伦理产生过强烈影响的事件, 如土地改革和战争中的农民的伦理身份。作家

们关注过去以及当下越南乡村社会中积极和消极的两面性，特别关注导致人物伦理选择、伦理禁忌和伦理悲剧的伦理困境。越南作家以家庭与宗族的冲突、善与恶的斗争、传统与现代的矛盾、保守与进步思想的关系等典型题材，呈现出一幅充满活力的田园生活图景，体现出深刻的教诲价值。

关键词：伦理选择；越南；土地改革；农村小说；教诲功能

作者简介：阮英民，越南顺化大学教育学院文学系教师，华中师范大学文学院比较文学与世界文学专业博士研究生，主要从事文学伦理学批评、日本文学、越南文学和比较文学研究。

Introduction: A New Ethical Context and A New Literary Movement

The termination of the American-Vietnamese war on April 30th, 1975 paved the way for a new era in the history for the country with both advantages and disadvantages. Due to a dilapidated economy that is the consequence of wars, the Vietnamese Communist Party (VCP) conducted a new policy called “the centrally planned subsidised economy” from 1975 to 1986 as an endeavour to develop the whole society. Under the new policy, individual businesses were obliterated and the state-directed economy played a more major role. Along with absolutely distributed goods via “the tem phieu system” (one form of special currency that could only be used to buy one particular kind of goods), the central government also controlled both domestic trade and international trade. The planned economy was not as robust as authorities had wished it to be; on the contrary, it generated a severe crisis for the local people and ceased in the late 1980s following the 6th National Congress of VCP that took place from 15-18 December 1986 in Hanoi. The event was initiated to applying “the Renovation” (Doi Moi) to the national economy, aiming to establishing a socialist-oriented market economy. The innovation not only involved economic scope but also was related to every aspect within the society on politics, education, culture, the publishing industry, the press, and literature.

In the case of literature, due to the Renovation, the government implemented an “coi troi policy”, or “unshackling policy”, that allowed local authors to be more independent and creative in art composition. After 1986, in the light of democracy and freedom, Vietnamese literature thrived and witnessed a prominent movement of novels with many famous novelists such as Bao Ninh, Duong Huong, Pham Thi Hoai, Le Luu, Ma Van Khang, Nguyen Xuan Khanh, and so on. This new background, which was termed as ethical context (伦理环境) by Ethical Literary Criticism (ELC), helped the writers discover many matters of daily life, on the one hand, and rethought historical issues, on the other hand. The pastoral novels along

with war novels, urban novels, and historical novels, known as the four significant novelistic categories, played an essential role in the whole stream of Vietnamese novels after 1986. The rural life and peasant characters as the familiar topics in the previous literature, however, were different from the theme and artistic images of the characters described in the contemporary pastoral novel. Given the new ethical condition, the local novelists showed a fresh approach about the countryside and farmers. Authors manifested peasant characters and rural life vividly with the present images. Some internal issues in pastoral areas and farmers' life such as the struggle for family powers and rights, traditional morality and belief, culture and customs were embodied in the novels. Moreover, they looked back to some historical events that were inseparable from the rural communities including the land reform and farmers' tragedy in wars. Through an ethical perspective, local writers were also concerned about some ethical matters that strictly impacted the ethical choices of the novelistic characters. Vietnamese novelists also noticed ethical taboos like incests and homicides, the good-evil struggle, ethical tragedies that were expressed in the love, marriage, and gender relations. By analysing and displaying ethical attitudes for these moral matters, Vietnamese pastoral novels after 1986 further explained the so-called "edificatory function" (教诲功能) as the theory of ELC.

The Land Reform: Ethical Dilemmas and Unethical Choices

On September 8th, 2014, the Vietnam National Museum of History exhibited approximately 150 relics that are associated with the land reform in the past. These are rare, valuable documents, pictures, and relics that were shown off for the public for the very first time.

The land reform (also known as the land revolution) was carried out in Northern Vietnam by the Workers' Party of Vietnam (a name of VCP at that time) and the government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam from 1953 to 1956. The reform was conducted during the war, influenced by the communist theory of Soviet and lessons from China's experiences of the land revolution (土地改革). It aimed at getting rid of the feudal culture, defeating the treasonous, reactionary and exploitative classes, re-allocating agrarian areas for farmers. Authorities tried to redistribute lands in a fair way to develop the socio-economic aspect and improve the mental well-being of the national citizens. "From 1953 to 1956, there were eight times of mobilising the public to reduce the rent in 1,875 communes, and five times of agrarian reform in the plain, midland areas and 280 northern mountainous communes. In 3,314 communes, with 10 million people, more than

700,000 hectares (44.6%) of the land were given to nearly 4 million farmers.” (Ngo) These figures “reflected the process and results of the reform” (Ngo) for the local peasants who had undergone feudal landlords and colonialists for a long time. It is noteworthy that the exhibition was not a whole picture of the land revolution. There were some dark parts that were hesitated to point out by local historians and politicians but were seen as chances for some anti-communist elements to attack the system. The core policy of the reform was quite revolutionary for the exploited classes, particularly the peasant class who had experienced almost life without their own land for cultivating. Unfortunately, due to executors’ weaknesses (such as the limited cultural and political capacity; the hasty mind, subjective and mechanical manners; the low degree of civil wisdom), this reformed encountered a number of crucial flaws. The revolutionists wrongly identified the kind of classes, killed a lot of innocent people, destroyed many cultural and historical relics, created a climate of social tensions, and damaged people’s confidence in the party and the regime. At the beginning of 1956, the party and the central government found faults in the reform and decided to stop it and make corrections. On August 18th, 1956, President Ho Chi Minh sent the citizen and officials a letter to state achievements and errors of the agrarian reform. Although some apologies were spoken out by those who played the crucial role in the reform and amend the faults for the victims of the revolution, people could not erase such painful memories.

Not until nearly 60 years later were Vietnamese people able to view the event via an official exhibition, its reality had already existed among the local community and history. That is the reason why there was a different display of the reform, which was earlier than the governmental one, in Vietnamese novels after 1986. Local writers did not ignore the phenomenon and described it in their writings with their own experiences and analytic evaluations. According to the sensitiveness of the matter, it should be noticed that novelists’ descriptions would not be aimed at political points but at ethical purposes. Through a moral analysis and serious attitude when looking back to the history, the fictionists attempted to explore ethical situations and peasants’ fate in the land reform. There were seemingly not any reform-related writings in the previous literature. One of the most remarkable reasons is that any other issues, especially a sensitive topic as the land reform, could be discussed during the wartime other than fighting spirit. It was not the case after 1975, notably since the beginning of the renovative movement in 1986. Living and writing in such a new ethical background, the post-war authors displayed the reform in literary works courageously: *Story of Cuoi Village* (1991) by Le Luu, *The Three Others* (2006) by To Hoai, *The Age of Deities* (2008) by Hoang Minh Tuong,

Farewell to the Darkness (2008) and *The Old Kho* (2014) by Ta Duy Anh, and so forth.

Most of the novelists presented some wrong actions during the revolution. The most apparent faults, for example, were to wrongly identify classes, crimes, and punishments. Due to implementers' inaccurate methods, plenty of guilty peasants suffered great miseries and tragedies. In the arena of a "public denouncement", farmers were denounced and told of crimes they had or had not committed, and then passively receiving their accusations, criticism, reproof, condemnation, even dishonouring, and wounding. For these victims, not only were their status, prestige, and reputation overturned, but their ethical and moral characters were also severely damaged. In a chaotic arena, some executors took unfair advantage of the situation for their own interest or commit sexual abuses while some others stole properties or revenged personal feuds, even killed their fellows. As a result, to protect their own human life and benefits, some farmers were unfaithful to the morality and made many unethical choices. The land reform witnessed the subversion of ethics, the destruction of ethical relations and ethical values. Therefore the revolution was a catastrophe for the farmers. The old Kho, the male protagonist, in the novel of the same name by Ta Duy Anh is a typical victim of the reform. The man was a hero of his Tho Village before the land revolution happened. As a needy and unlearned farmer, the old Kho's life changed when the communist revolution (in French-Vietnamese war) occurred in his hometown. He became the president of Hoang Commune and kept trying to improve his people's life. The man was always willing to make great sacrifice for and held a sincere belief to his communist leaders in his heart. Even just two days after his wife had given birth to a daughter, he left the two to come back to his short-term theoretical course of co-operative management that he believed "How can it be without me?" (Ta 87) However, "He was too well educated about the spirit of sacrifice. Individuals, families, villages, communes and the whole people and country are the factors that prevent the world from cosmopolitanism! He carries a great mission to sacrifice first. If his son, for some cause, for example dies because of him, he still has enough reasons to prove to his wife that this is just one of thousands of sacrificial expressions." (Ta 87) Flooded with a solid faith, the rustic farmer believed in what he was building, but he did not predict that everything has been changed suddenly when the agrarian revolution appeared. During the ups and downs of history, the old Kho's ethical identity (伦理身份) has transformed from a hero of a pastoral community to a harmful individual who was bound tightly by rope and led as a buffalo, bearing the public shouting down with him. They detained the last hero into a filthy store.

He was beaten and judged by those who had been saved and supported by his own compassion before. The public denouncement, as a necessary part of the revolution, on the old Kho, was conducted very quickly with the participation of his relatives and neighbours. All of them owed him a debt of gratitude. Scenes of the free trial demonstrated people's ethical values and ethical tragedies. The neighbour of the old Kho was an opportunist who did not hesitate to betray his kindness no matter how Kho helped him in the harsh time. On the contrary, there were also some characters who took part in the denouncement with a reluctant willing, for example, the victim's foster sister, or who refused to join the denouncement against relative such as the old Kho's uncle. The uncle definitely knew that everything happening at the moment was a big mistake for his nephew, so he said nothing, and then screaming mournfully, falling, vomiting blood, and passing away. He died because of his anger with the trial and wrong crimes that his nephew had been accused of. In front of authorities, he chose not to be subdued, more importantly not to betray the moral nature that a righteous man must have. His writhe of outraged morality was a response of good-nature inside an ethical man. Unfortunately, his action was not common among most of the poor farmers during the period when the implementors predominated over political positions and power.

The local novelists described the executors of the reform as opportunists, hogs, wolves, horse-leeches, and sensualists. They destroyed the happiness of other people's families, vandalised the peacefulness of rural community, performed sexual abuses with village girls, and even vigorously raped them. These weak conductors were the direct or indirect causes of other's death, which is an ethical taboo (伦理禁忌) for ELC. Although the core goal of the innovation was benevolent, the implementor's immoral faults pushed others into ethical troubles and moral tragedies. In other words, they created the ethical dilemma (伦理两难) and ethical predicament (伦理困境) that impacted on the peasant's ethical identity. One of the most terrible sins of the executors that were usually depicted in the novels of this period was sexual-related actions. Hieu, a northern Vietnamese soldier in *Stories of Cuoi Village* (1991) by Le Luu, had to leave the peaceful village where his beloved wife and his old mother were living because of the war. The innovators came to the countryside while the soldier was fighting with foreigner enemies in the south of Vietnam. It is hard for him to imagine that one of the innovators sexually abused his wife. The crime happened many times inside and outside his poorly furnished cottage, although the mother knew the guilt. She remained silent due to her fear of the authorities. In the beginning, the young lady acted just as her mother-in-law. She did not dare to put up resistances of the executor, let alone the fact that she committed fornications with the

executor little by little. It means that her ethical identity moved from a sexual-abuse victim to an immoral accomplice. Hieu's wife was to be in cooperation with the implementor of the reform undermining ethics.

Sexual abuses and sexual relations among the reformatory members and village ladies in the land revolution, as explained by the writers, are caused by 1) the villagers' fear of authorities, 2) their desires to protect themselves and their own family members, 3) their hope to earn benefits based on their intimate relationship with the executors, and 4) their own libido. Due to fears of authority and wish for saving themselves, villagers chose to be liars and told untruths about others in the public denouncement, which could let them go safely but pitifully put their friends, their neighbours, and their relatives into troubles. Even those lies could execute them. There were some ladies who recognised the executors' power and made a win-win relationship with these men to get profits from the reform. In this case, the biggest involvement was agrarian portions, and the country girls used their body, especially their own ethical values, to make exchanges with the reformatory group. It became a typical overturn between material values and ethical values. Duyen, nearly-married, in *The Three Others* (2006) by To Hoai is a precise example for the moral downfall. She was willing to sleep with reformatory men, not only leader Cu but also the leader's staffs, Boi and Dinh. She put Boi's shirt on her body to show villagers her close relationship with one of the members of the revolutionist team. Duyen did not care about neither her fiancé nor her dignity. She was only interested in some fertile field parts that these men promised to give her. Ironically, Duyen had given them everything, including her virginity and conduct but then obtained nothing. Cu, Boi, and Dinh were three core communist officers who appeared in the village to lead the missions. One part of their missions was to live with some village families in order to find out the status of the whole place. They lived together with the family and slept with daughters of the family. In the novel by To Hoai, it is not clear to list achievements of the reform, but it is undoubtful to watch a popularised sexual abuse. Leader Cu married some wives during the process (in fact, it was his black conspiracy to regularise his sexual relations with these women), and did not forget enlisting opportunities to have sex with other ladies. Boi performed body-games with Dom when he lived in her family, had sex relations with Duyen while staying at her house, and made sexual cuddles to a lot of other female partisans. Dinh, one of the three officers, was not different from his colleagues. More seriously, he was imprisoned, tortured, and forced to admit a sudden crime that Dinh did not know where it came from. His ethical identity that was unexpectedly transformed into another side was also a chance for him to look

back to his victims when he stood on the commanding position. The prisoner, while being taken part in a public denouncement and about to be shot, understood the misery he had created for others.

The Three Others, originally titled “Stories of the Three”, was first landed in 1993, but the book was immediately withdrawn and suspended for the reasons related to sensitive issues of the agrarian reform. More than twenty years later, in 2006, with a more open mind, To Hoai changed the novel’s original name to “The Three Others” and published the previously banned work again. For literary creations of the theme, compared with other novels, To Hoai’s *The Three Others* took another way in describing and explaining the land reform. Some contemporary books depicted the phenomenon by the observer’s eyes, whereas in *The Three Others*, the author used an experienced angle of a person who was believed to have participated in the project in the past. There are some similar points between To Hoai and the main character Boi in the novel. As a result, many scholars advocate *The Three Others* as a self-narrative novel by the writer. Actually, from today’s perspective, the novel is still the most authentic and influential book about land reform. In any case, the purpose of To Hoai, Le Luu, Ta Duy Anh, and other outstanding novelists is to state a shadow part of Vietnamese history, to remind the regime and the nation of a real historical period, and to avoid repeating mistakes like the past. Moreover, this was the authors’ endeavour to show and analyse the fate of ethics and people’s ethical tragedy in the painful time. It was also the main ethical posture of contemporary Vietnamese fictionists towards the theme of land revolution.

Historically, in 1956, President Ho Chi Minh and the Workers’ Party of Vietnam earnestly discovered the limitation and inaccuracy of the activity, and they quickly adopted some methods to amend them. On behalf of the party and the government, Uncle Ho straightly and sincerely conceded critical faults of the campaign to the parliament. “His tears fell because of the shortcomings due to subjectiveness, ignorance to listening to the people, and lack of coordination with practice. In front of the national compatriots, He did not hesitate to state these defects of the party, of the highest leader who is him.” (Duong) The Vietnamese dignitaries were very brave and responsible for they were able to recognise the errors, offer a public apology, and correct the fault. For the local writers, creating literary works with a reality-passed theme was also a way to express history and its truth, as well as the ethical penitence and moral repentance to the past. Under a new ethical context with the democratic and “free speech” atmosphere, primarily supported by a reliable ethical manner, the novelists after 1986 were brave enough

to stand up and present a previously forbidden place in literature. This kind of earnest creation was necessary for Vietnamese readers. Because without the pastoral novel, it would be difficult for them to get close the secret of history, which now becomes one kind of trauma in Vietnamese society, particularly for those having gone through the land reform.

Family Conflicts and Desires for Power: The Fate of Morality

As for the novelistic theme, family conflicts are one of the significant topics in contemporary Vietnamese novels. Regarding culture, the institutional type of Vietnamese pastoral society depends on the culture of the community, lifestyles of villages with the vital role of clans and families. “In rural Vietnam, awareness and traditions of clans and families play a critical role, considered as the ultimate mission and the glue that connects the village and the community (sense of community). On the other hand, to protect their own clans and villages, they are willing to fight against other ones (autonomy).” (Bui) Intercommunity and autonomy create the traditional character for Vietnamese village society about the management of social life, cultural activities, and religious rituals. The prominence of clans and families also causes some negative influences to the relations among human communities and the economic, political, and cultural development. It was not until after 1986 that the writers focused on this problem, however the previous literature had written much about these aspects. It is notable that in a new context of Vietnam’s economic improvement and international integration, the matter of villages and its cultural heritages has become an indispensable part for the whole progress, so writers were more concerned about this issue. Each writer while writing on the theme of rural areas often tried to build their own artistic images of the village, which bears their own aesthetic characteristics and ethical messages. In the past literature, Nam Cao initiated his Vu Dai Village where the famous short story writer reflected the fate of peasants under the French colonial rule. The novel after 1986 did not seem to pay more attention to the outside enemy but focused more on the inside one, which existed among complicated relations, and tenacious conflicts of the power of clans and families. Ta Duy Anh created Tho O Village (*Farewell to the Darkness*) and Dong Village (*The Old Kho*). Nguyen Khac Truong had his Gieng Chua Village in the novel *A Land of Many Ghosts and Many People* (1988). Le Luu invented Ha Vi Village and Cuoi Village in his writings *A Distant Time* (1986) and *Stories of Cuoi Village* (1991), respectively. Nguyen Binh Phuong described Tho Village in *At the Beginning* (2014), and so on. The face of morality also appeared vividly through these villages in writings after the wartime.

The authors described many events related to the theme of rural communities to provide readers with a realistic picture of village life in Vietnam. They also depicted characters' ethical identities that were locked in some ethical dilemmas within the family fightings. Under the influence of certain ethical situations, it was not easy for people to make ethical choices accurately. They were stuck in their own relatives and other families that were sometimes associated with their lovers, beloved friends, dear neighbours, and their social positions. Hence, aside from some who could extricate themselves from ethical dilemmas, most of them encountered tragedy and misfortune. Nguyen Khac Truong in his rural novel *A Land of Many Ghosts and Many People* (1988), for example, constructed an inherited hatred between two big clans of Gieng Chua Village, Vu Dinh families (with Vu Dinh Phuc as the representative) and Trinh Ba families (Trinh Ba Thu as the leader), and a lot of unethical issues that rooted from their animosity. The two clans' enmity that originated a long time ago was associated to marriages, ground, position, and power among them. In a bid to promote the family's reputation and interests, they tried to strengthen their powers by competing or buying seats in the village government, as well as hatching conspiracies to harm the opponent. As described, Vu Dinh Phuc and his son secretly broke into Trinh Ba Hoanh's house and damaged the picture of Trinh's sacred tiger, which was believed as the clan's tutelary genius. This was an immoral action that exacerbated the conflicts between the Trinh and the Vu families. Till to his last breath, Trinh Ba Hoanh could not revenge the Vu, but he still did not forget the hatred and gave his last will to Trinh Ba Ham, his son. Afterwards, Trinh Ba Ham continued to intensify the situation between the two families. He and his partners dug up the new grave of Vu Dinh Phuc's father, who had been buried recently, to turn it upside down and made an exorcism. The Trinh hoped to stop the adversary's power and influence. As a result, they made a choice that is unacceptable in Vietnamese culture and tradition. Their action violated the dead and hurt the living. The Vu discovered the immorality, and the culprit was imprisoned. To get rid of the contender's hands, Trinh Ba Thu (Trinh Ba Ham's younger brother) hatched a plot and forced his brother's wife, named Son, who had been Vu Dinh Phuc's old lover, to trap him. The extremist also constrained the poor woman to write a fabricated petition accusing Vu Dinh Phuc of ravishing her. The consequence was that Son had to suffer great shameful misery, and her ethical choice was a suicidal decision because she could not escape from the ethical dilemma. If Son told the truth, she would be unfaithful to her family; If the woman told lies, she would be at fault to her old lover; more importantly, she would betray her own conscience. Thus, the lady drowned herself into a river of

the village to terminate her inglorious life. Their fighting for domination and power not only made one poor woman lose her life, but also undermined their younger generation's happiness. Despite the fact that Tung (the Vu's posterity) deeply loved the lady Dao (the Trinh's descendants), the two families hindered their relation. They only cared about the social position and powerful influence. The morality was nothing to them. Without authentic ethics, their choices were unethical and inhumane. Son, Dao, Tung, and many others in Gieng Chua Village were chess pieces in some representatives of their families. Fortunately, one of the Vu's members, the young man Tung with his friend's support, stood up and denounced both his own family and the Trinh's sinful actions. His brave choice was based on a good ethical standpoint that helped him to stop the two clans' race of influences and to regain his beloved lady, Dao.

Not a happy ending as it is in *A Land of Many Ghosts and Many People*, most of the characters in *The Wharf of Without Husbands* (1990) by Duong Huong, due to the oath of Nguyen and Vu families, experienced ethical tragedies. Nghia, one of the Nguyen's talented sons, is quite similar to Tung in the novel by Nguyen Khac Truong. He loved a girl of the Vu, named Hanh, but that was an ethical plight for him: If Nghia still gave his heart to Hanh, he would betray his people; If the man did not live with his real feeling, he would be a faithless lover for the girl and himself. Finally, the young man dared to overcome the conflict between families to achieve his own happiness. The couple's marriage might be hope for deconstructing the two families' disagreement, but they could not resolve the status because of their childlessness. This trouble pushed Nghia into another lady's hands. Hanh decided to divorce him, not because of Nghia's adultery but her true love for him. Hanh sacrificed her own happiness to cultivate the other family's happiness, which was one of her great ethical expressions. Tragically, the lady was caught into another sad situation with Nguyen Van, a member of the Nguyen. The male character, a veteran, lived a hard life with the so-called "ideal" to maintain the balance of ethical scales. He tried to keep the image of a true communist soldier. His belief to the communist party was so tight that it erased his individual desire, which was very popular for people in the wartime. That is the reason why Nguyen Van denied the love of Nhan, who was Hanh's mother. The veteran was not courageous enough to get over the obstacle of clans and families' clash. His ethical thought and ethical choice relied on a firm basis that was "the revolutionary ideal" while the woman did not overcome the public opinion and the old-fashioned idea to live with him. However, then Nguyen Van, spending almost his whole life preserving ethics, in a stormy night got drunk and uncontrollably satisfied his

sexual desire with Hanh. This could be seen as an act of incest or an ethical taboo. When Nghia and Hanh were young, they lived in Nguyen Van's cottage, and the old soldier adopted them as his children. Hanh also considered the man as her father. Additionally, Nguyen Van loved Hanh's mother. From their ethical identity, the sexual activity between the two was the father having sex with daughter, the mother's lover having sex with the lover's daughter. The old man's last choice showed his emerging ethics: he jumped into the river to kill himself. For a man who always wanted to keep the right morality, once committed the ethical sin, he must repair the fault, no matter what cost it would take.

The struggle for social positions, influences, interests among the clans significantly impacted the ethics of families and communities. The conflict even happened inside one group, one family as the case of two branches of the Nguyen family in *The Old Kho* (2014) by Ta Duy Anh. The Giap branch and the At branch belonged to the same clan in Dong Village. Their animosity was rooted from the dispute of the grave of the forefather between the two branches. The old Kho, a member of the Giap family, who was inspired by the responsibility of a communist soldier and a revolutionary mission, led a civil defence group to demolish buildings of the wealthy leader of the At branch. The wealthy man and his people were determined to revenge the old Kho to save the family's fame and tradition. The hostility became means of existence for the At family's men who waited for the day of vengeance. Many years later, Tu Voc, one of the men of the At, returned to the village and conspired with a kinsman, the old Nam, to recover the branch's worship shrine and purge their archenemy. For the old Kho, he could not forget the miserable and unhappy life as a slave in the At leader's place. For this reason, when he had the authority in his hands, which was believed as the authority of the farmer class in the revolution, he did not hesitate to chastise the domination. A class feud had existed inside the old Kho, and after destroying the landowner's property, he ignited a new family hatred that followed both of the two sides steadily. The old Kho had been living a covered-by-hatred life and his other relatives had always been in a state of revenging. The animosity made them become blindfolded humans. Tu Voc and his kinsman were so beset with images of vengeance that they killed each other in a crazy situation. It is worth mentioning that the death of the antagonist did not satisfy the old Kho; in contrast, he felt the emptiness of the feud and life also. "The old Kho feels horribly lonely. His enemies stab each other following a certain fate. It is terrible assuming there is that kind of fate. He is lonely because he is extremely tired of the elimination. What is the meaning of life anyway? Because he refuses to find it out, his life is

struggling, useless, and meaningless. The most terrible thing is meaninglessness. It does not give people the opportunity to reincarnate in the future lives.” (Ta 187) The old peasant’s immense sadness showed the rise in ethical consciousness, which had been concealed a long time in the world of clashes. Behind the story, Ta Duy Anh’s message is that there were nothing more horrible than a boring life. If people take morality to exchange authority, power, position, and property, it will be an insignificant choice. Unless based on a rational ethical foundation, which decides people’s thought and behaviours, humankind will perform an immoral incarnation. Without a wise ethical choice, people will probably construct a bad world where monsters live with human beings as the name of a little drama within *Farewell to the Darkness* (2008) by the same author. Coordinated to the title of the novel, “darkness” symbolises the power of evil and Ta Duy Anh’s central philosophy is that people need to say farewell to the bad, the crime, and the immorality. It also means that in the battle between good and evil, the writer believes that the former will win eventually the latter. Providing the novelist’s opinions, there were various manifestations of evil forces in the society, such as the presence of alcoholics, adulterers, thieves, and murderers. These men were still living with others whether in the countryside or other places because they were one part of the society. On account of the co-existence of both an evil person and a right man, their different nature and confrontation with each other never abolished, but forever generated and sustained.

Regarding the good-evil thematic concerns, *At the Beginning* (2014) by Nguyen Binh Phuong is viewed as one of the most iconic works about this theme. The core content of this novel involves a male protagonist called Tinh. His father was an alcoholic and caveman. Inheriting his father’s negative attributes, Tinh gradually became a malignant man. During his childhood, he did not play with anyone and had not gone to school also. He was happy when killing tiny insects and regarded this action as a form of amusement. He liked to make friends with lunatics, and those who would give him incredible feelings like Phung and Hung. The former was a poor writer who often burned his manuscripts in front of Tinh’s face. The fire made him crazy: “Tinh likes fires, he does like it, he dances happily.” (P. Nguyen 19) The latter was a veteran who usually told stories of fighting with American soldiers and beating the enemies’ necks. Hung’s homicide-related stories gave Tinh much of inspiration. Besides, the protagonist was also interested in watching others kill pigs and gradually became a pig slayer himself. He even secretly went to villagers’ houses to kill pigs in the dark. Because of his father’s influences, his relations with lunatics, especially the violence of sticking pigs, Tinh

seemly saw others as animals that are objects for him to kill. He was fascinated by staring at people's neck and would like to stick that position as he did to the pigs. The man had a beautiful wife, called Hien, who wanted him to see her as a woman every night. He did not touch the wife's sexy body but only fastened his eyes upon her neck. He did not have the sexual desire with her; instead, what covered him was the desire of killing that made Hien the country woman experience marriage misfortune. In the wedding night, Tinh slept like a log meanwhile Hien took her clothes off, turned the light on and contemplated her own naked body. She even once "takes the shirt off, bows down to the ground, rubs her breast towards the rocks. Her breasts are scraped, ooze blood. Tinh touches the blood on the rock, sticks out his tongue and tastes it, and his face is shining." (P. Nguyen 96-97) Since malignancy had controlled his human nature, Tinh finally broke a serious ethical taboo. He did not only kill animals but also kill several people in his rural place. Originated from a fire-related story of Hung, Tinh set his neighbour's house on fire and burned the drunk-host inside the cottage. "At the time, his face is slightly glowy." (P. Nguyen 31) He felt comfortable with the evil that he created. Afterwards, the hostess felt wretched with her husband's death. She felt ill and left the world behind. Tinh killed one life directly and another life indirectly. Moreover, he murdered one mad boy savagely. He stabbed an evangelist namely Khoa and then coming back home to find Hien, his wife, who was having a bath at that time. It was the first time Tinh had seen Hien's naked body thoroughly, and the pure beauty of this lady, which was glowing with the yellow sunshine. This was the core factor in reviving Tinh's rational willing (理性意志). He suddenly recognised his crimes and stuck himself to end the life of a demon.

His ethical choice marked the recovery of ethical willing that made him transform into a genuine person with two parts of the Sphinx factor (斯芬克斯因子): human factor (人性因子) and animal factor (兽性因子). The Sphinx jumps to the abyss to commit suicide after answering the puzzle of her true ethical identity. Tinh also killed himself after getting the enlightenment of ethical consciousness. The original ethical beauty saves human beings' human factor and takes them back at the beginning. It is one of the most prominent ethical reminders that Nguyen Binh Phuong wishes to propagate via his pastoral writing.

Traditions, Belief, and Sex: Ethical Taboo and Edificatory Function

As an integral part of Vietnamese culture, the village culture in rural society has its own characteristics that include rich and colourful depictions written in the local pastoral novels after 1986. It should be mentioned that the culture, which

involves both superannuated traditions and new problematical ones, becomes one kind of ethical conditions that brings about some ethical tragedies to people. Furthermore, in the face of the plight, it is tough for the characters to make their ethical choices correctly, and sometimes they fall into the ethical taboo. Nguyen Thanh, a local literary scholar, in the book *Vietnamese Literature after Thirty Years of Innovation (1986-2016): Creation and Reception* (2017), points out: “Most remarkable in the pastoral novels after 1986 is the obsession with people’s tragedies because of various reasons: unsound customs, wars, miserable life and infantile ideologies from the command period, some faults of the land reform, and people’s depravations.” (T. Nguyen and Ho 269) The critics only see the sources of people’s tragedy as that belongs to the past but still do not realise the influence of contemporary matters. Some local novelists sang the praises of the beauty of Vietnamese rural culture, simultaneously they paid more attention to its shortcomings and negations that were chiefly described via some underdeveloped traditions and customs, superstition, and backward thoughts. They also wrote about some matters such as sex, love, and individual happiness, which were rarely demonstrated in the previous literature. With the strong support of a new ethical condition, the writers had lots of advantages to declare situations of characters’ moral problems and spread educational values via the writings.

About the traditional culture in rural areas of Vietnam, “rural culture” or “common culture” has become an indispensable part of pastoral life in this country. It existed among the community and played an inherent component of peasants’ life. After 1986, the rural novels focused on depicting this national tradition as a particular characteristic to provide the audiences with a lot of cultural colours, and people’s plentiful soul world, which can be seen through *The Wharf of Without Husbands* (1990) by Duong Huong, *Stories of Cuoi Village* (1991) by Le Luu, *A Land of Many Ghosts and Many People* (1988) by Nguyen Khac Truong, *The Dagged Board* (2004) by Mac Can, *The Three Others* (2006) by To Hoai, *The Age of Deities* (2008) by Hoang Minh Tuong, *Farewell to the Darkness* (2008) and *The Old Kho* (2014) by Ta Duy Anh, *At the Beginning* (2014) by Nguyen Binh Phuong, *Silence in the Abyss* (2017) by Do Bich Thuy, and so forth. These novels portrayed the positive images of traditional beliefs in peasants’ life. They also expressed some old and conservative aspects, which influenced people’s life and led to their ethical tragedies. The tradition of “wife-abduction” in the novel by Do Bich Thuy, for example, was a humanitarian voice for those who were living under some strict cultural situations. Wife-abduction mentioned a traditional custom of the H’mong minority, also called Mong or Meo, who primarily settled

in northwestern Vietnam. For the tradition, the two lovers would be dating on the same day and in the same place, and the male shall “catch” his lover. The girl also pretended to fight against and cried because she believes that these actions would make the marriage happier. After three days residing at the catcher’s house, the girl officially becomes a wife. In case the girl does not fall for the man, he is not allowed to abduct her. If the man ignores that fact and deliberately catches the lady, she can find ways to escape from his place within three days. If she fails to do that, she still is his wife. The excellent feature of wife-abduction is that it shows the men’s braveness and a true love for his sweetheart. It also manifests the H’mong ethnic minority’s freedom marriage and a way out for poor men who do not have enough money to afford wedding-presents. Besides, “It can be said that the wife-abduction tradition has a profoundly humanitarian meaning, affirming the freedom of marriage, contributing to the removal of some unsound customs such as ‘parents set where children sit’, challenges of wedding-presents, and suitable alliances...” (Diep) Unfortunately, some people make use of the tradition to “catch” their wives without any permission, which makes the custom transform into a frightening fact for the mountainous ladies and their family. To Hoai mentioned this type of cultural topic in his very famous short story *The Couple A Phu* (1952) in the before-1986-literature that depicted a pitiful victim of the tradition via the life of My. This H’mong girl suffered much misery in her husband’s house, and then the light of the communist revolution liberated her. Being different from To Hoai, the after-1986-writer Do Bich Thuy chose an alternative way to approach the same matter in her novel *Silence in Abyss*. There were no any rescues for both the catcher and the abducted girl, inversely the price they had to pay was a tragic life.

Giang Senh Vu’s plan of catching Giang Thi Sua (or Sua) was failed because of the appearance of a third party, Trang A Phong (or Phong), who unilaterally loved Sua and suddenly knew the couple’s intention. When the lady opened her eyes in a strange room, and the catcher was not her lover, she was feeling awkward and exceedingly painful. It was not a happy dream as she had imagined. Sua was confined to Phong’s room. The rich man violated Sua brutally. He treated her like a sex slave. She escaped from the terrible house, went to the forest, and stood on the edge of an abyss. If there were not the appearance of Chia, who was Phong’s dumb sister-in-law, just at the moment when Sua intended to commit suicide, she would jump down to the abyss. There were no other choices, and the poor girl had to turn back to the catcher’s place and undergone her ethical plight: in front of her was Phong, while in her heart was Giang Senh Vu (or Vu), between the two she did not know how to continue her life. “How to live on? How to see the

sun rising everyday, falling everyday? How to continue to think about Vu without being heart-broken? Sua does not see anything worth stepping forward.” (Do 36) She wanted to end her life by hanging herself. The dumb girl appeared timely to stop her suicide. Later then, surprisingly, Chia gave Sua the signal for running away, and Sua took such rare chance to leave the house. However, when Sua met Vu by chance on her fleeing way, she gave up the intention that her lover could not understand the reasons. “Does Sua want to decamp? She does. However, Sua cannot stand seeing Vu like this. Sua has nothing left for Vu. He does not deserve gnawing a maize that was gnawed by an inhumane man. No Mong man has to do it, the better he is, the less he has to.” (Do 45) Sua’s ethical choice was based on her deep love for Vu and her moral consciousness, which was related to her virgin situation. Out of weariness, she let things run its course. The pretty girl became a shadow of herself. She silently borne her husband’s daily sex. Sua tried to do housework to postpone sexual affairs that she was fully soundless whenever it happened. On one occasion, the wife decided to flee from her husband. Ironically, she found out she was pregnant. She did not want any Phong’s children and wished to leave out the foetus. The pregnant woman came to the river to drown herself, but the water was not deep enough. She climbed up the hill and rolled over on the ground, but nothing happened to her. Then the baby was born. It was like a string of fate tightening Sua, causing her to be attached to this family forever. The son also made his father change personalities, but the baby did not much improve his mother’s feelings. She was still a quiet shape: “The shadow is able to walk, work, cook, nurse, pamper her child, who is in front of Phong’s face, but there is no way for him to catch her.” (Do 141) The lady’s manner and frigidity made him so angry that he committed an incestuous case with his sister-in-law, Chia. The true cause of his ethical taboo is that he wanted to revenge the wife. While discovering the true nature of her brother-in-law’s action, in which he only used her as a vengeance tool, Chia came to the abyss, where she saved Sua’s life before, and jumped down to the darkness. Simultaneously, Phong found out his true ethical identity as an adopted son, and, along with his emptiness about the marriage, he jumped down to the same abyss, where he knew was exactly the position of Chia’s corpse. Sua came to the cliff and felt that “Life is ending now. Sua only feels that thing when winds are blowing from the bottom of the abyss that seem to dragging Sua down.” (Do 205) There were no any liberations for them all. The remains were moral pangs. All came from Trang A Phong’s wrong ethical choice at the beginning, and then from a series of ethical chaos among characters’ thought, behaviours, and actions. The most underlying reason for this tragedy is people’s attitude to the wife-abduction or

the traditional heritage. They should have paid respect to the tradition, which is an expression of morality. Once people break through the ethical values, it will cause troubles for them. The wind still blew up from the bottom of the abyss in the novel, which could be the ethical - moral wind, to touch the hearts of those who were living in the present life.

With the tragedy brought about by rural culture to people, Vietnamese novelists after 1986 tried to show the tragic life of love, sexuality, and marriage. The aim was to break the cultural and ideological remnants from the feudal society, to clarify some conservative and backward concepts and customs, and to serve the development of farmers. Compared with literature before 1975, this content was an improvement of the local novel. The pastoral characters described in the previous texts were a collective image, a tool of revolutionary war, a figure that had no personal feelings but only patriotic ideals. Correspondingly, the ethical choice made by peasant characters in the before-1986-literature was one kind of collective ethical choice. The situation was different after 1986 when the local authors not only expressed the collective characteristics of farmers but also pointed out their personal ones. The local fictionists were concerned about the private world of pastoral characters, reflecting their feelings, aspirations, dreams, desires, but most of their wishes were reduced to a tragic state. The reason for each person's tragedy is different. For Nguyen Van in *The Wharf of Without Husbands* it is his mechanical ideal; For the old Kho in the same name novel, it is his sacrificial belief; while for the protagonists in *Silence in Abyss*, it is love, marriage, and the tradition. For Nguyen Binh Phuong in *At the Beginning* it is the sexual desires of Hien and her mother-in-law, Lien, which make them make some ethical mistakes. Because Tinh did not satisfy Hien's sexual appetency, the wife had to please herself by some dramatic ways including contemplating her own naked body and rubbing her breast onto rocks. As a married woman, she even perpetrated two ethical taboos including seeking sexual satisfaction via the writer Phung and accomplicing with her mother-in-law's adultery. The two female characters' ethical identities were not the same, but the similar point between the two was their unsatisfied sexual tragedies. This is a feministic voice of Nguyen Binh Phuong for a topic that seemingly has long been forgotten in the literature about the rural theme. People's demands needed to be seen carefully and met fully in an ethical perspective. If their libido were either ignored or were satisfied in an immoral way, ethical taboo would emerge, which influenced human being's real values.

The manifestation of the farmer's matters was also a kind of new humanitarianism in Vietnamese pastoral novels after 1986. In particular, the

revelation of peasants' love dreams and sexual aspirations was a remarkable contribution of the local authors in comparison with the previous literature. Through these contents, the readers were able to explore the characters' moral conflicts, ethical plights, and their ethical tragedy. Since they could not resolve the contradiction between private desire and reality, they were all stuck in this tragedy. On account of the ethical dilemma, sometimes the characters broke the ethical prohibitions that were majorly homicide and incest. The little boy Thuong in the novel *Farewell to the Darkness* (2008) by Ta Duy Anh, for instance, with the help of the secret evil force, unintentionally killed several lives in the village. Although no one else knew about the perpetrator of the killings, he recognised the true face of the terrible crimes. For this reason, he was finally determined to say goodbye to the darkness in order to protect others' lives. The old Phung, another character in the novel, often fabricated false things against others. Phung had calumniated his uncle in the land reform, and the man was so angry that he vomited blood leading to death. One of the most outrageous crimes of the character was that he frequently raped his daughter-in-law. When his son uncovered the incest, he took a knife and came to see his father. "You are my child, if I tell you to die, you have to die. How worthy is your wife? If I borrow her once, nothing matters. Not only me, there are millions of people out there willing to do the same" (Ta 187), said the unethical father. The son shouted and cut a leg of a buffalo calf off, and went away. Since then Phung freely violated the poor daughter-in-law until she gave birth to a deformed child, and both of them had been kicked out of the house by the old man. The price he had to pay for his incestuous crime was unexpectedly falling into a well and died painfully. He was unscrupulous and did not deserve to be a father. The contemporary fictionists realised and analysed such issues of the ethical taboo. The purpose was to show the evil nature of human beings on the one hand, and to provide the moral example and edificatory values for the readers on the other hand.

Most of the sinners who have fallen into the ethical taboo were influenced by the ethical context or the ethical environment. In other words, the environment of pastoral communities had a severe impact on the development of people's personality and quality. Even a pure and beautiful girl like Hien in the novel *At the Beginning* sometimes wants to stab her vicious husband, Tinh. This means that under the influence of the violence, human beings' moral and ethical values are likely to be emasculated and corrupted if they cannot make righteous ethical choices. The local novelists who wrote pastoral writings in Vietnam after 1986 have reminded readers of ethical values, which are available via edificatory functions of literature as defined by ELC: "As long as it is literature, whether

ancient or contemporary, Western or Chinese, edification is its basic function. It can even be said that there is no literature without the function of education.” (Nie 249) Reflecting on some moral novelistic models, the readers obtaine thical lessons that allow them to be truly ethical individuals.

Conclusion

Generally, according to the introduction of a new ethical condition, which was inextricably linked with the political and economic innovation led by the VCP since 1986, the local writers stood on a new perspective to reflect and evaluate the rural life. The new ethical basis allowed them to recall and analyse some sensitive issues in the history that had not been demonstrated by the previous literature for some reasons. The fictionists also focused on depicting peasants’ internal matters related to traditions, customs, beliefs, culture, and lifestyles. They also manifested some contemporary problems in rural society such as families and clans’ fights, authority and position conflicts, individual and collective contradictions. The primary content of the local pastoral novels after 1986, especially the images of peasant characters, described both good and bad aspects. It aimed at embodying the true nature of life, which is a Sphinx organism that contains both human factors and animal factors. These two sides of the pastoral society showed the different angles of Vietnamese society and culture. Among them, the novelists discovered some people’s ethical issues such as the farmer’s ethical identity in the families struggles, their ethical dilemma and ethical tragedy in the land revolution, the ethical taboo in the incarceration of the undeveloped customs and traditions. As a local author’s title “A Land of Many Ghosts and Many People” (1988), the Vietnamese rural community was an intricate combination of good and evil, demons and human beings, light and darkness. Whether it is a reflection on the past or a depiction of contemporary life, positively or negatively, the pastoral theme is one of the biggest ones of Vietnamese literature after 1986 that offeres some valuable lessons to readers.

Works Cited

- Bùi, Hải Như. “Ý thức về làng xã, họ tộc trong tiểu thuyết Việt Nam viết về nông thôn đương đại.” *Văn Hiến Việt Nam*, 25 Sept. 2013. <vanhien.vn/news/Y-thuc-ve-lang-xa-ho-toc-trong-tieu-thuyet-Viet-Nam-viet-ve-nong-thon-duong-dai-39494.> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).
- [Bui, Hai Nhu. “Awareness of Villages, Clans in Contemporary Vietnamese Novels about Rural.” *Vietnamese Culture*, 25 Sept. 2013. <vanhien.vn/news/Y-thuc-ve-lang-xa-ho-toc-trong-tieu-thuyet-Viet-Nam-viet-ve-nong-thon-duong-dai-39494.> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).]

- Diệp, Anh. “Tục ‘bắt vợ’ của người H’mong - Phong tục hay hủ tục?” *Sao Style*. <n. d., saostyle.vn/tuc-bat-vo-cua-nguoi-hmong-phong-tuc-hay-hu-tuc/> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).
- [Diệp, Anh. “Wife-Abductions of the H’mong: Good Custom or Unsound Custom?” *Sao Style*. <n. d., saostyle.vn/tuc-bat-vo-cua-nguoi-hmong-phong-tuc-hay-hu-tuc/.> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).]
- Đỗ, Thúy Bích. *Lặng yên dưới vực sâu*. Hà Nội: Nhà xuất bản Hội Nhà văn, 2017.
- [Do, Thuy Bich. *Silence in the Abyss*. Hanoi: Writers Association Publishing House, 2017.]
- Dương, Hương. “Bác Hồ với công khai khuyết điểm.” *ITV News*, 18 May 2010. <vtv.vn/trong-nuoc/bac-ho-voi-cong-khai-khuyet-diem-40433.htm.> (Accessed 20 Dec 2018).
- [Duong, Huong. “Uncle Ho with the Declaration of Defect.” *ITV News*, 18 May 2010. <vtv.vn/trong-nuoc/bac-ho-voi-cong-khai-khuyet-diem-40433.htm.> (Accessed 20 Dec 2018).
- Ngô, Anh Vương. “Trung bày chuyên đề ‘Cải cách ruộng đất 1946-1957’.” *Nhân Dân Điện Tử*, 8 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.nhandan.com.vn/vanhua/dong-chay/item/24252402-trung-bay-chuyen-de-%E2%80%9CCai-cach-ruong-dat-1946-1957%E2%80%9D.html>.> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).
- [Ngo, Anh Vuong. “Exhibition on ‘The Land Reform 1946-1957’.” *Online People*, 8 Sept. 2014. <<http://www.nhandan.com.vn/vanhua/dong-chay/item/24252402-trung-bay-chuyen-de-%E2%80%9CCai-cach-ruong-dat-1946-1957%E2%80%9D.html>.> (Accessed 20 Dec. 2018).]
- Nguyễn, Phương Bình. *Thoạt kỳ thủy*. Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh: Nhà xuất bản Trẻ, 2014.
- [Nguyen, Phuong Binh. *At the Beginning*. Ho Chi Minh City: Young Publishing House, 2014.]
- Nguyễn, Thành, và Hồ, Hà Thế, chủ biên. *Văn học Việt Nam ba mươi năm đổi mới (1986-2016): Sáng tạo và Tiếp nhận*. Hà Nội: Nhà xuất bản Văn học, 2017.
- [Nguyen, Thanh, and Ho, Ha The. ed. *Vietnamese Literature after Thirty Years of Innovation (1986-2016): Creation and Reception*. Hanoi: Literature Publishing House, 2017.]
- 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.]
- Tạ, Anh Duy. *Lão Khố*. Hà Nội: Nhà xuất bản Hội Nhà văn, 2014.
- [Ta, Anh Duy. *The Old Kho*. Hanoi: Writers Association Publishing House, 2014.]

“世界文学”景观中普适性与地方性： 汉学家伊维德中国宝卷研究路径与伦理身份

Universality and Locality in the Landscape of “World Literature”: An Exploration of Sinologist Idema’s Research Path of the Chinese Baojuan

李永平（Li Yongping） 乔现荣（Qiao Xianrong）

内容摘要：在前所未有之大变局来临之前，在古老的东方中国，欧洲学者对中国文学的阅读、翻译、研究、交流是“世界文学”的重要组成部分。深入历史的细部，可以说，有多少民族和本土的视角，就会有多少种“世界文学”。生于荷兰达伦，大半生辗转欧洲大陆、日本、美国哈佛，毕生从事中国俗文学翻译、研究的汉学家伊维德就是一个典型。作为欧美汉学家的代表，他走过的汉学之路，是欧美汉学家的典型路径。这一路径既是汉学家入门的典型路径，又在研究的文类偏好、研究路径选择上极具伦理身份特色。其中既有普遍性，又有特殊性。梳理伊维德译介研究中国宝卷的缘由及身份特色，为新世纪中国成为真正“世界文学”的中心提供一个参照。

关键词：伊维德；汉学家；欧美汉学；中国宝卷

作者简介：李永平，文学博士，历史学博士后，陕西师范大学文学院教授，博士生导师。国家社科基金重大项目“海外藏中国宝卷整理与研究”首席专家。陕西师范大学文学人类学中心主任；乔现荣，陕西师范大学文学院博士生，陕西科技大学文理学院副教授，陕西科技大学翻译与文化传播研究所所长，主要从事世界文学与比较文学研究、翻译学研究。本文为国家社科基金重大项目“海外藏中国宝卷整理与研究”【项目批号：17ZDA266】的阶段成果。

Title: Universality and Locality in the Landscape of “World Literature”: An Exploration of Sinologist Idema’s Research Path of the Chinese Baojuan

Abstract: Before the unprecedented era of change, in ancient China, the reading, translation and exchange of Chinese literature by early European scholars are an important part of “world literature.” Going deep into the details of history, we can say that there are as many kinds of “world literature” as there are national and local perspectives. Born in Leiden, Netherlands, Will L. Idema spent most of his life in Europe, Japan, and Harvard. He devoted his life to the translation and research of Chinese popular literature. As a representative of sinologists in Europe

and the United States, his research path embodies many of the paths of the other sinologists. This path is not only typical for sinologists who get their study started, but also has personal features in literature preference and research path selection. It is both universal and particular. This paper analyzes the reasons and his identity characteristics to provide a reference for China as part of the center of the real “world literature” in the new century.

Key words: Idema; sinologist; Euromerican sinology; Chinese Baojuan

Author: Li Yongping, is Ph.D. of literature, Postdoctor of history, and Professor as well as a doctoral supervisor at School of Chinese Language and Literature Shaanxi Normal University (Xi'an Shannxi 710062, China). He is Chief Expert of the major project “Overseas Collection and Research of Chinese Baojuan” funded by the National Social Science Foundation of China. He is the Director of Literary Anthropology Research Center of Shaanxi Normal University (Email: ypli@snnu.edu.cn); **Qiao Xianrong**, is a Ph.D. student at School of Chinese Language and Literature Shaanxi Normal University, an associate professor at School of Arts and Sciences of Shaanxi University of Science and Technology. She is the Director of the Institute of Translation and Cultural Communication of Shaanxi University of Science and Technology (Xi'an Shannxi 710021, China). She specializes in the research of world literature, comparative literature and translation studies (Email: qiaoxianrong@sust.edu.cn).

引言

在中华民族千年未有之大变局来临之际，中国之世界以“世界文学”的面目首先降临。“世界文学”（world literatures）是具体存在的，在世界不同地域、不同民族，“世界文学”的实践形式多种多样。在古老的东方中国，中国文学与早期欧洲学者之间的阅读、翻译、研究、交流是“世界文学”的重要组成部分¹。深入历史的细部，可以说有多少民族和伦理视角，就有多少种“世界文学”（Saussy 11）。要通过中国思考“世界文学”，就绕不过去一个重要概念“汉学”（Sinology）。如果要通过中国发现不一样的“世界文学”，那么生于荷兰达伦，大半生辗转欧洲大陆、日本、美国哈佛，从事中国文学翻译和传播的汉学家伊维德（Wilt L. Idema）²就是一个典型。正如伽达默尔（Hans-Georg Gadamer）所说：“获得一个视域总是意味着我们学会了超越近在咫尺的东西去观看，但这不是为了避而不见这种东西，而是为了在一个

1 参见大卫·丹穆若什：《什么是世界文学》（北京：北京大学出版社，2013年）译者序。

2 伊维德教授是笔者国家重大项目“海外藏中国宝卷整理与研究”项目组重要成员。本文的研究是建立在与伊维德教授的交往与邮件往来基础上的，论文同时也参考了时贤与伊维德教授的访谈录及伊维德教授的研究论著，在此对伊维德教授的支持帮助深表谢意。

更大的整体中按照一个更正确的尺度去更好地观察这种事物”（Hans-Georg Gadamer 304）。作为中国文化的翻译和阐释者，伊维德在本土与他者语境间的来回穿梭，由此而在不同身份选择之间形成互动与张力。作为欧美汉学家的代表，他走过的汉学之路，可说是欧美汉学家的典型路径，这既是特定历史时期汉学家入门的典型路径，又在翻译的文类偏好、研究路径选择上极具身份特色，其中既有普遍性，又有特殊性。本文通过对资料的研究，结合与伊维德本人的学术交往，梳理这一过程，为新世纪中国成为真正“世界文学”的中心提供一个参照视角。

一、欧洲早期的汉学传统

在周宪看来，跨文化研究中对他人文本意义的理解和解释，受到多重语境、历史性、文化间互动以及解释共同体的制约。尽管人文学者的研究常常是个体性的，但是，任何人的研究始终受到解释共同体（interpretive community）的解释规则的制约。在这样的解释共同体中，翻译、阐释、研究活动存在一个解释共同体内部的协商过程，这一过程是历史性的、可交流和可理解的。¹ 因此，对伊维德与欧洲汉学的共有知识的互动路径的形成，有必要放在欧洲汉学的解释共同体内部，寻找坐标定位。

17 世纪之前的欧洲汉学一般被认为是“游记汉学”，到了 17-18 世纪发展为“传教士汉学”，19 世纪后才出现了学理意义上的“专业汉学”。² 在这三个阶段当中，欧洲汉学研究的对象随着欧中互动的变化而变化。

从“大航海时代”到 19 世纪，随着资本主义的急剧扩张与世界秩序重塑，欧洲汉学完成了“游记汉学”到“传教士汉学”的转变。早在 7 世纪，就有穆斯林探险家来到中国，陆续出版了中国游记。大约成书于 851 年《中国与印度游记》（*Travels in China and India*）就已经全面介绍了中国的宗教、文化、风俗人情等。13 世纪的《马可·波罗游记》（*The Travels of Marco Polo*, 1997）记录了在中国的风物见闻，游记完成后风靡欧洲，成为了中外关系史上的历史性文献。³ 17-18 世纪，欧洲学者从这些中国游记中提取素材，掀起了 18 世纪欧洲的中国热，这不仅为日后“专业汉学”的兴起奠定了基础，而且影响了伏尔泰为代表的“亲华派”的戏剧创作，为此后中国文化在欧洲的

1 参见周宪：《文化间的理论旅行：比较文学与跨文化研究论集》（南京：译林出版社，2017 年）22-23。

2 有关汉学发展阶段划分，可参见张西平：“雷慕沙：西方专业汉学第一人”，《世界历史评论》6.4（2019）：5；张西平：“西方游记汉学的奠基之作——《马可波罗游记》的历史价值”，《社会科学论坛》8（2017）：115-122；张西平：“卜弥格与欧洲专业汉学的兴起——简论卜弥格与雷慕沙的学术连接”，《国际汉学》1（2014）：107-119+204-205；张西平：“传教士汉学平议”，《世界汉学》1（2006）：114-118。

3 参见钱林森：“论游记在西方汉学中的地位和作用”，《江苏社会科学》6（2000）：153-159。

传播和交流起到了重要的先导作用。¹

初到中国的传教士，为寻求主流社会的认同，一般都和西方汉学史公认的第一个汉学家利玛窦（Matteo Ricci）一样，以中国知识阶层为榜样，希望成为“西儒”。在东西方文化碰撞的时代，传教士群体注定是中西文化的中继站。从文化传统上看，中国文化传统对现世人伦的关切胜过对彼岸灵魂的安顿，这给了传教士群体成为“耶儒”的机会。从时代精神上看，晚明天崩地坼，释家渗入儒家使个性解放和精神自觉成为时代潮流，这让传教士的理想抱负得以伸展。利玛窦在《天主实义》（1604）中力图证明基督教义是溥天之下的神学，他常重复陆九渊的一句话：“东海西海，心同理同”，不失时机地将自己绘制的《山海輿地全图》（1609）悬挂于起居室中，使得本来以为天下仅有十五省的中国士人群体感到极为震撼，起到了振聋发聩，颠倒众生“世界”观的重要作用。² 早期，西方人仍然不了解中国的宗教道教、佛教，对抒情诗、白话小说、散文等不同的文学类型相当陌生，欧洲人只接受合乎理性主义与启蒙主义思想的那一部分中国文化³，其中的选择充满了西方东方主义的幻想、欲望和无意识的想象，是西方人的观看或表征（represent）。当然也与中国闭关锁国的外交政策有关，当时中国对传教士研习中国语言文化有极其严格的限制，因此这些传教士汉学家学习研究的资源受限。除了研习中国文化，来中国的传教士也扮演着对东方中国的“启蒙”的伦理角色，小说无疑被看做是深得人心的形式。19世纪末之前，传教士创作、小说具有鲜明宗教特色，韩南认为，最早的一部为米怜（William Milne）所著。最多产的作家要数郭实猎（Karl Gutzlaff）了，他在19世纪30年代写了七八部小说。影响最大的传教士小说，却是李提摩太（Timothy Richard）为贝拉米（Edward Bellamy）的小说《回头看：2000-1887》（*Looking Backward, 2000-1887*, 1988）所作的摘要。⁴ 中国俗文学书籍出口到欧洲的数量在这一时期较少，因此，欧洲的图书馆收藏明清俗文学作品比较晚。“专业汉学”兴起之后，说唱文学作品的研究起步更晚。

19世纪的汉学，保持着当时的时代精神和潮流，是一种浪漫式的汉学，含有帝国主义、实证主义，及历史主义的思想。身处欧洲本土的汉学研究传教士汉学旨趣不同，为了熟悉中国人的日常生活，欧洲本土的汉学研究热衷于中国的古代小说和戏曲等俗文学。汉学也因此而客观化，并且逐渐成为

1 最早将中国俗文学作品翻译成欧洲语言的是法国的汉学家。18世纪，欧洲已经出现了中国白话故事、戏剧和小说的法文和英文译本，其中，杂剧是最早被翻译的文本类型之一。1735年，马若瑟（Joseph de Prémare）就将纪君祥的《赵氏孤儿》译为法文并出版，此后儒莲（Stanislas Julien）又重新翻译了全本的《赵氏孤儿》，并翻译了李行道的《灰阑记》和王实甫的《西厢记》。

2 参见卜正民：《挣扎的帝国：元与明》，潘玮琳译（北京：中信出版社，2016年）。

3 参见 Gauting Herbert Franke, *Sinologie an Deutschen Universitaeten* (Wiesbaden, 1968)。译文引自《东方杂志》复刊第20卷第8期。

4 参见韩南：《中国近代小说的兴起》，徐侠译（上海：上海教育出版社，2010年）4。

一门主要的学科。19 世纪后，专业汉学确立，欧洲人可以自由出入中国，汉学家越来越认识到，小说戏曲在中国的低下地位，因此，逐渐对小说、戏曲等俗文学失去了兴趣。欧洲各大图书馆对俗文学的收藏也日渐失去兴趣。

20 世纪初，欧洲汉学家的主要关注点是中国古典文学和哲学，而中国学者开始将传统白话文引入文学研究，这一研究动态也受到西方学者的关注。二战后，汉学范式发生重要转型，以欧洲为主要研究阵地的“汉学”研究，转变为以美国为首的“中国研究”。近年来，这两种汉学模式互有借鉴、互有融合。

伊维德出生于欧洲早期汉学的摇篮——荷兰。1853 年夏，帕赫德氏 (C. F. Pahud) 在莱顿大学成立了汉语研究院 (Sinological Institute of Leiden)，13 年后，该中心的第一届学生施莱格尔 (Gustave Schlegel) 博士出版了他的成名作《天地会：海外华人秘密结社之研究》 (*ThianTi Hwui: the Hung League Heaven, Earth League, a Secret Society with the Chinese in China and India*, 1866)，重点研究了海外华人天地会在组织结构和礼仪规定等方面的问题¹。1875 年，施莱格尔博士成为莱顿大学第一位汉学教授。²

19 世纪欧洲的许多著名的汉学家都曾在莱顿大学学习，莱顿因此成为欧洲汉学早期的重镇。毕业于荷兰莱顿大学，先后在德国海德堡大学、荷兰莱顿大学，主要研究中国民间宗教和民间文化史的田海³ (Barend J. ter Haar) 就是其中成绩突出的一位。生于荷兰的伊维德就是在这种变动中的国际汉学环境中，继承了伦理身份，成长为日后在中国俗文学研究领域最具国际影响力的汉学家⁴。由于受到日本视域的影响，又伴随着国际汉学中心的迁移，作为叙述者的伊维德，在某种意义上，超越了身为欧洲学者的东方主义“帝国之眼”的凝视，他的研究呈现出对世界文学的更为丰富的认知。

二、从戏曲到宝卷的汉学路径

追本溯源，伊维德的汉学之路始于美国作家赛珍珠 (Pearl S. Buck) 的译

1 参见 Gustave Schlegel, *ThianTi Hwui: the Hung League Heaven, Earth League, a Secret Society with the Chinese in China and India* (Batavia: Lange & Co., 1866)。

2 参见刘正：《图说汉学史》（桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2005 年）。

3 田海著作有《中国历史上的白莲教》 (*The White Lotus Teachings in Chinese Religious History*, 1992)、《讲故事：中国历史上的巫术与替罪》 (*Telling Stories: Witchcraft and Scapegoating in Chinese History*, 2006)、《践行经文：中华帝国晚期的世俗佛教运动》 (*Practicing Scripture: A Lay Buddhist Movement in Late Imperial China*, 2014) 等。

4 伊维德，荷兰的汉学家，荷兰皇家艺术和科学院院士。欧大年 (Daniel L. Overmyer)，主要研究明代新教派的起源，对民间教派文研究著述颇丰，也是研究宝卷最早的欧洲学者之一；另有，荷兰皇家科学院院士，法国高等研究院特级教授，曾任荷兰莱顿大学汉学院院长施舟人 (Kristoffer Schipper)，以研究道教闻名，著有《道体论》 (1982)、《道藏通考》 (2005) 等；此外还有，荷兰汉学家龙彼得 (Piet van der Loon)，他曾任教于牛津大学与剑桥大学，主要研究领域为戏曲与傀儡戏。

作《牡丹》(1948)和荷兰汉学家、东方学家、翻译家、小说家高罗佩(Robert Hans van Gulik)的《大唐狄公案》(2018)系列小说。那时赛珍珠刚获得诺贝尔奖,这让年轻的伊维德对中国文化产生了浓厚兴趣。在荷兰莱顿大学完成了本科、硕士及博士学位之后,伊维德到日本北海道大学、京都大学做访问学者(1968-1969),跟随京都大学人文科学研究所的田中谦二(Kenji Tanaka)学习中国的元曲。田中谦二是继青木正儿(Masaru Aoki)之后,日本中国戏剧造诣最深之耆宿。在北海道大学社会学系访学时,伊维德学会了用社会学方法研究文学,近代以来,日本曾经扮演着近代社会变革语词“东渐”和中国文学“西游”的中介角色,这些对他之后的文学研究视域和偏好产生了深刻的影响。

研究生阶段,伊维德对白话叙事文学的兴趣让他走向了“杂剧”“散曲”研究之路,他在中国通俗小说、民间歌谣及女性文学领域发表了许多著述。伊维德的博士论文《中国白话小说:形成期》(*Chinese Vernacular Fiction: The Formative Period*, 1974),主要研究了中国早期的白话小说,他认为话本不一定是说书人的脚本,话本与戏曲、杂剧、小说等都互有影响,而且话本语篇形式的改变受到社会经济环境、表演形式、其他文本等影响。¹博士毕业后,伊维德选择留校任教,第一份工作是在莱顿大学汉学院的中国资料中心担任图书馆助理,书写图书卡片。这份工作对伊维德后期俗文学版本问题、故事结构演变等研究领域的形成有非常重要的影响。²杂剧和散曲需要运用大量的白话,被广义的称为“元曲”。³柯润璞(James Irving Crump, Jr.)认为“曲”既可以用来抒情也可以用来叙事,因而也包括了简单、直接和未加修饰的白话。⁴伊维德在某种程度上因袭了从平话到白话,再到杂剧、戏曲的研究路线。

从戏曲入手,翻译、教学与研究相互促进,让伊维德的汉学研究独树一帜。翻译是汉学教学、研究的重要入门工作。在美国哈佛大学东亚语言与文明系任教期间,为了给美国博士生开设中国讲唱文学,给本科生开设中国民间故事、《聊斋志异》故事课,为研究中国古代戏剧,伊维德开始翻译元杂剧。除此之外,他还翻译了闽南歌仔、宝卷、江水女书等。

伊维德的杂剧翻译实践,也经历了不同阶段。正如上文所述,一开始翻译的目的是为欧美学生学习汉语提供课外读物,后来是为了研究文学故事背后的社会现象,再后来是为了美国本科生做选修课的教材。伊维德认为不同

1 参见 Wilt L. Idema, *Chinese Vernacular Fiction: The Formative Period* (Leiden, 1974).

2 参见 Beata Grant and Wilt L. Idema, *Escape from Blood Pond Hell: The Tales of Mulian and Woman Huang*. (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011). 其中,对“黄氏女”姓氏、情节和人物设置在不同版本的故事中的变化有详细考述。

3 参见杰夫·凯勒、吴思远:“柯润璞与中国口述表演文学研究”,《中华戏曲》1(2015): 1-19。

4 参见杰夫·凯勒、吴思远:“柯润璞与中国口述表演文学研究”,《中华戏曲》1(2015): 1-19。

的需求也影响翻译时杂剧文本的选择、体例的呈现，甚至这种翻译也能够反映出翻译者的文学、学术修养。有些译者会任意删除对他们来说没有意思的段落，同时也会修改文类样式以迎合西方读者的阅读习惯。

《中国文学导读》（*A Guide to Chinese Literature*, 1997）是在他 1980 年代授课演讲稿的基础上完成的。1996 年出版了该书荷兰文增订本，1997 年该书有了英文版。为了让欧美学生读懂中国典籍，伊维德与汉乐逸（Lloyd Haft）合作，将大量中国文学翻译成荷兰文和英文。迄今为止，他已经将李白、杜甫、白居易、寒山等一大批诗人的作品翻译成荷兰语，并且还系统地介绍了敦煌变文、明清话本、笔记小说等诸多的叙事文学，许多英文译著也都是荷兰文在先。目前，伊维德虽已荣休，回到莱顿，但依旧笔耕不辍。他计划完成与奚如谷合作的《杨家将演义》（待出版）译本的出版以后，接着出版“庄子遇骷髅”各种相关版本的英文版。回顾他的学术人生，伊维德十分感慨地说，他们那一代人对中国文化产生兴趣的时候正值冷战期间，对当代的中国无法了解，只好将目光转向博大精深的古典文学。¹

伊维德的戏剧研究，建立在与奚如谷（Stephen H. West）密切合作的基础上。早期合作的著作《中国戏曲资料（1100-1450）》（*Chinese Theater 1100-1450: A Source Book*, 1982），收录了他们合译的南戏《宦门子弟错立身》（1982，出自《永乐大典》）、《紫云亭》（元刊本）、朱有燉的《复落娼》、《香囊冤》和《蓝采和》五部剧作²。同时伊维德也翻译了相关文献资料及第一手的宋、金、元、明时期的戏曲资料。与此同时，他还与奚如谷一起翻译的弘治版的《西厢记》（1498），1991 年版更名为《月与琴：西厢记》（*The Moon and the Zither: The Story of the Western Wing*）³，1995 年再版名称为《西厢记》（*The Story of the Western Wing*）。伊维德认为，将《西厢记》改为诸宫调或传奇，是考虑到表演程式上的实际需要，对原文本进行内容上的改编。⁴伊维德是将中国古代通俗文学作品翻译为英文最多的西方学者，除了《西厢

1 参见凌筱峤：“重构戏曲与文学史——伊维德教授的学术研究”，《戏曲研究》2（2014）：311-319，以及伊维德：《海内外中国戏剧史家自选集》（郑州：大象出版社，2018 年）7。

2 其中，《紫云庭》是《元刊杂剧三十种》中的孤本；两部朱有燉的剧作来自 15 世纪初期的刻本《蓝采和》来自 1588 年左右出版的《古名家杂剧》。《元曲选》中则选了《货郎担》的最后一折。参见伊维德、凌筱峤：“元杂剧：版本与翻译”，《文化遗产》4（2014）：46-56+157-158。

3 参见 Wang Shifu, *The Moon and the Zither, The Story of the Western Wing*, ed. and transl. with an Introduction by Stephen H. West and Wilt L. Idema, with a Study of its Woodblock Illustrations by Yao Dajun (Berkeley: U of California P, 1991): xiv +506.

4 参见伊维德、凌筱峤：“元杂剧：版本与翻译”，《文化遗产》4（2014）：46-56+157-158。

记》外，他英译的作品还有《汉宫秋》¹《迷青琐倩女离魂》²等元代戏剧，这些译作被欧美学界视为汉学研究最重要的参考文献。

最近十年，奚如谷与伊维德更侧重于14世纪刻本元杂剧的翻译。《和尚、强盗、战争与神仙：十一部早期中国戏曲》（*Monks, Bandits, Battles and Immortals: Eleven Early Chinese Plays*, 2010）³均以现存最早的版本为参校。其中关汉卿的《拜月亭》使用的是14世纪版本。朱有燬的两部“水浒戏”使用15世纪初的刻本。白朴《梧桐雨》选自《元曲选》，而其它的剧作翻译底本为《古名家》或《元曲选》。2012年出版的《战争、背叛与结拜兄弟——早期中国三国戏》（*Battles, Betrayals and Brotherhood: Early Chinese Plays on the Three Kingdoms*），其中翻译了七部杂剧。这七部杂剧，一部是朱有燬的创作、两部是内府本杂剧、一部是晚明刻本杂剧（另附《元曲选》本），还有三部14世纪的元刊杂剧，分别是关汉卿的《单刀会》、《西蜀梦》和无名氏的《博望烧屯》。目前，奚如谷和伊维德将要出版的《赵氏孤儿及其它早期杂剧》（*The Orphan of Zhao and Other Early Plays*，待出版），其中翻译了七部14世纪刊本杂剧。他们分别是纪君祥的《赵氏孤儿》（附《元曲选》本）、杨梓的《霍光鬼谏》、张国宾的《薛仁贵》（附《元曲选》本）、高文秀的《好酒赵元》（附脉望馆钞校于小穀藏本）、孔文卿的《东窗事犯》、无名氏的《焚儿救母》。目前为止，14世纪的三十种元刊杂剧中，他们已经翻译了十二种之多。⁴

在荷兰莱顿大学中国语言与文学系任教期间（1976年1月至1999年9月），伊维德分别于1977年、1987年、1993年、1998年、1999年在夏威夷大学马诺阿（Manoa）分校、加州大学伯克利分校、法国高等研究学院和哈佛大学做客座教授。2000年至2018年，伊维德前往哈佛大学东亚语言与文明系工作，此后，与国际汉学中心一道，他的研究也转移至美国，在哈佛大学从事教学科研长达二十余年直至荣休，其中先后出任哈佛大学费正清研究中心主任、东亚语言与文明系主任工作。可以说，伊维德是一位对欧洲和美国汉学博采众长、兼收并蓄的汉学家。

1 参见 Idema, Wilt L., “Li Kaixian’s Revised Plays by Yuan Masters (Gaiding Yuanxian chuanqi) and the Textual Transmission of Yuan Zaju as Seen in Two Plays by Ma Zhiyuan.” *Chinoperl Papers* 26 (2005-2006): 47-66.

2 参见 Stephen H. West and Wilt L. Idema, *Monks, Bandits, Lovers, and Immortals: Eleven Early Chinese Plays*. (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett, 2010): xlii + 478.

3 该著作翻译了关汉卿的《感天动地窦娥冤》、《包待制三勘蝴蝶梦》、《闺怨佳人拜月亭》；白朴的《唐明皇秋夜梧桐雨》；郑光祖的《迷青琐倩女离魂》；李行道的《包待制智勘灰阑记》；无名氏的《汉钟离度脱蓝采和》；朱有燬的《豹子和尚自还俗》、《黑旋风李逵仗义疏财》；无名氏的《小孙屠》等11部戏剧，该书对外国人阅读元、明杂剧及南戏很有帮助。

4 参见伊维德、凌筱岍：“元杂剧：版本与翻译”，《文化遗产》04（2014）：46-56+157-158。

三、伊维德的宝卷研究之路

在莱顿大学工作时，由于学校中国俗文学典藏丰富，伊维德涉足了多种中国叙事文学传统（说唱文学 / 曲艺）。社会学、中国文学等跨学科学术训练让伊维德对传统叙事文学类型的多样性、不同文学类型的故事改编方式产生了浓厚的感兴趣。由于对文类的理解，欧美学者会把宝卷看做小说。早在1833年，葡萄牙的郭实猎（Charles Gutzlaff）把从普陀寺得来的《香山宝卷》看做“一种易懂的、甚至粗浅的风格”写成的“佛教小说”，称《香山宝卷》为“香山的小说”（“The Story of Fragrant Hill”）（韩南 67）。中国话本小说、戏剧与宝卷的改编关系让伊维德开始关注宝卷。因此，伊维德和其他汉学家一样，从汉学研究开始，历经了从评话、戏剧、民间故事，再过渡到了宝卷。20世纪初，在俗文学转向的带动下，宝卷这一俗文学传统引起了西方学者的关注。在与管佩达（Beata Grant）合作完成的《黄氏女传说：从污染到净化》中，伊维德比较《金瓶梅》中《黄氏女故事》情节时了解到其中多处对宝卷念唱活动的描写，这一部分的研究，在他为《剑桥中国文学史》（*Cambridge History of Chinese Literature*, 2010）撰写的第五章“说唱文学”中有充分的概括。¹

2001年前后，伊维德参与撰写了《哥伦比亚中国文学史》（2001）第41章“传统戏剧文学”²，其中特别提到了宝卷研究³。此后，伊维德为孙康宜、宇文所安主编的《剑桥中国文学史》撰写了第五章“说唱文学”。其中“早期的宝卷和道情”部分，伊维德结合自己多年的研究，对《香山宝卷》宝卷的题材来源做了深入的分析，认为《香山宝卷》宝卷的题材很可能源自一个在南宋依然表演着的“说因果”文本。无论它的实际创作年代究竟为何时，根据16世纪初期的一则史料，这个文本在16世纪后期就已经存在了。然而，现存最早的刻本刊刻于1773年。1773年刊刻的全本中还包括一些反教的片段，明显与海中小岛普陀山成为圣地这一流行现象有关。17世纪之后，道情中最具代表性的曲目是唐代儒家、诗人韩愈被侄子韩湘子点化的故事。韩湘子

1 伊维德在研究管佩达的“*The spiritual Saga of Woman Huang from pollution to purification*”一文时，认为非教派宝卷持续流行于16、17世纪，这一点可由16世纪匿名小说《金瓶梅》及其17世纪的续书——丁耀亢的《续金瓶梅》中有关宣卷活动的描写得知，因此只有当类似《黄氏女对真经》、《香山宝卷》等非宗教宝卷非常流行时，才可能被写进小说。参见 Wilt L. Idema, “English-Language Studies of Precious Scrolls: A Bibliographical Survey.” *Chinoperl Papers* 31 (2012): 163-176.

2 参见梅维恒主编：《哥伦比亚文学史》（北京：新星出版社，2016年）。该书2001年由哥伦比亚大学出版社出版。

3 第49章“口头程式传统”（马兰安，Anne E. McLaren），提到宗教宝卷于15世纪开始盛行，并开始具有许多小说的特质。这一提法也许是作者对宝卷故事与民间故事对比而来。同时，作者认为宗教宝卷也包含了源于民间娱乐的虚构内容，抄写宝卷可以积累功德。也提及《金瓶梅》的一个早期版本中“尼姑”为富户女眷表演宝卷的描。参见 梅维恒主编：《哥伦比亚文学史》（北京：新星出版社，2016年）991、995、1102。

是八仙之一，他的故事见载于 16 世纪的小说《东游记》。故事中，韩湘子再三希望点化叔叔，但是使出浑身解数，也无法动摇韩愈的儒家信念。当韩愈因反对皇帝奉迎佛骨被贬至潮州时，他才领悟到所有尘世的荣耀皆为虚空，从此一心修道。¹

由于对中国戏剧版本问题的研究积累，伊维德认为，对传统戏剧作品版本的研究，不能仅限于文字的考证校订，也不能局限于作家思想与艺术特色的研究，要看到版本演变背后深层的社会政治、经济、文化等诸多因素的影响。不同时代、地区、文化对民间说唱文学都有影响。²

据伊维德本人讲，他翻译宝卷的一个主要原因（除了他们的文学质量外）是宝卷长度适中。³ 许多著名的弹词和鼓词篇幅过大，伊维德认为不太适合翻译。但是，不可否认的是相较于《元曲选》等戏曲唱词，宝卷的韵文部分相对更加口语化，更容易理解和翻译。伊维德译介的宝卷包括⁴：

1. 《目连三世宝卷》全译版⁵。
2. 《香山宝卷》简译版及《善财龙女宝卷》全译版⁶。
3. 《孟姜女宝卷》及《孟姜女哭长城宝卷》翻译版⁷。
4. 《张四姐闹东京》全译版⁸。
5. 《雷峰宝卷》全译版⁹。

1 参见孙康宜、宇文所安：《剑桥中国文学史》，刘倩等译，北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，2013 年。

2 参见伊维德，凌筱岍：“元杂剧：版本与翻译”，《文化遗产》04（2014）：46-56+157-158。

3 这一观点源于伊维德与作者的通信内容。

4 参见 Wilt L. Idema, *English-language Studies of Precious Scrolls: A Bibliographical Survey* (An Updated Version, Leiden) August 30, 2014.

5 参见 Beata Grant and Wilt L. Idema, *Escape from Blood Pond Hell: The Tales of Mulian and Woman Huang* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011): 35-145. 该书收录了《目连三世宝卷》和《黄氏女对金刚》英译本。《黄氏女对金刚》藏于台湾“中央研究院”傅斯年图书馆，该版本是黄氏女故事的唱本，不属于宝卷，故不计入。

6 收录于 Wilt L. Idema, *Personal Salvation and Filial Piety: Two Precious Scroll Narratives of Guanyin and her Acolytes* (Translated with an Introduction by --. Kuroda Institute Classics in East Asian Buddhism. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2008): 227. Reprint: New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2009.

7 分别收录于 Wilt L. Idema, trans. and introd., *Meng Jiangnü Brings Down the Great Wall. Ten Versions of a Chinese Legend, with an essay by Haiyan Lee* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008): 112-159, 181-213.

8 发表于 *CHINOPERL Papers* 31(2012): 37-112.

9 收录于 Wilt L. Idema, *The White Snake and Her Son: A Translation of The Precious Scroll of Thunder Peak, with Related Texts* (Indianapolis / Cambridge: Hackett, 2009): 7-84.

6. 《庄子蝶梦骷髅宝卷》翻译版¹。

7. 《沉香宝卷》全译版²。

由此可以看到，伊维德的宝卷翻译主要倾向于文学故事卷。同时，为了保证翻译质量，伊维德多采用合作翻译的模式，这样做更容易让目的语读者接受。在翻译《目连三世宝卷》和《黄氏女对金刚》时，管佩达（Beata Grant）先拟稿，伊维德再进行修饰润色。伊维德认为翻译的首要目标是让目的语读者以自己的方式和“味道”接受中国文化的熏陶，尽量减少翻译注解，让译作忠实于原作且通俗易懂。因此，涉及译文中提到的问题和人物时，他采取的是将详细信息和专家见解附在参考文献中的方式³，以尽量增强阅读的流畅感和舒适感。

在海外汉学家中，伊维德是为数不多的宝卷译介与研究并重的学者。中国学者研究宝卷多从宗教、文学和民俗入手，而海外汉学家却与之不同，除了宗教、文学之外，也从艺术角度入手译介和研究宝卷。伊维德研究宝卷，采用了历史、文学、艺术综合研究的方法，注重不同版本与故事演变的历史考察，也注重研究宝卷念唱的曲艺特点。他的论文《观音的鹦哥》（“Guanyin’s Parrot. A Chinese Buddhist Animal Tale and Its International Context”，1999），对郑振铎的《鹦哥宝卷》的“劝孝”说予以反思，认为《鹦哥宝卷》中鹦鹉故事的本事是《杂宝藏经》中的佛本生故事⁴。正因为这种历史意识，伊维德在翻译研究的同时，特别注意对宝卷研究史的梳理。从“早期研究”“宗教宝卷研究”“社会历史研究”“宝卷翻译”“研究近况”等五个方面，伊维德全面地分类、归纳、总结了欧美宝卷研究成就，完成学界广泛关注的综述《宝卷研究的英文文献综述》⁵，该综述为海外学者研究宝卷提供了重要的入门参

1 收录于 Wilt L. Idema, “Traditional Dramatic Literature,” in Victor Mair, ed., *The Columbia History of Chinese Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001): 220-253。

2 收录于 Wilt L. Idema, introd. and trans. “The Precious Scroll of Chenxiang.” *The Columbia Anthology of Chinese Folk and Popular Literature*. Ed. Victor Mair and Mark Bender (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011): 380-405。

3 参见 Beata Grant and Wilt L. Idema, *Escape from Blood Pond Hell: The Tales of Mulian and Woman Huang* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011): ix。

4 在论文《改头换面的孝鹦哥——〈鹦哥宝卷〉短论》中，伊维德进一步研究 1967 年发现于上海嘉定的明成化说唱词话《全相莺歌行孝义传》和藏于“中央”研究院史语所图书馆的《鹦哥宝卷》（1872 年，南京刊本）后，认为不同版本中鹦鹉形象的演变与故事增删、改头换面的重写，形成一个谱系，它背后是思想史，不同时代的社会思潮、历史意识、读者接受等各方面的因素，这些都左右着故事的流变过程。

5 “English-Language Studies of Precious Scrolls: A Bibliographical Survey” 曾发表于美国学术期刊《中国演唱文艺》（*CHINOPERL: Journal of Chinese Oral and Performing Literature* 31(2012):163-176）。此英文初稿由霍建瑜翻译，以“宝卷的英文研究综述”为题刊登于《山西大学学报》35.6（2012）：13-19。补充与修订后的重译稿收入王定勇主编《中国宝卷国际研讨会论文集》（江苏：广陵书社，2016 年）33-48。

考。

1930年,陈寅恪曾提出“预流”与“未入流”之说(陈寅恪 266)。今天域外的“汉学”中的宝卷学¹已成为当前的“预流”。研究人类社会记忆的学者如巴尔特雷特(Frederic Bartlett)曾经提及,人们是透过一种过滤网一样的心理“结构”(schema)来认识外在世界和习得的故事的(Bartlett 278)。这种心理结构是脑文本编码的元语言,“通过口头表达的文学能够以口耳相传的方式复制成脑文本”(聂珍钊 270),因此脑文本与口头文学关系更密切(聂珍钊、王永 172)。由于身份限定,伊维德的语言习得基本都是通过书写文本完成的,口头文学比书写文本更接近伦理身份。因此,伊维德研究翻译中国戏曲、宝卷存在一定局限,对宝卷的伦理教诲体会不到位。

四、结论:伊维德译介、研究宝卷的路径与伦理身份

伊维德译介和研究宝卷的历史路径与伦理身份密切相关,概括起来有以下四方面:

首先,受欧洲汉学家对中国杂剧、戏曲译介文本限制的影响,早期部分传教士、汉学家等译介和研究杂剧、戏曲出于中国欧美文类的双向理解,他们认为和欧洲一样,戏曲在中国拥有较高的社会地位,因此,掀起了戏剧翻译的热潮。但是,19世纪前的西方学者译介杂剧、戏曲时,难以理解唱词,一般不翻译唱词或大量删减唱词,多翻译宾白,也就是白话部分,形成了西方汉学界偏重译介和研究宾白部分的译介传统,造成了后继海外汉学者学习、翻译、研究杂剧、戏曲等时偏重白话文体研究的现象。伊维德译介、研究宝卷也继承了这一传统模式。

其次,宝卷与戏曲、杂剧在故事层面上的相似性,是伊维德研究介入宝卷的重要原因。宝卷在发展的过程中与戏曲、杂剧、弹词、诸宫调、小说等互相交融、相互借鉴、彼此杂糅。明清时期的戏曲、杂剧、宝卷三类文本都具有韵散结合、文白夹杂的文学特点。散文部分,可看作宾白,韵文同唱词。但与戏曲、杂剧不同的是,宝卷这种俗文学作品相较于戏曲和杂剧而言,语言更加简练,通俗易懂。尤其对国外汉学家和学习者或读者而言,更容易理解和接受,是一种较容易入手的文学形式。

再次,受西方高校教学、科研一体化的影响,伊维德译介、研究宝卷的缘起与翻译策略的选择出于教学研究需要与个人爱好。伊维德从社会学研究的角度出发认为俗文学“并非等同于老百姓的文学,写俗文学的人毕竟需要一定的文学背景,他们或者是没有中举、中进士者,或者是道士、和尚等,也有一些戏曲、小说的作者还有行政官职”(霍建瑜 77-78)。为了帮助欧美学生尽快了解这些作品,在翻译策略上,按照欧美学生的阅读和书写习惯,

1 “宝卷学”由国内学者李世瑜先生首倡,濮文起研究员做了进一步阐释。参见 濮文起、李永平:《宝卷研究》(上海:商务印书馆,2019年)1。

伊维德放弃了韵律，主要翻译文本意义，在书的正文前单辟一章对原文中的翻译所采用的策略进行举证说明。这些说明言简意赅，阐明了整体翻译策略和取舍缘由，读者可以先行阅读，这既使读者可以了解译作全文风貌，有提纲挈领的作用，也给读者带来了流畅的阅读体验。

最后，无论荷兰、日本还是在美国，我们常常在文学的地方性中思考“世界性”，世界的构成就是在地方与地方之间的“共有知识”“共有伦理”的关联中传播与生产的。在各民族文学板块“迁移”的边缘，我们发现“世界文学”。在存在的门槛上遐想世界的时候，我们与伊维德彼此相遇。世界文学一直存在，并在召唤中，我们要么做出反映，要么重新陷入遗忘和被遗忘：我们是谁？我们是什么？我们在哪里？

Works Cited

- 弗雷德里克·C·巴特莱特：《记忆：一个实验的社会的心理学研究》，黎炜译。杭州：浙江教育出版社，1998年。
- [Bartlett, Frederic C. *Memory: An Experimental Social Psychological Research*. Trans. Li Wei. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Education Press, 1998.]
- 陈寅恪：《金明馆丛稿二编》。北京：生活·读吾·新知三联书店，2001年。
- [Chen Yinke. *The Second Series of the Jinming*. Beijing: Life·Reading Wu·Xinzhi Sanlian Bookstore, 2001.]
- 韩南：《中国近代小说的兴起》增订本引言，徐侠译。上海：上海教育出版社，2010年。
- [Han Nan. *The Rise of Modern Chinese Novels*. Trans. Xu Xia. Shanghai: Shanghai Education Press, 2010.]
- Hans-Georg Gadamer. *Truth and Method*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- 霍建瑜：“徜徉于中国古代通俗文学的广场——伊维德教授访谈录”，《文艺研究》10（2012）：77-88。
- [Huo Jianyu. “Wandering in the Square of Ancient Chinese Popular Literature-An Interview with Professor Idema.” *Literary Research* 10(2012): 77-88.]
- 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 Literary Ethics Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- 聂珍钊、王永：“文学伦理学批评与脑文本：聂珍钊与王永的学术对话”，《外国文学》4（2019）：166-175。
- [Nie Zhenzhao and Wang, Yong. “Literary Ethics Criticism and Brain Text: Academic Dialogue between Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Yong.” *Foreign Literature* 4(2019): 166-175.]
- Saussy, Haun, ed. *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006.
- 孙康宜、宇文所安：《剑桥中国文学史》，刘倩等译。北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，2013年。
- [Sun Kangyi and Yu Wensuo'an. *Cambridge Chinese Literature History*. Trans. Liu Qian, et al.

Beijing: Life·Reading·Xinzhi Sanlian Bookstore, 2013.]

伊维德: “元杂剧版本与翻译”, 《文化遗产》2014 (04): 46-56。

[Wilt Lukas Idema: “Yuan Zaju Version and Translation.” *Cultural Heritage* 04(2014): 46-56.]

—, *Personal Salvation and Filial Piety: Two Precious Scroll Narratives of Guanyin and Her Acolytes.*

Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 2008.

—, “Evil Parents and Filial Offspring: Some Comments on the Xiangshan baojuan and Related Texts.”

Studies in Central and East-Asian Religions 12/13(2002): 1-40.

—, introd. and trans. “The Precious Scroll of Chenxiang” in *The Columbia Anthology of Chinese Folk and Popular Literature*. Ed. Victor Mair and Mark Bender. New York: Columbia Preass, 2011:

380-405.

—, “The Filial Parrot in Qing Dynasty Dress: A Short Discussion of the Yingge Baojuan [Precious Scroll of the Parrot].” *Journal of Chinese Religions* 30 (2002): 77-96.

周宪: 《文化间的理论旅行: 比较文学与跨文化研究论集》。南京: 译林出版社, 2017 年。

[Zhou Xian. *Theoretical Travel between Cultures: Comparative Literature and Cross-cultural Studies.*

Nanjing: Yilin Publishing House, 2017.]

玛莎·努斯鲍姆的同情论：争议、辨析与反思

Martha Nussbaum's View on Compassion: Contr-oversies, Analysis and Ref lections

陈 芬 (Chen Fen) 苏 晖 (Su Hui)

内容摘要：同情论是美国当代伦理批评的代表性学者玛莎·努斯鲍姆情感伦理理论中极为关键而复杂的部分，她重视从同情的视角挖掘文学的道德功能，认为文学阅读能使读者对人物产生认同，并培养其同情心、提升道德。然而，努斯鲍姆认知主义指导下的同情论却饱受争议，其理论过于强调同情的认知性，这会导致对同情受阻的情况、读者和文本的互动模式以及阅读和做好人之间的关系等认识不足；其批评实践忽略文本特征和情境因素的情感认知，容易让人落入观念先行和普遍主义的泥淖。这些问题可能导致读者认同困难，进而阻碍了文学通过同情实现其道德目标。努斯鲍姆建立在认知主义基础上的同情论固然有其缺陷，但它凸显文学情感的教诲功能，减弱功利主义的破坏性，强调伦理责任和实际行动，展现了拒绝冷漠和虚无的人文立场。只有充分参与理论对话、加深对读者和文本互动方式的认识、尊重文本，以此改进认同模式，我们才能澄清同情的伦理价值，并在同情的指引下，真正实现文学阅读的道德功能。

关键词：玛莎·努斯鲍姆；认同；同情；文学阅读；道德功能

作者简介：陈芬，华中师范大学文学院比较文学与世界文学专业博士生，主要研究加拿大文学和文学伦理学批评。苏晖，华中师范大学文学院教授，国际文学伦理学批评研究中心研究员，主要研究欧美文学和文学伦理学批评。本文系中央高校基金科研业务项目“东西方戏剧经典的伦理叙事研究”【项目编号：SK02072018-0324】及华中师范大学研究生教育创新资助项目“玛莎·努斯鲍姆文学伦理思想研究”的阶段性成果。

Title: Martha Nussbaum's View on Compassion: Controversies, Analysis and Reflections

Abstract: Compassion is a critical but most complicated part of the theory of emotion established by Martha Nussbaum, the representative scholar of contemporary American ethical criticism. With extensive accounts of the ethical value of literature through the perspective of compassion, Nussbaum maintains that reading literature can help readers identify with the fictional characters, cultivate their compassion and raise their moral awareness. However, her view

of compassion based on cognitivism is highly controversial. Theoretically, overemphasis on the cognitive dimension of compassion would fail to reveal the cases when compassion fails, the way readers and texts react and the relationship between reading and being a good person. In critical practice, ignoring textual features and various situational factors would easily lead us to preconceptions and universalism. These problems would bring about failures of identification and thus thwart the moral mission of literature. Flawed as it is, Nussbaum's cognitive view of compassion highlights the moral function of literary emotions and her attempts to reduce the harm of utilitarianism through compassion are related to ethical responsibility and actions, displaying a humanistic stand against indifference and nihilism. Only when theoretical dialogues are fully carried on, the identification model is revised, the way readers and texts react is better understood, and literary texts are duly respected can we clarify the ethical values of compassion and truly approach the moral core of literature reading.

Key words: Martha Nussbaum; identification; compassion; literature reading; moral function

Authors: **Chen Fen** is Ph.D student at the School of Chinese Language and Literature, Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China). Her major research fields are Canadian literature and Ethical Literary Criticism (Email: Judyjuly@126.com); **Su Hui** (corresponding author), is Professor at the School of Chinese Language and Literature, Central China Normal University, specializing in European & American literature and Ethical Literary Criticism (Email: suhuichina@163.com).

美国伦理学家玛莎·努斯鲍姆 (Martha Nussbaum, 1947—) 围绕“人应该怎样生活?”这个问题展开对文学阅读道德功能的探讨, 她认为, 阅读文学作品能使读者与人物产生情感共鸣和认同感, 并培养读者的同情心、提升道德。她在其专著《思想的剧变: 情感的智性》(*Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*¹) 中结合大量文学作品详细阐述了认知主义的同情论, 并在多部著作中从同情的视角进行了文学批评实践。但同情作为努斯鲍姆情感伦理的一个关键词以及情感智性论最复杂的部分之一, 却备受争议。评论界从同情的伦理理论基础、同情与文学阅读道德功能的实现之间的关系等方面质疑了努斯鲍姆的同情观。本文主要针对各种质疑, 对努斯鲍姆的同情观和相关批评实践进行辨析, 在去伪存真、广泛吸收各种研究成果的基础上, 进一步考察同情与文学阅读的道德功能间的关系。努斯鲍姆的同情观和由此展开的文学批评实践的确存在局限, 需要综合考虑各种因素, 如文本自身的

1 以下简称《思想的剧变》(*Upheavals*), 此书中的内容均为作者自译。

特征、读者和文本的互动方式、文本选择的多样性等，我们才能在同情的指引下，真正实现文学阅读的道德功能。

一、努斯鲍姆的同情论及相关批评实践

同情是努斯鲍姆情感伦理的关键词之一，也是她从事文学批评实践的重要视角。在以《思想的剧变：情感的智性》为代表的多部著作中，努斯鲍姆结合大量文学作品详细阐述了自己的同情论。

首先，努斯鲍姆对“同情”以及相关概念进行了辨析。努斯鲍姆的“同情”对应英文单词“compassion”，她将之与相关概念如“怜悯”（pity）、“移情”（empathy）和同样译为“同情”的“sympathy”进行了辨析。在她看来，怜悯带有对受难者屈尊降贵的色彩，移情是对他人体验的想象性重建，但不含有对这种体验的评价。“compassion”与“sympathy”意思接近，但比后者情感更强烈，受难者的苦难更深重（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 300-301）。本文论及的同情既包括 compassion 所指的虚构人物或读者身上作为道德情感的同情心，又指读者与人物产生的情感共鸣和认同，后一层面的同情更接近 sympathy 或 identification，它不单是道德情感，更是情感感召下的认知和伦理认同，能提升道德感。在相关的文学批评实践中，努斯鲍姆也主要是在这两个层面上讨论同情问题。

其次，努斯鲍姆对同情的认知结构及其与利他主义的关系进行了阐释。她继承了斯多亚派“情感包含评价性判断”的观点并指出，同情的认知结构包含三个方面的认知因素，即受难者苦难深重、受难者无过错原则和同情者的幸福论判断（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 320）。其中，前两个因素来自亚里士多德对同情的定义，而该定义中同情者感受到的“痛苦”¹被替换为“同情者的幸福论判断”，即受难者是同情者的人生规划和目标体系中极为重要的因素，促进受难者的善也有助于同情者获得幸福。努斯鲍姆在同情的条件中排除了“痛苦”、“惊奇”等非认知因素，坚持认知论的同情观。她不仅指出了同情的认知结构，还分析了同情如何与伦理相关。同情关注的是“怎样培养、扩大并稳固那些已有的关怀因素，尤其是怎样建立对他人稳定的、真正的伦理关怀，因为他人也有需求、怨恨和愤怒”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 336）。同情让人走出自我的拘囿，去关心和自己没有直接关系的生命，它是为了他人而产生的感情，因此含有伦理的因素。努斯鲍姆发现，虽然同情与利他主义的关联在理论上难以证明，但心理学的相关研究成果已经证实这种关联的存在（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 337-339）。认知是客观的、理性的，认知因素相同时，富于同情心的人更会积极地帮助其同情的对象。因此，同情不仅有利于同情者自身的幸福，而且在很大程度上也是利他的。

1 详见左稀：“论同情的充要条件——纳斯鲍姆同情观研究”，《道德与文明》2（2014）：60-68。

第三，努斯鲍姆分析了阻碍同情产生的诸种因素。努斯鲍姆比亚当·斯密更清楚同情的复杂性，对同情受阻的情况，她主要谈到两点：其一，从情感因素来说，羞耻、嫉妒和恶心是封闭型情感，会阻碍同情的产生。“同情比很多类型的爱都更能将自我的边界向外延伸，而其他一些情感却让人在自己周围筑起锐利的防护，免受外物污染”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 299）。为此，但丁都受到努斯鲍姆的批评。她提到但丁在《地狱篇》中差点因同情而晕倒，但后来他由于鄙视、厌恶犯罪者，心肠越来越硬。但丁对尘世的爱因为少了同情而受到损害（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 587）。其二，社会差异或物种界限也会使同情受阻，“各种各样的社会差异，包括阶级、宗教、民族、性别、性等都会限制想象力和情感。物种之间的界限对情感来说也是很难跨越的”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 316）。

第四，努斯鲍姆还对哲学史上有关“同情”的论争进行了梳理和辨析。在“同情的哲学之争”这一节中，努斯鲍姆梳理了哲学史上关于同情正反两派的观点。柏拉图主义认为同情意味着泛滥的情感和毫无反思的模仿，因而会损害理性；斯多亚派拒绝同情，因为他们认为同情本身与愤怒相关而有可能转为残酷，同情者软弱的心灵容易受到愤怒和仇恨的毒蛇的攻击；尼采将同情和软弱联系起来，视其为“仇恨的毒草得以生长的潮湿土壤”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 361）。与这些攻击同情的哲学家不同，亚当·斯密虽然也意识到同情的弊端，但他更多的是为同情进行辩护，他强调借助设身处地的想象去了解别人的感受，因为我们对此没有直接经验，他说：“对社会的车轮来说，作为优良光滑剂的美德，似乎必然使人愉快（……）同情在任何意义上都不可能看成一种自私的本性”（斯密 418-419）。努斯鲍姆在了解对同情的各种质疑并作出回应的基础上，也为同情进行辩护并指出：“同情是伦理生活的基石而不是非理性的糟糕向导”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 353）。努斯鲍姆的同情论有以下几个特点：

其一，她的同情论突出道德想象和对他者情感的理解和认同，同情就是站在他人的立场设身处地看问题，包含着对他人的认识和道德感知，这在一定程度上沿袭了斯密的观点。“通过对他人生活经验的同情性想象，文学和情感能够让我们以最大同情的态度去拓展我们的生活和经验边界，能够帮助我们去除那些未经反思的歧视和仇恨，尽量作出真正负责任的群体评价，防止那些基于偏见的群体仇恨和群体歧视”（努斯鲍姆，《诗性正义》14）。同情要求有一种道德想象力，悲剧能激发同情心，读者通过想象拉近和遥远世界的距离，扩展对有价值的事物的认识，从而让人超越狭隘的自我，实现道德水平的提升。同情心是情感和伦理意义上的“共通感”，失去同情心，就失去了人性，纳粹失去对犹太人的同情和认同，就导致了种族大屠杀（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 346-347）。

其二，努斯鲍姆持认知主义的同情论，认为同情受认知因素的影响，改

变认知就能改变同情，因而同情心能通过教育来培养和调节，进而超越自身的局限性。文学阅读就是培养人的同情心和想象力的重要途径，文学作品中的同情也就具有重要的教育意义。这对斯密的观点是极大的推进。斯密将同情视为人类天然、原始的情感，他虽然也提及一些文学作品，但并没有深入探讨文学阅读中同情的伦理问题。他关注的主要是现实人际交往中的同情，其条件是受难者通过克制激情与同情者的看法和情感达成一致，因为没有克制的激情只会阻碍同情的产生。这种同情一般是令人愉悦的，有利于人际关系的和谐。相比之下，努斯鲍姆对同情的认知更为复杂，也对该情感的可塑性和功能寄寓了更深的期待。需注意的是，努斯鲍姆并不主张读者盲目认同小说中的观点和思想倾向，她在《诗性正义》的前言中分析了移情的局限性。在充满偏见和仇恨的社会中，文学想象对于培养人的同情心并不总是奏效。“文学想象是公共理性的一个组成部分，但不是全部。我相信，如果提议用移情的想象来代替基于规则之治的道德推理，那将是极端危险的”（努斯鲍姆，《诗性正义》7）。不管怎样，努斯鲍姆依然对这一道德情感抱以厚望，她认为“光有同情远远不够，但我们有理由相信，它将指引我们走向道德的核心”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 390）。

其三，作为当代非常有影响力的公共知识分子，努斯鲍姆关注现实人生，反对沉溺于书本、反对只同情而不行动。她的同情论具有鲜明的实践指向，与伦理责任和实际行动密切相连，甚至能影响公共决策。文学情感常常被指责有审美化倾向，她依然为同情辩护，“希腊悲剧有将痛苦审美化的倾向，在当时的社会文化现实中，受害者很少能获得救助和正义，但这并不意味着同情本身有这种倾向”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 398）。

努斯鲍姆同情论的上述理论特色也基本贯穿于其围绕情感伦理展开的相关文学批评实践中。努斯鲍姆的批评实践不胜枚举，涉及的作品主要包括古希腊悲剧《阿伽门农》和《菲罗克忒忒斯》、亨利·詹姆斯的《金碗》和贝克特的小说三部曲（《马洛伊》、《马龙之死》、《无名的人》）等。对这些作品中的同情问题，她主要从两方面展开分析，并在此基础上探讨文学阅读的道德功能。

一是聚焦作品中影响某个人物伦理选择的情感反应，如人物情感想象力和同情心的缺失与否。在努斯鲍姆看来，除了意志和规则，我们还需要情感，她对两部古希腊悲剧的分析展现了剧中人物同情缺失时人性的泯灭，包含了对功利主义目的论的批判。阿伽门农迫于无奈献祭女儿以拯救舰队，但做出决定后他对女儿毫无同情怜悯之心，也没有尝试和命运去抗争，努斯鲍姆通过歌队的观察视角指出，这是违反人性的行为（努斯鲍姆，《善的脆弱性》51）。希腊神箭手菲罗克忒忒斯被蛇咬伤后被遗弃在荒岛，十年后，奥德修斯为了战争胜利才返岛将其带回（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 303）。在努斯鲍姆看来，这两部悲剧中，被献祭的女儿和被遗弃在荒岛的菲罗克忒忒斯都仅被

视为达到目的的工具，而两部剧都通过歌队谴责了将领的冷酷无情。努斯鲍姆对《金碗》中价值冲突的分析，同样聚焦人物的道德感知力和同情问题，她充分肯定了梅吉在面对难以调节的伦理冲突时展现的道德感知和想象力，认为这使她走向了道德成熟。

二是从读者情感认同的角度来分析（此时的“同情”其实更接近“sympathy”和“identification”，而不是“compassion”），主要研究的作品是贝克特的小说三部曲。努斯鲍姆认为作品中大量的内心独白即人物的单一声音很难得到读者的广泛认同，作品中对虚无世界的描绘以及传达出的内疚、恶心、悲观绝望等思想情感有很强的个人色彩。她反对贝克特将死亡视为对原罪的惩罚而不是生命的自然状态，认为他对特定社会形式的强烈鄙视造成了小说中的绝望气息，他没有看到基督教之外的世界以及那个世界中人的自我表达，也没有看到有限人生的独特光辉。上帝之死并没有伤害所有人的情感生活，因此，贝克特的世界观依然是狭隘的、缺少普适性，很难让一些读者产生共鸣（Nussbaum, *Love's Knowledge* 309-310）。此外，努斯鲍姆对《安提戈涅》的分析也涉及读者同情问题。她认为该剧突出了克瑞翁代表的城邦利益和安提戈涅代表的家庭义务这两种价值追求之间的对立冲突，展现的是其中一种利益凌驾于另一方之上时产生的悲剧。她指出，两位主角“对生活中重要事情的看法，都是单一和狭隘的。他们每个人所关心的东西，都向我们显示了另一个人拒绝接受的重要价值”（努斯鲍姆，《善的脆弱性》98）。读者因而意识到安提戈涅美德的复杂性，她虽然处于弱势，但她敢于承认外在世界对美德的限制，这使她成为两个主角中更具有人类理性、思想更为丰富的那一个。即使有片面性，她依然是值得同情的。当提到读者为安提戈涅泪流满面时，努斯鲍姆指出：“如果我们总是要忍住眼泪，极力不让自己失控，我们往往就不能彻底地理解这部剧本。解读不单纯是沉静的理性活动，还包括情感上的反应”（努斯鲍姆，《善的脆弱性》102）。

这些作品大多展现人物在复杂情境中面临冲突时的内心活动与选择，而努斯鲍姆认为读者既能凭借想象进入人物的内部视角，又能作为旁观者对人物表示同情。同情是对他人的感知力，文学作品给读者带来新的感知，让人获得灵动的同情心和道德知识，而不是僵化、片面的知识。“内心无声的感知活动本身是一种值得称道的美德，也是人类好生活的构成部分”（Nussbaum, *Love's Knowledge* 93）。同情也是伦理上的认同，是不可或缺的人性，是激发行动的重要情感因素。因此，阅读文学作品是提高人们的道德感知力、加强对有价值事物的认同、帮助人们获得真理和好生活的重要途径。

二、有关努斯鲍姆同情论的争议与辨析

努斯鲍姆的同情论及其对同情与文学阅读的道德功能之间关系的论述引发了评论界激烈的争议。很难将这些评论家们截然划归为正反两个阵营，

除了少数极端的反对派，他们大多是在指出努斯鲍姆观点的合理性之后，重点分析其中的弊端，并提出各自的改进方案。兼听则明，从这些支持的声音和反对的声音中，我们对努斯鲍姆的同情论能有更清晰的认识。比较有代表性的评论家包括拉特克利夫（Sophie Ratcliffe）、斯托（Simon Stow）、戴克（Tricia Van Dyk）、伊格尔斯顿（Robert Eaglestone）、多诺霍（Denis Donoghue）、哈珀姆（Geofrey Galt Harpham）和凯茨（Diana Fritz Cates）。探讨努斯鲍姆对同情与文学阅读的道德功能之间关系的认识，首先要考察其同情论的伦理理论基础，其二是分析努斯鲍姆的读者认同论在认识同情与阅读的道德功能方面的功与过。

对努斯鲍姆同情论的伦理理论基础的质疑主要针对同情概念的片面性和同情的极端认知论倾向。在同情的概念上，努斯鲍姆的同情强调对他人体验的认知和理解。拉特克利夫指出，这忽略了伦理的神秘性，他人的苦难有时让我们感到震惊、几乎难以理解（Ratcliffe 18），因此同情的概念应该包括惊奇（wonder）和神秘。对同情概念的历史考察必须考虑我们面对其他世界和思想时情感的复杂性（Ratcliffe 20）。这与列维纳斯的“绝对他者”的观念遥相呼应，代表了评论界对努斯鲍姆极端的情感认知论的不满。诚然，认知和情感紧密联系，但认知并不总能导致情感的产生，因为认知或价值判断往往并不单纯。“认知观需要的不仅是对事物的情感和价值判断的对等，还需要价值判断本身能代表对世界的纯粹的认知。但这很可疑，因为价值判断本身就表达了某种态度、立场和对事物的感觉”（Blackburn 38）。人们的认知或价值判断往往并不单纯，很难与情感对等。例如，努斯鲍姆同情论的认知结构中包含受难者无过错原则，且不说对受难者有无过错的判断本身可能就会误导人，也很难说过错者就一定不会引人同情。不过，努斯鲍姆在后期著作《政治情感：为何爱影响正义》（*Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*）中，在一定程度上修正了无过错原则，认为该原则主要适用于成人的同情，而幼儿和动物的同情则不受此限。对于成人的罪过，人们可能在考虑具体情境后，依然对之怀有一定程度的同情（Nussbaum: 143-144）。

努斯鲍姆的认同论在认识同情与阅读的道德功能方面有何功与过呢？自由人文主义者的文学观很大程度上依赖于“认同”，包括移情和价值判断等认知活动，是努斯鲍姆的同情伦理及其在读者、人物和作者关系上的观点确立的基础，认同是确立阅读的道德功能的关键。然而，努斯鲍姆的读者认同论在认识认同的条件和对象、同情受阻的情况、读者和文本的互动模式以及阅读和做好人之间的关系等方面存在诸多不足，受到了多方抨击。

其一，努斯鲍姆的同情论强调对他者体验的模拟，模拟与认同都强调对人物处境和体验的想象以及对作者意图的揣摩，模拟是阅读虚构作品时，确立积极的道德观的核心因素。文学阅读能让读者模拟遥远地方陌生人的体验，从而产生伦理认同，但模拟不仅需要条件、而且模拟对象也很成问题，

不能断言读者一定能通过想象来认同人物的情感。

模拟需要条件，文学作品不一定具备认同的充分条件。戈登指出：“在关系密切的社会中，人们共享大量的事实、规范和价值观，不需要太多模拟就能解释和预测身边人的行为。然而，在陌生的文化中要做到这一点，人们可能需要大量努力才行”（Gordon 164）。和生活中的模拟一样，文学中的认同，尤其是对陌生文化和陌生人的伦理认同也需要大量条件。

模拟的对象也可能导致认同失败。首先，它是虚构的，有时甚至是即兴创造出来的，在实际的阅读体验中，读者不一定能分享虚构他者的体验，很多评论家都反对夸大读者对虚构人物的情感认同。伊格尔斯顿认为：“与虚构人物产生情感认同的想法从批评和哲学的角度看，都令人怀疑”（Eagleton 46-47）。“我们从人物那里听到的只是自己的声音，努斯鲍姆总是无视文本特征进行她所谓的认知阅读。把人物当成真实的并与他们产生情感认同，这很天真、甚至危险”（Donoghue 146）。哈珀姆也持类似观点，但言辞过激：“她与文学和思想的关系看上去就是最原始的读者反应，即对虚构人物的同情（……）对努斯鲍姆来说，只要你在看小说，你就错不了”（Harpham 54-57）。其次，模拟对象不一定是“人”。拉特克利夫指出，“人物”（character）意味着较为鲜明、稳定的个性品质，而文学作品描写的对象经常只是某种“造物”（creature）。这些非人非兽、缺少天然同情心的造物在社会和道德意义上都更含混，代表了人类无法弃绝的原始本性和在本体论上对存在的焦虑（Ratcliffe 54-55）。努斯鲍姆的文学批评实践的确不大涉及非人类的造物。虽然造物一词神学色彩浓厚，但它触及到人类存在的多样性和同情的复杂性。面对这类文本和贝克特那种人物已经支离破碎的后现代文本，努斯鲍姆的同情论就可能失效。

上述争论其实涉及到同情受阻的情况，由于努斯鲍姆对这些情况并没有在批评实践中充分展开论述，这导致她对同情作为文学情感影响读者的方式分析不够全面，对同情和阅读的道德功能之间关系的论述不够严密。从自身出发不一定能达到了解他人的目的，因为难以摆脱的自我意识可能让我们最后又回到自身。例如，当自己的刻板印象作祟时，就很难通过模拟、想象对陌生文化产生认同。正如 W. H. 奥登所言：“艺术是一面镜子，每个人从中看到的是自己的脸”（qtd. in Mendelson 693）。列维纳斯也曾提到，西方哲学为了理解存在，有一种将他者简化为同一的倾向（Levinas 43）。“哲学史就像荷马史诗的奥德修斯，经过所有的漂泊，结果只是回到他的故乡”（qtd. in 金惠敏 47）。从这些比喻可以看出，同情有同化他者，将他者想象成另一个自我的嫌疑。

其二，努斯鲍姆的认同论在艺术与生活、阅读和做好人之间建立起直接、线性的因果联系，对读者和文本间复杂的互动方式、解构主义关于意义的不确定性和各种裂隙认识不足。以戴克和拉特克利夫为代表的评论家们批评了

努斯鲍姆的认同论，并借鉴不同的理论资源试图对之进行修正。

戴克在批评努斯鲍姆这种机械的因果模式时指出，对小说和道德哲学关系的建构需要借鉴阐释学对读者和作品互动方式的观点才更有说服力，人们与艺术作品间的互动模式应该是灵活、富于创造力、想象力的，而不是从作品到读者的机械、单向模式。她还借用苏伊德瓦尔特（Lambert Zuidervaart）关于艺术真实和伦理责任的理论中“想象性呈现”（imaginative disclosure）的概念指出，让艺术实现“想象性呈现”就需要考虑艺术生产过程中的作者意图，艺术运用过程中的读者需求和艺术的内在规律（Dyk 209-211）。

拉特克利夫则参照认知理论在同情和认同问题上的最新研究成果，试图澄清和扩展认同模式。她将认同和“模拟”（simulation）与“理论论”（theory-theory）这两种针锋相对的认知活动联系起来（Ratcliffe 43）。其中，模拟与认同都强调对人物的处境和体验的想象以及对作者意图的揣摩，模拟是阅读虚构作品时，确立积极道德观的核心因素。对努斯鲍姆来说，模拟的可能性和对作者意图的了解都很关键，然而从读者想象跨越到对人物情感的认同不是一蹴而就的。“理论论”则体现了后结构主义的批评方法，认为读者每次都是带着自己的理论进行阅读，阅读并不能加深我们对其他思想的共鸣与理解，因为在阅读中，读者没有与人物或作者相遇，遇见的只是自己的思想和理论。人物只是读者通过理论能任意建构和解构的纸上符号（Ratcliffe 47）。这种思想其实已经渗透进上文评论家们对同情问题的批判之中，在奥登的镜子隐喻和列维纳斯关于奥德修斯出发又回到起点的隐喻中也得到了一定程度的呼应。后结构主义对于批判传统道德批评中简单化的思想情感共鸣有积极作用，也有助于人们认识到自我和他者交流的难度，但将人物视为纸上符号，企图割裂文学和现实的联系，这种做法在文学的伦理转向中早已被摒弃。站在理论的十字路口，我们需要在自由人文主义的“模拟”、“认同”与解构主义的“理论论”之间保持某种平衡。

努斯鲍姆的认同论被有些评论家指责为一种单向、机械的模式，其中一个重要原因是她忽略了各种裂隙。凯茨指出：“亚里士多德区分了思想和欲望（尽管二者相互交织），原因之一就是得解释伦理判断和情感、欲望之间的裂隙”（Cates 332）。然而，努斯鲍姆忽略了这一区分，也因而忽略了认知和同情之间的裂隙。阅读文学能增进伦理意识，但不一定会引发同情，而且同情持续的时间可能很短，伦理意识和行动之间也可能断裂。

在认同论的指导下，努斯鲍姆的文学批评实践十分重视对同情的分析，其中不乏精彩独到的见解，但同情的诸多弊端也遭到评论界的反对。弊端之一是观念先行而忽略文本特征的倾向，与之相关的另一个弊端是批评实践中聚焦单个人物而忽略众多情境因素，人物被解读为某种观念的化身，而文本特征、历史文化语境、读者的接受心理等情境因素被忽视。这些都会导致读者对人物认同困难，通过同情来提升道德想象力的目标也就难以实现。

努斯鲍姆在分析《金碗》中梅吉的道德感知时,上述两个弊端都存在,她对该小说伦理价值的理解从小说的叙事特征和读者接受这内外两个角度来看都存在不少争议。努斯鲍姆断言,梅吉通过对父亲设身处地的情感想象与认同走向道德成熟,但她在分析中仅聚焦梅吉一人的情感和叙事而忽略了整体叙事特征,这导致她对人物之间不平等的关系和小说结局的多义性认识不足,也不利于读者对人物命运多种可能性的解读。梅吉生活在父亲用金钱为她打造的象牙塔中,她虽然渴望打破这个假象,和丈夫亚美利哥有完整的两性关系,但他们的关系却毫无平等可言。贫穷的亚美利哥和夏洛特在这个家庭中没有选择权,他俩在小说中被描述成笼中困兽、牵线木偶。结尾处亚美利哥抱着梅吉说的那句“现在,我的眼中只有你”,也可以理解为金钱捆绑下的僵局。努斯鲍姆充分肯定了梅吉面对伦理冲突时表现出的道德感知力、对秩序的追求和对生活的调整,但这样的调整无异于对他人命运的残酷操纵,说梅吉最后走向了道德成熟而无视其行为的残酷性是片面的。从读者接受讲,努斯鲍姆称赞梅吉时似乎忘了道德冲突随文化语境而变化。在重视孝道的中国文化中,做女儿与做妻子这两种身份之间并不存在如此深刻的矛盾,女性为了丈夫而牺牲父亲的做法很难让读者产生伦理认同。即使在价值多元化的西方社会,这一做法也不一定能得到读者的认同,毕竟,读者接受心理受社会、文化现实条件的制约,忽略这些制约因素,既削弱对作品丰富性的理解,也难以让来自不同文化背景的读者接受,努斯鲍姆理解的道德教诲就难以实现。

努斯鲍姆对《阿伽门农》中同情问题的分析十分精辟,评论界也很少提出质疑,但事实上,她在指责阿伽门农丧失了同情心、不人道时,很大程度上忽视了历史文化语境。从历史角度看,古希腊的英雄德性本来就排斥同情心,而阿伽门农出于战争考虑,只能根据比较原则做出选择,这更是在很大程度上消解了同情。就像奥德修斯为了战争而避开痛苦中的菲罗克忒忒斯那样,阿伽门农拒绝看被献祭的女儿也很可能是他唯一的选择。努斯鲍姆反对价值相对论和功利主义的比较,主张结合具体情境做出最好的选择,她根据已经变迁的时代语境,对古老文本进行新的解读,这具有可贵的现实意义。然而,在文本分析中脱离历史文化语境的倾向是不可取的,毕竟,人物难以超越历史。

努斯鲍姆的同情论在批评实践中还有普遍主义的倾向,因为同情强调人类心理上的共通感,要求作品能够回应人们普遍情感的声音和呼求。她认为,贝克特在小说三部曲中试图表现上帝死后西方人的恶心、绝望和孤独等情感,这很难引起世界上其它地方读者的共鸣。拉特克利夫对理解和同情的难度有更深刻的认识,她指出,努斯鲍姆没有仔细地听贝克特的声音,而贝克特所用典故的性质、他对戏剧独白形式的改编等都表明他对“思想和情感的分享”有更复杂的看法……贝克特一直关注“传达和听取另一个声音的难度”(Ratcliffe 171-172)。这一反驳让我们看到,文学展现独特的生命感和复杂、

多元的道德生活，普遍主义思想在解释人类情感时存在诸多谬误，我们不能将情感共鸣视为文学阅读实现其道德功能的必要条件。列维纳斯“绝对他者”的理念中，他者是无法完全理解的，道德就是尊重他者的“他者性”。西蒙·斯托（Simon Stow）也出于类似的原因反对努斯鲍姆的同情论，他认为努斯鲍姆的同情和道德想象在亚当·斯密那里就出了问题，我们不能把发挥想象力、站在他人的立场看问题当做是理所当然的，而努斯鲍姆以为白人中产阶级自然会同情社会底层（Stow 45）。这个批评是很中肯的，不排除努斯鲍姆有忽略主体差异、夸大道德想象功能的理想化倾向。从列维纳斯“绝对他者”的理念出发，所谓的设身处地就有同化他者的道德嫌疑。另外，如果同情的条件是自我能够对他者进行道德想象，那迥异于自我的他者很可能就得不到同情。可见，努斯鲍姆虽然意识到阶级、宗教、民族、文化等差异会限制想象力，使同情受阻，但遗憾的是，她在具体的文学批评实践中并没有深化该观点，有时甚至还有所违背。评论界对努斯鲍姆文学批评实践的批评也主要是针对她对该观点的忽视。

评论界对努斯鲍姆的同情论不乏过激和不公道的评价，忽略了其思维的周密之处。以斯托为例，在他看来，阅读文学作品和读者产生同情、提升道德之间并没有必然的联系，道德想象甚至可以是破坏性的。“施虐者也可以很有想象力地去施虐，以他人的视角看世界也可以成为和他人对抗的最佳武器”（Stow 48）。努斯鲍姆其实已经说过：“施虐狂明白，站在受害者的角度，受害者遭受的痛苦很糟糕，但对施虐者而言，这痛苦是好事”（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 322）。她清楚移情可以服务于自私的目的，它本身是有缺陷的，道德上中立。斯托试图质疑努斯鲍姆关于同情的幸福论断，即同情者把关心、同情他人的苦难与自身的幸福联系起来的认知判断，但他混淆了移情和同情。此外，斯托重视读者在阅读中的主动性，但他声称“二手的教诲没有任何作用（Stow 58）”，这流露出政治学家对文学批评的贬抑。努斯鲍姆的批评实践屡遭诟病的地方是她对《金碗》的分析，但肯定梅吉对他者的道德感知力这一主张其实有合理性。梅吉清楚自己的行为给亚美利哥和夏洛特带来的痛苦，她对他们不无同情心。“挥舞手中的权力总是残酷的，但他者的感知能减轻这种残酷性”（陈丽 166）。该观点填补了努斯鲍姆分析梅吉过程中的一个空缺，也从另一个角度证明了梅吉同情感的伦理价值，对那些过激的反对之声无疑是一种反击和矫正。

三、对努斯鲍姆同情论的评价与反思

努斯鲍姆从同情这一人性化视角探讨文学阅读的道德功能，对大量文学作品做了精彩的解读，展现了拒绝冷漠和虚无、让世界回归真诚与爱的立场和强烈的人文关怀意识，能提升促进人的道德能力。努斯鲍姆作为双重转向的先锋之一，她的文学研究模式具有不容忽视的理论意义。我们应该正视其

理论和批评实践的误区，并吸收可取之处，为文学伦理学批评的理论建构打下更坚实的基础。

就误区而言，努斯鲍姆的同情论主要存在两方面的问题：极端的认知论导致其伦理理论基础出现缺陷；批评实践中，她对具体情境包括文本特征和同情受阻的各种情况不够重视，因而出现了忽略生活和艺术的距离、片面夸大文学阅读的道德功能的理想化倾向。列维纳斯反对人们对艺术功能的看法太乐观，提醒人们光明与阴影和幕后的神秘共存（Levinas 30）。针对文学研究中见树不见林的弊端，穆雷·史密斯（Murray Smith）在谈到布莱希特传统时写道：“对小说移情式的情感反应使我们局限于单个人物的视角，从而阻止我们审视与其他人物和叙事全局的关系”（Smith 54-55）。努斯鲍姆虽然在理论上高度重视特殊情境中的各种因素，但她在具体的文本分析中确实有忽略文本细节，脱离社会、文化、历史语境和读者接受心理的问题。

脱离历史文化语境的倾向固然不可取，但就积极面而言，努斯鲍姆敏锐地看到，功利主义指导下的比较原则对人的独特性以及内心深处的希望和恐惧视而不见，具有破坏性，因此她试图将比较原则纳入同情的伦理原则之中，以同情调和比较的破坏性，引导人们关注被遗忘者的生活。努斯鲍姆的同情论与其反对审美超越，承认人类共有的脆弱性和不完美现实的价值这一哲学立场有关。正如吉尔·拉尔森（Jil Larson）所指出的：“对苦难的畏惧和对审美慰藉的渴望会让人逃避他者之脸及他者对认同和同情的诉求”（Larson 99）。从心理学看，人类心理的连续性决定了情感认同的认知阅读模式有顽强的生命力，很多评论家都意识到了这一点。穆雷·史密斯指出：“人物的概念在 20 世纪的作家和叙事学家手中都受到了抨击，但它依然在叙事话语中无处不在（……）人类主体的基本概念是我们日常社交和想象活动的基本元素，对虚构叙事的想象离不开人物”（Smith 17）。尽管有诸多不确定，“不可能消除所有固定的人物结构。完全没有崇高感和心理连续性的生活也是不可想象的……即使在‘想象的’、‘不负责任的’文学空间中，心理连续性也最终会重现”（Bersani 314）。自由人文主义者对同情的重视反映了人们对伦理认同的心理需求，“即便移情者所获得的心理内容与被移情者的原始心理内容不一致，那也要比那些通过以己度人的想象或自以为是的猜测而得到的心理内容真实得多，更要比那些对他人报以冷漠或鄙视，以至于连想象或猜测都懒得去做的人强上百倍”（李义天 20）。因此，从同情的角度挖掘文学作品给读者的伦理启示，这无疑是努斯鲍姆同情论的独特贡献。

改进同情论首先要改进认同模式，将认同建立在对综合情境的理解基础上。聂珍钊教授认为：“不同历史时期的文学有其固定的属于特定历史的伦理环境，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 19）。具体到同情与文学阅读的道德功能的关系上，我们应该充分认识同情在具体情境中受阻的情况、读者和文本及作

者互动时伦理认同产生的困难。文本的语言和叙事、作品的历史文化语境、读者的文化接受心理和认知能力等广义上都是语境的组成部分，应该综合考虑。“与我们的情感体验更密切相关的不是对角色的认同，而是对情境的理解”（Ratcliffe 46）。对情境的综合考虑其实就是拉特克利夫倡导的“在自由人文主义和解构主义这两种认知模式之间保持某种平衡。”一方面，我们要警惕文化相对论“什么都行”的态度，避免陷入主观主义的泥淖，发挥个体主动性去探寻作品的人文价值；另一方面，我们也要尊重文本，并充分参与和各种同情论的对话，对同情受阻、沟通困难的情况有更深入的理解，为意义的不确定性留下应有的空间。在特殊情境下，要承认认同的困难，不可走极端的认知路线，因为认同困难本身也蕴含独特的伦理价值。

除了改进认同模式，努斯鲍姆的同情论在文学批评实践中还要在文本选择方面更具包容性并充分尊重文本自身的特点。努斯鲍姆在分析同情对人物的影响时，有时确实言之有据，其中包含的生活智慧也很有启发性。她认为，书中会描绘在现实生活中与我们截然不同的人物，这样的阅读能丰富我们对更多“有价值的事物”的认识（Nussbaum, *Upheavals* 2），但她选择的文本类型大多是有社会政治内容的主流现实主义小说和古典悲剧，对诗歌和后现代作品极少涉及。拉特克利夫在《论同情》中研究的文体主要是诗歌，她指出：“努斯鲍姆自己对有价值的事物的认识却不是很多，她对我们与文学文本的关系的看法很狭隘，她选择的文本也大都是现实主义作品”（Ratcliffe 16）。对于为什么努斯鲍姆很少关注其他文学形式，有评论家这样分析道：“其他文学形式可能颠覆认同和同情的纽带，并尝试展现不同的读者关系，因此，在努斯鲍姆对文学伦理的构想中，对这些文本可能性的探讨十分有限”（Wrighton 157）。的确，努斯鲍姆通过对贝克特的批判，表达其反对虚无荒诞思想、排斥后现代作品的态度，但这也极大地削弱了其同情论的阐释力和适用度，对同情和文学阅读的道德功能之间关系的进一步思考亟需更复杂、文体更多样化的文本。此外，我们还应尊重文本自身的特点，明白艺术和生活的距离。这意味着不可脱离文本特征用预设的伦理观念去进行强制阐释，文学批评不是政治的竞技场，也不是个人阐发哲学主张的工具。

综上所述，努斯鲍姆的同情论和由此展开的批评实践有其独特的人文价值，但也存在不少局限。我们应该正视评论界的批评之声，在理论对话和批评实践中改进同情论，如改进认同模式、加深对读者和作品互动方式的认识、重视文本选择的多样性和文本自身的特征等。这些改进方案其实已经吸收了戴克所倡导的阐释学模式，该模式贯穿艺术的全过程，从作者意图、读者需求到艺术的内在规律。惟其如此，我们才能澄清同情的伦理价值，并在同情的指引下，真正实现文学阅读的道德功能。

Works Cited

- Bersani, Leo. *A Future for Astyanax*. London: Marion Boyars, 1976.
- Blackburn, Simon. "To Feel and Feel Not." *The New Republic* 24 Dec. (2001): 34-38.
- Cates, Diana Fritz. "Conceiving Emotions: Martha Nussbaum's *Upheavals of Thought*." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 31.2 (2003): 325-341.
- 陈丽: 《亨利·詹姆斯的艺术道德观》。上海: 上海外语教育出版社, 2013 年。
- [Chen Li. *Art and Morality in Henry James's Writings*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2013.]
- Donoghue, Denis. *Ferocious Alphabet*. London: Faber, 1981.
- Dyk, Tricia Van. "Not Just Cause and Effect: Resituating Martha Nussbaum's Defense of Novels as Moral Philosophy in a Hermeneutical Framework." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 19.2 (2017): 204-219.
- Eagleton, Robert. *Ethical Criticism: Reading after Levinas*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1997.
- Gordon, Robert M. "Folk Psychology as Stimulation." *Mind & Language* 1.2 Summer (1986): 158-171.
- 金惠敏: "无限的他者——对列维纳斯一个核心概念的阅读", 《外国文学》3 (2003): 46-53。
- [Jin Huimin. "Infinite Otherness: An Interpretation of a Key Term of Levinas." *Foreign Literature* 3 (2003): 46-53.]
- Larson, Jil. *Ethics and Narrative in the English Novel, 1880-1914*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2004.
- Levinas, E. *Totality and Infinity*. Trans. Alphonso Lingis. London: Martinus Hijhoff Publishers, 1979.
- 李义天: "移情是美德伦理的充要条件吗——对迈克尔·斯洛特道德情感主义的分析与批评", 《道德与文明》2 (2018): 15-21。
- [Li Yitian. "Is Empathy Necessary and Sufficient for Virtue Ethics? An Analysis and Criticism of Michael Slote's Moral Sentimentalism." *Morality and Civilization* 2 (2018): 15-21.]
- Mendelson, Edward. *Early Auden, Later Auden: A Critical Biography*. Princeton UP, 2017.
- 聂珍钊: "文学伦理学批评: 基本理论与术语", 《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.]
- 玛莎·纳斯鲍姆: 《善的脆弱性: 古希腊悲剧与哲学中的运气与伦理》, 徐向东 陆萌译。南京: 译林出版社, 2018 年。
- [Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and Ethics in Greek Tragedy and Philosophy*. Trans. Xu Xiangdong and Lu Meng. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2018.]
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford UP, 1990.
- 玛莎·努斯鲍姆: 《诗性正义: 文学想象与公共生活》, 丁晓东译。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2010 年。
- [Nussbaum, Martha C. *Poetic Justice: The Literary Imagination and Public Life*. Trans. Ding Xiaodong

etc. Beijing: Peking UP, 2010.]

—. *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*. Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2013.

—. *Upheavals of Thought: The Intelligence of Emotions*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Ratcliffe, Sophie. *On Sympathy*. New York: Oxford UP, 2008.

亚当·斯密：《道德情操论》，蒋自强等译。北京：商务印书馆，2009年。

[Smith, Adam. *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. Trans. Jiang Ziqiang etc. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2009.]

Smith, Murray. *Engaging Characters: Fiction, Emotion and the Cinema*. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

Stow, Simon. *Republic of Readers? The Literary Turn in Political Thought and Analysis*. New York: State U of New York P, 2007.

Wrighton, John. "Reading Responsibly between Martha Nussbaum and Emmanuel Levinas: Towards a Textual Ethics for the Twenty-First Century." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 19.2 (2017): 149-170.

嫉妒的伦理阐释：论朱利安·巴恩斯《她过去的爱情》中的脑文本与伦理选择

An Ethical Interpretation of Jealousy: On the Brain Text and Ethical Choice in Julian Barnes's *Before She Met Me*

汤轶丽 (Tang Yili)

内容摘要：在小说《她过去的爱情》中，朱利安·巴恩斯聚焦恋情中的嫉妒，围绕主人公格雷厄姆面对嫉妒时的心理状态和所做出的选择，讲述了一则关于斯芬克斯因子变化与冲突的寓言。从文学伦理学批评视角来看，格雷厄姆身上斯芬克斯因子的不同组合和变化引发了理性意志和非理性意志之间的冲突。格雷厄姆肆意猜忌妻子出轨，形成了背叛和愤怒的脑文本，导致其身上的兽性因子未能得到有效控制。在非理性意志的驱动下，格雷厄姆做出了刺杀好友杰克以及自杀的伦理选择。通过书写嫉妒，巴恩斯揭示了伦理道德之于人类生活的规范和指引作用。

关键词：《她过去的爱情》；朱利安·巴恩斯；文学伦理学批评；脑文本；伦理选择

作者简介：汤轶丽，文学博士，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院博士后流动站研究人员，主要学术研究领域为文学伦理学批评、当代英美小说研究与叙事学。本文系国家社科基金重大招标项目“当代西方伦理批评文献的整理、翻译与研究”【项目编号：19ZDA292】以及2019年度浙江省教育厅人文社会科学项目一般科研项目“巴恩斯小说的伦理叙事研究”【项目编号：Y201941586】的阶段性研究成果。本研究同时得到第66批中国博士后科学基金面上资助项目【项目编号：2019M662098】的资助。

Title: An Ethical Interpretation of Jealousy: On the Brain Text and Ethical Choice in Julian Barnes's *Before She Met Me*

Abstract: In *Before She Met Me*, focusing on jealousy in intimate relationships and the psychological portrait of as well as the choices made by Graham Hendrick in the face of this feeling, Julian Barnes writes a fable about the changes and conflicts of Sphinx factor. Adopting a perspective of ethical literary criticism, this article argues that different combinations and the transformation of Sphinx factor in Graham's psyche trigger conflicts between his rational and irrational will. Graham's illusions and suspicion of his wife's adultery form the brain text of betrayal and

anger, which leads to the uncontrollability of the animal factor in him. Driven by the irrational will, Graham makes an ethical choice to kill his good friend Jack and to commit suicide. Through the story of jealousy, Barnes reveals that human life should be guided by the moral principles.

Key words: *Before She Met Me*; Julian Barnes; ethical literary criticism; brain text; ethical choice

Author: Tang Yili, Ph.D. in Literature, is Postdoctoral Fellow at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research interests in scholarship include ethical literary criticism, contemporary Anglo-American fiction, and narratology (Email: milkytang2008@126.com).

自第一部小说《伦敦郊区》（*Metroland*, 1980）问世以来，朱利安·巴恩斯（Julian Barnes）始终关注爱情、记忆、历史、死亡、衰老以及婚姻等个人生存的话题，以睿智和冷静的笔触揭示自我与他人之间的复杂关系。作为其中的一条主线，爱情这一看似“老生常谈”的话题在巴恩斯建构的故事世界中焕发新彩，并成为了作者省视自我，叩问存在的载体。在其第二部小说《她过去的爱情》（*Before She Met Me*, 1982）中，爱情的基调似乎更为黑暗和讽刺。巴恩斯在采访中承认到：“（这一部）小说着实令人不快，它讲述了不愉快的性体验，嫉妒以及无法摆脱的情感”（Smith 74）。《她过去的爱情》充满了浓厚的巴恩斯风格，描绘了日常生活中最普通不过的情绪，聚焦于“爱情的病症”——嫉妒。小说讲述了中年男子历史学家格雷厄姆在经历多年失败的婚姻后出轨。当他终于与前妻芭芭拉离婚，如愿与现任妻子安开启甜蜜美好的新篇章时，却在前妻的刻意安排下观看了安曾经出演的爱情电影，从此陷入了嫉妒的漩涡，不能自己。安的年轻貌美与相对丰富的感情史使格雷厄姆变得疑神疑鬼。他反复不止地观看安曾经参演的电影，找寻她背叛的证据，并在好友杰克的小说中找到了安与杰克出轨的蛛丝马迹，一遍遍地幻想二者私通的画面。格雷厄姆脑中的猜忌、质疑和幻想在巴恩斯黑色幽默的笔下纤毫毕现，并在结局中得以爆发。在刺杀杰克后，他最终自杀解脱。相较于巴恩斯其他作品，《她过去的爱情》的叙述显得更为直接，更侧重精神和心理的刻画。虽然延续了第一部作品关于嫉妒这一主题的探讨，但巴恩斯在这部作品中对于这一主题显然更加野心勃勃，满是戏谑和狡猾的腔调，将受困于庸常生活的情感困境和道德悲剧放大至无以复加的地步，进而掰碎至读者面前。

尽管《她过去的爱情》在评论界并未得到过多关注，但大部分批评者们都指出并探讨了小说中对于嫉妒这一主题的刻画。大卫·蒙特罗斯（David Montrose）和彼得·查尔兹（Peter Childs）等评论者一针见血地指出，巴氏笔下的嫉妒是在性解放时代下催生出的病症（Montrose 69; Childs 34）。换

言之，这一部小说是巴恩斯对于 20 世纪 60 年代挑战传统性观念和性道德运动的反思。弗雷德里克·莫内龙（Frédéric Monneyron）以及马克·米灵顿与艾莉森·辛克莱（Mark K. Millington and Alison S. Sinclair）则分别从精神分析视角和性别视角探讨小说中的嫉妒机制。莫内龙认为格雷厄姆的嫉妒来源于婴儿期，产生于对母亲的理想化以及阉割威胁（Guignery 23），其嫉妒病症符合了弗洛伊德的范式。事实上，小说确实充满了作者巴恩斯对于弗洛伊德精神分析的思索。在格雷厄姆自身对于嫉妒的分析以及与杰克类似患者和治疗师般的对话中，巴恩斯展示了对于精神分析理论的思考和戏谑。与莫内龙的解读相呼应，米灵顿与辛克莱认为，安较为丰富的情感经验使其成为一个“母亲式”的形象，从而使格雷厄姆对自我的控制感出现问题。格雷厄姆最终的暴力行为反应了父权制社会并不能解决男性的问题，甚至试图控制或否认这些问题（Millington and Sinclair 15）。上述学者对于嫉妒这一主题的分析无不显示巴恩斯笔下的嫉妒，更像是作者观察生活和人性的一种独特的视角。巴恩斯把观察者格雷厄姆置于嫉妒的精神状态中，把他脑海荧光屏上不断闪现的画面、场景转化为语言及行动，将人物嫉妒的精神状态和精神表现描摹得淋漓尽致且充满荒诞感。就此而言，格雷厄姆的感情活动是强烈甚至偏激的，具有复杂的情感内容、心理内容、文化内容以及伦理思想内容。小说书写的是嫉妒，但却不仅仅止于嫉妒。从文学伦理学批评视角来看，小说中的嫉妒主题是作者探索头脑的伦理功能的载体。巴恩斯通过描写嫉妒状态下格雷厄姆有关背叛和愤怒的脑文本的形成和演绎，以及在此基础上做出的伦理选择，展现了思维和情感过程中斯芬克斯因子与脑文本之间相互影响的关系，从而引导读者形成正确道德行为的脑文本，实现文学的道德教诲功能，表现了小说家的伦理立场和人文关怀。

一、嫉妒的伦理意义与阐释

“嫉妒”（jealousy）作为人类普遍的情感体验，并非个人能得已轻易消磨，正如赫尔穆特·舍克（Helmut Schoeck）所言：“一个人要借助于自身取得的个人思想上的成熟来战胜本身的嫉妒，这并不是每个人都能做得到的”（赫尔穆特·舍克 9）。事实上，嫉妒不仅仅涉及爱情，社会中的任何人际关系都有可能为其提供温床。在现有关于嫉妒的研究中，大部分学者都将研究锁定为亲密关系中的情感，即爱情嫉妒。本文也将对嫉妒的探索定位至爱情关系中的嫉妒，以便更深入地探讨。翻阅嫉妒的历史卷轴，我们不难发现，嫉妒与其他情绪情感一般具有“多样性”。它囊括了丰富的哲学、文学以及伦理含义。同时它具有“跨时代性”和“跨文化性”。人们对于嫉妒的理解和认知有着深刻的伦理性，并随着伦理关系和社会内容的变化而不断演进。对于嫉妒伦理意义的探寻，文学则是最好的载体和表现艺术。

嫉妒作为文学作品中的主题古已有之。在《她过去的爱情》中，巴恩斯

的嫉妒书写大致具有以下三个特征：一是作品中所表现的嫉妒的导火索或者这一类情感体验的支点往往是微不足道、细小且平常的。在《她过去的爱情》中，安曾经主演的电影成为了嫉妒感情的落脚点；二是由此支点所引发嫉妒的情感活动却是强烈、亢奋甚至偏激的，具有复杂的情感、社会和伦理思想内容等。格雷厄姆的嫉妒之火使他成为了大脑的敌人，深陷于想象的猜忌或妄想的漩涡中；三是情感状态的亢奋和强烈往往会伴随情感者一系列的伦理选择，继而引出激烈甚至极端的行为。格雷厄姆深陷于“当大脑成为自身敌人”的困境中。在真实与虚构，理性主义与理想主义，自然情感与理性情感之间，他不得不做出一系列的伦理选择。

就此而言，在解读文学作品中嫉妒这一母题时，文学伦理学批评成为了我们分析嫉妒的一大利器。在文学伦理学的批评体系中，文学中的精神或心理分析基于“脑文本”（brain text）这一概念，它“以人的大脑为载体，是一种特殊的生物形态。人们对客观事物的感知和认知，先是以脑概念的形式在大脑中存储，然后借助脑概念进行思维，从而获取思维的结果：思想。思想是大脑在感知、认知和理解的基础上对客观事物或抽象事物进行处理得到的结果，这个结果只要在大脑中存储，就形成脑文本”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评” 30）。作为文学伦理学批评的重要概念，脑文本“给我们提供了深入分析精神的可能。从认识论角度看，只要有精神存在，就一定有精神存在的形式，只要有精神存在的形式，就可以对精神进行分析。精神的存在是以脑文本为前提的，没有脑文本，就不可能有对精神的认知。对心理的分析也同样如此。人的心理活动也是以脑文本为载体的，没有脑文本，心理活动就不可能存在。因此，无论精神分析还是心理分析，都要转移到对脑文本的分析上来”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评” 33）。有鉴于此，格雷厄姆的心理活动是以脑文本为载体，并以此决定了他的意识、思维、判断、选择、行动、情感、伦理和道德等。因而我们可以看到在解读或阐释格雷厄姆的嫉妒时，对其脑文本的解构和分析是必不可少的。格雷厄姆的大脑根据不同的伦理规则不断对嫉妒、出轨、愤怒等一系列情感体验和感知的脑文本进行组合和修改，从而对其本身发生作用，使意志和情感发生一系列的变化。同时，格雷厄姆身上斯芬克斯因子的不同组合和变化也导致了不同的意志表现，进而影响脑概念的组成和变化，最终影响了脑文本的生成和演绎。形成的脑文本也将影响格雷厄姆身上斯芬克斯因子的组合和变化，并决定了他的伦理选择。“在伦理选择的过程中，人的伦理意识开始产生，善恶的观念逐渐形成，这都是脑文本发生作用的结果”（聂珍钊，“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评” 33-34）。此外，在作家与读者层面上，作家在将对于嫉妒的感知、认知、理解和思考的“文学脑文本”（聂珍钊，王永 172）解码成书写文本的过程中做出了一系列的伦理选择；读者则通过阅读文本，从中获取形成相应的脑文

本，并从而完成自己的伦理选择。这一系列脑文本的转化也完成了文学的教诲功能，使得嫉妒这一系列情感体验通过文学的载体实现艺术化和伦理化。

二、《她过去的爱情》中的脑文本与伦理选择

在回答为何选择嫉妒作为小说的主题时，巴恩斯的答案颇具兴味。他认为作为小说的主题，嫉妒因为其“戏剧性”而具有“小说般”的吸引力，它通常是“非理性的、不公平的、无穷尽的、痴迷的且恐怖的。（嫉妒作用时）埋藏在我们深处的原始力量打破了我们所谓成年时期的表面，就像池塘里鳄鱼的口鼻。”（Guppy 157）那么巴恩斯口中的“原始力量”以及“鳄鱼”又代表了什么呢？在小说引语中，巴恩斯便给出了答案。他援引了保罗·麦克莱恩在《神经与精神疾病杂志》中关于“三个脑袋”的论断：

人类发现自己身处这样的境地：自然本质上赋予他三个脑袋，尽管它们结构迥异，但必须共同运作、相互交流。最老的那个脑袋基本上是爬行动物型的，第二个遗传于低等哺乳动物，第三个是晚期哺乳动物的进化，正是它……才使人成为独特的人。当我们以寓言的方式讲述这些脑中之脑的时候，不妨想象精神病医生叫病人躺在长榻上时，他是要他伸开四肢躺在马和鳄鱼旁。¹

麦克莱恩论述中“三个脑袋”的存在以及共同运作事实上与斯芬克斯因子中人性因子（human factor）和兽性因子（animal factor）的不同组合与变化有异曲同工之处。文学伦理学批评认为，人类在经过生物性选择之后还需要再经历第二次选择，即伦理选择，方能获得人的形式。由此可见，从“第一个脑袋”到“第二个脑袋”，人经历了生物性选择，奠定了人类向更高阶段进化的基础；从“第二个脑袋”到“第三个脑袋”，人类经历伦理选择，从而真正使自身与动物区分，成为真正理性的人。在此过程中，人即使脱离了野蛮状态，经历了“第二个脑袋”到“第三个脑袋”的过程成为了文明人，但身上依然保留动物的特性，也就是巴恩斯和麦克莱恩口中的“马与鳄鱼”。巴恩斯在解释为何引用“三个脑袋”的论断时强调道：“（此论断）契合小说的主题……讲述了一个文明的人，发现马与鳄鱼并未消失。正因为这种持续的爬行动物的头脑，事情便从乐观走向了完全的悲剧”（Freiburg 55）。人性因子与兽性因子并存于人类中这一特点是由斯芬克斯因子所决定的。当人性因子能够控制兽性因子时，人方能成为伦理之人；但当文明的人发现兽性因子，即“马与鳄鱼”，不受人性因子的控制和约束时，那么人便会受到非理性意志的驱使，导致自然情感的泛滥，做出错误的伦理选择，从而造成“事

1 朱利安·巴恩斯：《她过去的爱情》，郭国良译（上海：文汇出版社，2018年）引语。本文有关《她过去的爱情》的引文均来自朱利安·巴恩斯：《她过去的爱情》，郭国良译（上海：文汇出版社，2018年），下文只标注页码，不再一一说明。

情的悲剧”。人类区别于动物的伦理意识在于头脑中存储的各种不同“脑文本”。这些脑文本受制于意志的影响，并反作用于意志。作为人所独有的特征，斯芬克斯因子中人性因子和兽性因子的变化和冲突，不仅与情感和意志的变化紧密相连，以此为表现形式，同时也影响着人的思维活动，进而影响人的伦理意识和伦理选择。由此可见，巴恩斯对于嫉妒这一主题的兴趣在于情感作用时大脑的运作，即嫉妒作用下，格雷厄姆生成相应的脑文本，使得两种因子在他身上此消彼长和相互抑制，并通过两种意志（理性意志和非理性意志）和两种情感（自然情感和道德情感）之间的博弈体现。意志和情感的伦理冲突又影响了脑文本的生成和演绎，从而影响了他的伦理选择。

纵观小说关于格雷厄姆两次婚姻以及伴侣的描述，我们不难看出，格雷厄姆对于婚姻和情感充满了不可协调的矛盾。在与前妻芭芭拉第一场维持十五年的婚姻中，他承认和芭芭拉的感情。但是芭芭拉理智近乎冷漠的性情让他在婚姻中丧失了激情和爱情。甚至对于他们的女儿爱丽丝，格雷厄姆坦言“爱丽丝从未激起他心中更深沉的怜爱”（6）。然而他却强调自己的忠诚，认为婚姻中的不忠是错误的，解释道在女学生的勾引下自己仍然理性并未越轨。但讽刺的是，当真正的诱惑出现时，格雷厄姆口中的错误便成了情理之中的事。在遇到热情似火的安后，格雷厄姆体验到了身体和情感功能的复苏。在第二段婚姻中，格雷厄姆的情感和身体是麻木的，无法感受到婚姻和生活带来的乐趣，而这也成为了他与安私通“合理化”的理由。我们可以看到私通者格雷厄姆和安并非没有负罪感，他们深知出轨与不忠破坏了社会认同的伦理秩序，更违背了公认的伦理准则，但格雷厄姆却不断以爱情和快乐的借口背离自己作为丈夫和父亲的伦理责任和义务。“伦理身份是道德行为及道德规范的前提，并对道德行为主体产生约束”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》264）。在过去的婚姻生活中，尽管遭受了情感的痛苦与折磨，在理性意志的正确引导与约束下，格雷厄姆的行为尚且符合大学教师和丈夫的伦理身份与责任。然而随着婚外情的升温，格雷厄姆领略到了快乐之道迷津般的享受，他的道德情感也渐渐向自然情感转化，最终放弃其内心的道德法则。在向芭芭拉坦白出轨的事实时，格雷厄姆的反应丝毫看不出一丝愧疚与心虚，取而代之的是对家庭的嫌弃以及如何成功摆脱芭芭拉母女的心机。在此，我们可以看到由于本能的作用从格雷厄姆身上流淌出的原始欲望。他渴望追求快乐，尽管在与芭芭拉交往初期他的情欲炽热，迸发出强烈的爱意，但他不断强调与安的感情超越了情欲，使他远离了生活中的恐惧和猜忌。然而随着故事的发展，我们却不断见证斯芬克斯因子的变化。

在经历了第一次麻木且丧失主动权的婚姻后，格雷厄姆享受着人生中第一段性自由时期，而此时他对于婚姻以及爱情的幻想实则已凌驾于现实。正如本文第一节所述，在《她过去的爱情》中，嫉妒情感的导火索或是支点是细小、微不足道的。在芭芭拉的精心安排下，格雷厄姆与女儿进入电影院观

看安曾参演的电影《欣喜若狂》。在格雷厄姆看来，这一部电影充满艳俗的色彩和荒唐的情节。当看到自己的现任妻子出现在荧幕时，他的反应更多的是新鲜与好奇。但与女儿讨论该电影时，爱丽丝却毫不掩饰对于安的鄙夷和诋毁。在电影《欣喜若狂》中，安饰演的是一位卖弄风情的女子，或用其话而言“婊子”（36）。格雷厄姆在看到荧幕中的安时，他便已经知道芭芭拉与女儿的诡计。他一开始便意识到安仅仅是在表演，因而他的反应更多的是好奇和戏谑。但当他意识到前妻和女儿的处心积虑时，他似乎也变得不再那么自信。“她只是在表演”（31）这一句陈述事实的话对于格雷厄姆来说已经不再是内心理智情感的发声，更似安抚之言。在此我们可以看到格雷厄姆关于安出轨的脑文本中矛盾的内容：一方面他意识到安只是在表演，并未真正与演员厮混。同时电影发生在过去，早在安遇到格雷厄姆的前几个月，她便退出演艺圈，因此这与当下他们的情感关系并无多大联系。此外，芭芭拉和女儿的用意显而易见，因而她们对于安的评价并不可信；但另一方面，他又似乎控制不住自己的情感，电影中的情节以及安的过去让他渐渐产生了怀疑和猜忌，忍不住询问安电影拍摄的感觉以及电影中她的“意大利情人”。然而安的坦率回答并未平息格雷厄姆脑中不断滋长的情绪。

格雷厄姆在后一个礼拜中重看了三遍《欣喜若狂》，甚至为了电影影响了工作。电影这一导火索让他对安的去产生了过度的好奇和幻想。纵使他知道安过去的男友，但如今他控制不住想象安与前男友们是否像电影中一般有过肌肤之亲，而这种揣测和想象让他觉得安是在偷情，已经背叛了他。对于自己的这种想法，格雷厄姆认识到其不合理性，然而他却无法控制。格雷厄姆对于安过往情史的执着慢慢演变成了验证安与“意大利情人”厮混的热忱。他以历史学家的“实证”精神试图为自己的嫉妒心找寻佐证。当发现无法亲眼目睹妻子与其他男演员在电影里私通时，格雷厄姆甚至认为这代表了妻子虽然在荧幕前保持贞洁，但在私下里与男演员通奸。在此我们可以看到现实与电影的混淆以及对于安私通的妄想占据了格雷厄姆大部分的脑文本。随着这一负面文本的不断积累和发酵，格雷厄姆更难控制自身的兽性因子。他的大脑中不断浮现着复仇的画面：

他将巴克溺死在满是果汁朗姆酒的池子里：巴克衰竭的肺里鼓出来的最后一个泡泡在布满口水的泳池表面消失得无影无踪……不过最精彩的复仇在最后面……格雷厄姆环顾四周，把推土机挂上后档，然后驾着它慢慢轧过毫无生命气息的尸体，他要碾碎他的骨头，要把他的血肉碾得像酥饼一样薄。（110-113）

在这个复仇梦中，格雷厄姆俨然成为了一个凶残的杀人凶手。无论是杀人的手法抑或是折磨尸体的手段都宣泄了格雷厄姆内心积累的愤怒和妒火。

尽管他不断强调这是在梦中，但格雷厄姆丝毫不为自己萌生的杀人念头而感到惶恐，他将自己谋杀“情夫”的臆想只当作漫无边际的幻想。此时格雷厄姆的兽性因子并未得到有效地约束，并逐渐控制人性因子，侵蚀他正常的心智和情感。尽管未确定巴克或者皮特与安是否真正私通，格雷厄姆仍然无法控制自然情感，任由谋杀的念头泛滥。

然而，彼时格雷厄姆的理性情感，即道德情感，并未完全转化为自然情感，人性因子与兽性因子一直处于博弈的状态，并体现在他的思忖和与杰克的“谈话治疗”中。在感受到嫉妒的情绪肆意膨胀时，格雷厄姆提出了关于嫉妒的一系列问题：首先，“为什么嫉妒会产生——不仅是他，还有芸芸众生？它是怎么产生的？”（155）；第二，“出于某些原因嫉妒是必须存在的，但它为什么还影响着过去？为什么似乎是它主导着情绪？”（156）；第三，“为什么因回顾而产生的嫉妒仍在当今存在，仍在20世纪的最后25年存在呢？”；第四，“为什么这种令人嫌弃的、鄙夷的嫉妒仍挥之不去、纠缠不已？”（157）格雷厄姆嫉妒的导火索仅仅是安的电影和一些杂志图像。而这些影像刺激使他打开了潘多拉的魔盒，最终释放了所有的邪恶。格雷厄姆试图为自己的情绪和失控找寻逻辑，希望理性化情绪。作为一位历史学讲师，他理应善于选择和诠释信息来源，更能分辨过去与现在的差别。然而他现在所遭受情绪带来的苦难恰恰证明作为一名历史学家，他对于安的历史建构是主观甚至虚构的。为了找寻安不忠的证据，重建她的过去，格雷厄姆对于一切蛛丝马迹不做任何理性的甄别：从安参演的电影，与其搭档的男性演员的评论、电影到实证考察她所去的地方、拍摄的照片、广告、外国硬币和火柴盒等。随着格雷厄姆头脑中这些影像信息的积累，他的大脑开始运行。安和各类男演员在银幕上的调情，拍摄的各类照片等信息促进了格雷厄姆大脑中一系列关于安出轨的脑概念的形成。在他对于婚姻和爱情的伦理规则理解下，大脑不断对这些脑概念进行组合和修改，并在斯芬克斯因子组合和变化的影响下逐渐形成了安背叛的脑文本。但显然格雷厄姆也意识到自己出现了爱情的“病症”，并为此苦恼不已。因此，在自身无法找寻答案后，他试图咨询好友杰克。

在整部小说中，格雷厄姆与杰克类似“患者”与“治疗师”的谈话出现了若干次。在格雷厄姆看来，杰克能充当“治疗师”角色的原因不仅在于他在男女或婚姻关系的经验比格雷厄姆更为丰富，更懂得如何应对这些爱情中的症候，而且小说家的职业使他能从混沌中提炼些许秩序。事实上，杰克确实提出了格雷厄姆遭受苦难的原因：

“我不知道有什么能阻止你想去看那些电影。我是说，那是在你脑子里的东西，对吧？”（94）

“从你现在的情况来看，它们确实在闹腾。因为那一批，即第二批，它们才控制我们的情绪，迫使我们踢狗杀人，上别人的老婆，投票给托

利党。”（95）

杰克关于脑子的论断可谓与麦克莱恩“三个脑袋”的论述不谋而合。在杰克看来，格雷厄姆之所以如此执着于安的去，妒火攻心，是因为他无法控制自己脑子中的“第二批”，即兽性因子，导致格雷厄姆形成了一系列安背叛和出轨的脑概念，并受制于他的非理性意志和自然情感。那如何去控制这些情绪呢？杰克提出了一系列的建议，包括度假、出轨以及自慰等。格雷厄姆只实践了自慰并且毫无疗效。在此，我们不妨分析一下杰克作为“治疗师”的伦理身份。作为格雷厄姆和安的介绍人以及共同好友，杰克与安曾有过一段短暂的恋爱关系，甚至在安主动找他聊格雷厄姆的情况时，他仍表现出对安的爱慕和留念。那么在面对格雷厄姆与安的婚姻以及格雷厄姆的情感咨询时，杰克是否也存在嫉妒心呢？从杰克在妻子苏以及安面前对于格雷厄姆的态度中不难看出，他享受着“治疗师”的身份，将格雷厄姆视为弱者，戏谑地称他为“小奥赛罗”。但与格雷厄姆不同，杰克对于自己的嫉妒心似乎拿捏得当。他享受于生活在理性主义与理想主义矛盾之间，将自己满足和平和的心态凌驾于其他情绪之上。因此，即使他依旧留念安，对格雷厄姆有着竞争者的心态，他并未臣服于嫉妒之下并形成相应的脑文本，也未让兽性因子得以控制。

但正是杰克这种玩世不恭，操控情绪和大脑的性格让格雷厄姆产生了怀疑。在格雷厄姆看来，虽然自己并未是世界上最忠诚的情人，但是他对于前妻的背叛是缘于对自由、爱情和快乐的追寻。且正因为他对安的专一和忠诚才有了现在的多愁善感；而杰克似乎对于爱情和婚姻并未忠诚。在探讨大脑对于情绪控制这一话题时，格雷厄姆不经意间地问出了关键的问题：“但是你会上，就像你说的，别人的老婆……你说这是脑子中没发育好的那部分会让你做一件事情。所以，你一定被控制做过这件事情”（97）。格雷厄姆的试探显然遭到了杰克的否定，但猜忌和怀疑的种子早已播下。对于格雷厄姆而言，如果说他“脑子中没发育好的那部分”（97）控制他的嫉妒和愤怒，那么杰克必然也会受到那部分控制干出出轨这一类事。因此，当看到派对上安与杰克的互动、亲吻时，格雷厄姆的愤怒和嫉妒之火喷涌而出。他试图从杰克小说的文本信息中找寻他们奸情的线索。相较于格雷厄姆历史教师的职业，作为小说家的杰克本应是虚构的行家里手，但讽刺的是他的文牍工作更像是历史编撰。他对于现实的依赖远远超过了该有的想象力。就此而言，格雷厄姆更符合小说家的特质，但他却混淆了真实和虚构。他试图在杰克小说中找寻“胸部”、“胸罩”以及其他敏感身体部位的字眼，并最终在杰克的政治性爱主题小说《冲出黑暗》中找到了杰克和安私通的文本证据：安痣的部位、吸烟的习惯、胸部的描述以及做爱的习惯等等。格雷厄姆“理性分析”并最终得出了结论：“杰克和安的奸情开始于1971年，他刚认识安的时候，

他和安结婚后，这两人还一直维持着关系”（210）。从怀疑、认证再到最后的确认，格雷厄姆的脑中已经储存了关于安出轨私通的一系列脑概念。即使这些信息荒诞无稽，并不具可信度，但他已经预设了结论，即安和杰克已经背叛了他。在背叛的脑文本作用下，格雷厄姆将小说中的文字影像化，脑海中不断浮现安和杰克出轨的画面。有鉴于此，格雷厄姆身上的嫉妒等一系列情感体验不仅仅是情欲的愤怒和自尊心使然，更深层次的原因在于他不再将自己的幻想或恐惧与现实区别。换言之，作为第一段婚姻中的背叛者，格雷厄姆将自己曾经的不忠投射于安身上。这种恐惧对方出轨背叛的心理在对于变迁事物想象力的助力下不断滋长发酵，进而使他混淆了过去与现在，现实与梦境。

另一方面，格雷厄姆关于安出轨的脑文本形成后，影响了斯芬克斯因子的组合和变化。最终，在理性意志和非理性意志博弈的过程中，格雷厄姆的人性因子逐渐失去了对兽性因子的有效控制。格雷厄姆把刀刺向了杰克。在杰克恢复神智并试图做出反抗时，他不断朝着杰克心脏和生殖器中间的位置攻击刺扎。在刺杀完成后，格雷厄姆冷静地清理了现场，并舒服地喝着杰克泡的咖啡。尽管格雷厄姆曾幻想过谋杀安情夫的画面，但那时候的兽性因子显然被人性因子所压制。然而在关于安出轨的脑文本形成后，在友情和爱情的“双重背叛”刺激下，自然情感和非理性意志驱使他做出刺杀杰克的伦理选择。这一伦理选择是其相关脑文本形成和演绎的结果：一系列安私通出轨的脑概念在他对于婚姻和伦理规则的理解下，组合形成了关于愤怒、嫉妒、自卑、复仇等脑文本。尽管在脑文本的修正过程中，他也经历了兽性因子和人性因子的博弈，理性意志和非理性意志的斗争，以及自然情感和道德情感的转换，但负面的脑文本最终指导了他的行动，并将幻想的谋杀付诸实施。在结局中，格雷厄姆将安捆绑，避免与她进行眼神交流。他感到自己的脑袋空空如也，毫无念想。在自杀前，他对自己说：“最重要的一点是不要让一切看起来像一部电影：那将会是最大的讽刺，这是他完全不能接受的。不要大幕线，不要情节剧”（237）。在此，我们可以看到在做出伦理选择后，格雷厄姆被压抑甚至是缺失的理性意志在慢慢苏醒。他渐渐意识到他的悲剧在于，当他认为自己能控制情绪，成为脑子的主人时，大脑已经在利用这些负面的脑文本使其成为了他的敌人。他无法控制兽性因子，害怕直面自己的自然情感，从而只能深陷其中，以自以为是为的逻辑和理性成为大脑和情绪的奴隶。

三、巴恩斯的文学脑文本和伦理意识

在世界文学中，以嫉妒为主题的小说可谓汗牛充栋。到了二十一世纪巴恩斯的笔下，这一主题显然有了独具特色的巴氏色彩并带有浓厚的伦理涵义。《她过去的爱情》是一部具有高度互文性的伦理性文本。巴恩斯的语言戏谑幽默，且时不时喜欢织一张互文的网，将嫉妒与其诠释方法所并置，继而对

人性各层面进行拓展和深挖，并通过讲述嫉妒的故事给读者带来道德警示和伦理启迪。

在描述格雷厄姆的脑文本的形成和演绎，以及两种情感和因子的博弈时，我们分析道，巴恩斯试图展现理性和非理性自我之间的斗争以及由本能、情感和理智三者关系失控所引发的道德悲剧。这一主题与福斯特（E. M. Forster）《霍华德庄园》（*Howards End*, 1910）中关于“唯有联结”的主题有着意味深长的关联性。在《霍华德庄园》中，玛格丽特知道了亨利不光彩的过去，然而她选择了原谅并接受求婚。玛格丽特将婚姻这一“联结”的使命视为对亨利的救赎：“它将我们生活中的平淡与激情联结起来。如果没有这种联结，我们都是无意义的碎片，要么当修道士，要么当野兽，就像两个从未联结起来的圆弧”（Forster 159），玛格丽特不断强调将看不见与看的见的“联结”，将生活中的“诗性”与“散文”所联结。事实上，这种“联结”正是弥合理想世界和现实之间不可逾越的鸿沟所做的努力，也是玛格丽特通过婚姻在理想主义与理性主义之间的调和。相较于玛格丽特的原谅和协调，格雷厄姆执着于安“不光彩”的过去，深陷于理想主义与理性主义的鸿沟之中，也因此无法联结“修道士”和“野兽”两个圆弧。如果说“联结”的思想反映了福斯特人文主义的社会理想；那么在巴恩斯笔下，“联结”则展现了他通过隐匿在亲密关系中的嫉妒母题对头脑的伦理功能和斯芬克斯因子的探讨。如果没有了“联结”，那么我们只能走向“修道士”或“野兽”两个极端。然而人性因子和兽性因子是不可分的，只有两者结合且人性因子控制和约束兽性因子时，人才能成为伦理的人，构成完整的人格。小说最后一章的标题“马和鳄鱼”正是对麦克莱恩的论断以及“野兽”的回应。当格雷厄姆拿起刺刀刺向杰克时，他做出了伦理选择，在罪恶中越陷越深。头脑于是丧失了理性，成为了格雷厄姆的敌人。

格雷厄姆关于安出轨和背叛的脑文本来源于他对“事物、对世界的感知、认知和理解”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：口头文学与脑文本”11）。就格雷厄姆所处的生活环境和社会背景而言，彼时的英国正处于社会大变革时期，以披头士为代表的摇滚乐大面积走红，因过多性爱描写而被禁的小说《查泰莱夫人的情人》也已经解禁，“反叛”席卷了英国。这一场“性革命”声称要通过普通人的性解放颠覆整个蔑视人性的社会，所造成的文化冲击，不亚于这个世纪出现的任何一次重大的社会动荡。诞生于此背景，《她过去的爱情》却是一部反思“性革命”的小说，在采访中，巴恩斯坦言：

在某种程度上而言，它是一本反60年代的书。……维多利亚女王仍然当权，披头士乐队接踵而至，突然间，每个人都开始和其他人睡觉，并通过此得到许多的治愈。正如许多人所看到的那样，这是英国性史的粗略计划。而我只想，它并不是那样的；永恒不变的是人类的心灵和

激情。至于谁与谁做了什么事这只是一个表面的变化。(McGrath 21)

不难看出,《她过去的爱情》刻画的正是在性解放时代下催生的病症,即嫉妒。在巴恩斯看来,真正且永恒的解放不仅需要打破禁欲观,它更需要打破内外的双重枷锁,继而使人性达到情感与欲望统一,上升至伦理自律的高度,并最终获得高度完善以及觉悟的人性。格雷厄姆的伦理选择不仅受到了脑文本的影响,同时也反映了巴恩斯的伦理意识。巴恩斯通过“回忆性嫉妒”的荒诞讲述了一场由兽性因子控制下导致的悲剧。在此,他通过描绘格雷厄姆陷入的头脑困境,展示其只能盲目地、片面地面对这种悲剧,并以此将嫉妒作为探讨人性和伦理的突破口,赋予了它深刻的社会意义、哲理意义和伦理意义。读者感知的不仅仅是爱情中的占有与愤怒,更多的是在格雷厄姆的脑文本与斯芬克斯因子互相影响下,意志和情感的伦理冲突及其带来的伦理启迪。

正如巴氏其他著作一样,《她过去的爱情》是智性的。它将意志、情感、伦理和人性进行剖析和分解,钩沉人性曲折幽微。巴恩斯的通达与聪慧在于他并不陷入虚无和绝望。人性是伦理选择的结果。尽管我们无法将人协调至完全理性的位置去规避痛苦和弱点,但正因为这些缺陷和弱点促使我们找寻救赎的出路。从文学伦理学批评的视角而言,文学的根本目的“在于为人类提供从伦理角度认识社会和生活的道德范例,为人类的物质生活和精神生活提供道德指引,为人类的自我完善提供道德经验”(聂珍钊,“文学伦理学批评:基本理论与术语”17)。就此而言,通过书写嫉妒,巴恩斯揭示了伦理道德之于人类生活的规范和指引作用。

Works Cited

- 朱利安·巴恩斯:《她过去的爱情》,郭国良译。上海:文汇出版社,2018年。
- [Barnes, Julian. *Before She Met Me*. Trans. Guo Guoliang. Shanghai: Wenhui Publishing House, 2018.]
- Childs, Peter. *Julian Barnes*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2011.
- Forster, E. M. *Howards End*. New York: Penguin, 2000.
- Freiburg, Rudolf. “‘Novels Come out of Life, not out of Theory’: An Interview with Julian Barnes.” “*Do You Consider Yourself a Postmodern Author?*” *Interviews with Contemporary English Writers*. Ed. Rudolf Freiburg, Jan Schnitker. Münster: Lit Verlag, 1999. 39-66.
- Guignery, Vanessa. *The Fiction of Julian Barnes: A Reader's Guide to Essential Criticism*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.
- Guppy, Shusha. “Julian Barnes: The Art of Fiction, no. 165.” *Paris Review*, 157 (Winter 2000).
- McGrath, Patrick. “Julian Barnes.” *Bomb* 21 (Fall 1987): 21-23.
- Millington, Mark I. and Alison S. Sinclair. “The Honourable Cuckold: Models of Masculine Defence.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 29.1(1992): 1-19.

- Montrose, David. "Julian Barnes." *Contemporary Novelists*, 4th edition. Ed. D. L. Kirkpatrick. London: St James Press, 1986.
- 聂珍钊: “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。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. "The Forming Mechanism of Brian Text and Brian Concept in Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Foreign Literature Studies* 5(2017):26-34.]
- . 《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2014 年。
- [— *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- . “文学伦理学批评: 基本理论与术语”, 《外国文学研究》1(2010): 12-22。
- [— "Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1(2010): 12-22.]
- . “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。
- [— "Ethical Literary Criticism: Oral Literature and Brain Text." *Foreign Literature Studies* 6(2013):8-15.]
- 聂珍钊, 王永: “文学伦理学批评与脑文本: 聂珍钊与王永的学术对话”, 《外国文学》4(2019): 166-175。
- [Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Yong. "Ethical Literary Criticism and Brain Text: Academic Dialogue Between Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Yong." *Foreign Literature* 4(2019): 166-175.]
- 赫尔穆特·舍克: 《嫉妒与社会》, 王祖望、张田英译。台北市: 时报文化, 1995 年。
- [Schoeck, Helmut. *Envy: A Theory of Social Behaviour*. Trans Wang Zuwang and Zhang Tianying. Taipei: Times Culture, 1995.]
- Smith, Amanda. "Julian Barnes." *Publishers Weekly* 236/8 (3 November 1989): 73-74.

《查泰莱夫人的情人》中欲望的伦理表达

The Ethics in Desires of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

李长亭 (Li Changting)

内容摘要：在《查泰莱夫人的情人》中，劳伦斯描写了康妮与克里福德无性的婚姻状况以及与梅勒斯基于身体欲望的两性关系，试图为欲望找到一个开放的语境。整部小说洋溢着对性放纵和反传统行为的赞美。但本文认为，康妮在家庭、婚姻以及身体欲望的选择上，更多地倾向于自然选择而非伦理选择，全然不顾婚姻中的契约精神，即维护家人的道德品质和精神面貌是妻子的重要职责这一家庭伦理身份。她一系列的性放纵行为是对夫妻关系和家庭伦理的粗暴践踏，这与其说是彰显“血性意识”，毋宁说是把自己降格为动物的现实表达。这种极端利己主义的行为严重影响了社会中的家庭和婚姻伦理秩序，使婚姻和家庭沦为空洞的能指符号，其神圣的伦理属性在原始欲望的冲击下荡然无存。因此，构建和谐稳定的家庭伦理秩序是文明社会健康发展的基石，也是人类区别于其他动物的根本标志。

关键词：《查泰莱夫人的情人》；伦理身份；自然选择；伦理选择

作者简介：李长亭，文学博士，南阳师范学院外国语学院教授，主要从事英美文学研究。本文系国家社科基金项目“19世纪末20世纪初英国小说中的家庭伦理叙事研究”【项目编号：17BWW081】，教育部社科基金项目“新媒体时代美国电子报的中国文化与形象的传播与变异研究”【项目编号：19YJCZH162】的阶段性成果。

Title: The Ethics in Desires of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*

Abstract: Lawrence depicts the Connie's marriages with Clifford void of sex and the absolute sexual relations with Mellors, which attempts to find an open context for the desires. The novel permeates the approvals of sexual indulgence and anti-tradition. However, this paper thinks that Connie, Clifford's wife, on the choice of family, marriage and desire, utterly neglects the contract spirit of marriage, that is, to protect the familial morality and spirits is a wife's important duties, and her indulgence into the sexual activities with other men coarsely violates the ethics of marriage and family, which would rather degrade to the animals without moral consideration than the announcement of "blood consciousness". This absolute egoism severely hampers the traditional ethical order of family and marriage, and causes them to be empty signifiers without any ethics entailed in it under the surge of primal desire. Therefore,

to build the harmonious and steady familial ethical order is the base of healthy society and also the symbol of human beings different from other ones.

Key words: *Lady Chatterley's Lover*; ethical identity; natural choice; ethical choice

Author: Li Changting, Ph.D., is Professor of Nanyang Normal University (Nanyang 473061, China). His research focuses on British and American Literature (Email: lct66385@163.com).

引言

人们普遍认为,《查泰莱夫人的情人》(*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, 1928; 以下简称《查》)是大卫·赫伯特·劳伦斯(David Herbert Lawrence, 1885-1930)最有名也是最受争议的一部作品。作品通过一个贵妇人背着丈夫与仆人私通的故事,描述了无性婚姻的破裂和基于欲望的两性关系的发展。在对这部作品的评述中,评论家几乎都聚焦于男女主人公的血性意识和对工业社会扭曲人性的挞伐。爱尔兰诗人威廉·巴特勒·叶芝(William Butler Yeats, 1865-1939)在致英国小说家奥利维亚·莎士比亚(Olivia Shakespeare, 1863-1938)的信中写道:“《查》是一部高尚的作品,其语言有时粗俗,但是全书充溢着火一般的激情,即使是性的部分的描述,也是为了反对一个腰身以下已经死亡的时代”(张中载 123)。“劳伦斯写这部书是他最后做出的努力,企图把爱情作为我们社会的一种反实用力量,把做爱看作是一种神圣的象征。这对已经被工业化社会大大削弱了的个人来说,实在是太抒情化、太自若、太自由了”(张中载 131)。劳伦斯本人也声称,他写作此小说的目的就是要告诉世人,做爱是一个人的正当生理要求和权利,应该愉快地得到社会的承认,而不应该被看作是淫荡。¹

纵观对这部小说的评论,很少有从家庭中的伦理身份层面对男女行为进行道德剖析的,而家庭问题是维多利亚时期的社会中心问题,家庭问题中的伦理身份又是人们关注的焦点,很多文学作品都是围绕着家庭成员的伦理身份展开的。²“伦理身份是评价道德行为的前提。在现实中,伦理要求身份与道德行为相符合,即身份与行为在道德规范上相一致”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》265)。其实,《查》在张扬性解放这个显性主题外,还并行着一个隐性主题,即如何建构家庭的伦理责任。作品的叙事貌似在为欲望找到一个开放的语境,以颠覆传统的伦理空间和秩序,因为在传统的婚姻和家庭的禁锢下,欲望只能得到部分的实现和表达,性只能与生育相关联。其实,在劳伦斯看来,没有人是正常的。当绝对的自我屈服于社会无休止的挑战时,

1 参见 D. H. 劳伦斯:“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”,《奥维德·劳伦斯论性爱》,戴望舒、黑马译,北京:团结出版社,2006年,第308-309页。

2 参见李宝芳:《维多利亚时期英国中产阶级婚姻家庭生活研究》,北京:社会科学文献出版社,2015年,第31页。

自恋的自我就不会长时间的独善自身。这就是对劳伦斯而言的相对论。¹ 相对论也表明了他笔下的人物不管对别人还是对自己而言都从来没有绝对和完整的。他曾写道：“天下所有的事情对于个体生物而言都是相对的，个体生物之间也都是相对的”（Lawrence, *Fantasia of the Unconscious* 182）。家庭是这种相对性表现最集中的地方。在家庭中，个体努力呈现出自我状态，但家庭也是检视欲望形成过程的场所。劳伦斯把他笔下的人物置于千丝万缕的社会关系之中，通过家庭和社区这些社会单元不断影响他们的个人生活和活动。这些人物常常是不囿于血缘关系的羁绊，他们有强烈的社会意识，极力想在社会中实现自我。劳伦斯既向往又排斥家庭，如果说传统小说习惯于以婚姻和家庭团聚为结局的话，劳伦斯则倾向于以自杀、家庭破裂或犹豫彷徨作为人物的结局。这样的结局包含着强烈的伦理反思，体现出劳伦斯思想上的双重性。就《查》这部小说而言，我们应看到，小说在张扬个性解放、反对工业文明的同时，也在考虑着家庭在社会中的作用、家庭成员间的关系以及生理性别之外的社会性别。对这些因素的分析可以帮助我们更好地理解这部小说蕴含的伦理价值。

家庭结构与伦理身份

康妮的家庭成员中有父母和姐姐四口人，她的父亲麦尔肯·瑞德爵士曾是皇家艺术学会知名人士，而她的母亲则是颇有点拉斐尔前派风格的费边社成员。在艺术家和社会主义者之间，康妮和她的姐姐希尔达接受了一种带有审美意味的“非传统教育”（劳伦斯，《查泰莱夫人的情人》2）²。那么，当时的传统尤其是家庭传统又指什么呢？众所周知，维多利亚时代是一个以家庭生活为中心的时代，和谐向上的家庭成为整个社会的价值核心之一。维多利亚文化就是以这种家庭观念为基础建构起来的文化，它要求人们重视神圣的婚姻和美好的家庭，因为“大英帝国是一个以家为首的国度，国人对于保护家的温暖是认真和全力以赴的，因为家仍是一切之源，没有了家，大英帝国也不可能荣华”（Williams 66）。在家庭这一社会单元中，家庭结构和成员的变化深刻地影响着家庭伦理秩序的建构，进而影响着整个社会的发展进程。小说《查》几乎没有提到康妮的母亲，我们只能从只言片语中了解到，她是一个不久于人世的“神经病患者”，她有自己的收入和自己的行事方式，在她思想上或心灵中有她无法摆脱的“某些古老的权威印象”，她只想让她的女儿能“自由”和“成就自我”（5）。所以她并没有给康妮造成多大的影响，而且和丈夫的关系也不是很融洽，因为他是“光会享受自己生活”（69）的人。在家庭环境的耳濡目染下，康妮的行事风格更多地受到了父亲的影响，

1 参见 Lawrence, D. H. *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974: 182.

2 本文有关《查泰莱夫人的情人》的引文均来自 D. H. 劳伦斯，《查泰莱夫人的情人》，杨恒达译（北京：中国友谊出版公司，2016年）。以下引文仅标注页码，不再一一说明。

而她的父亲则是提倡自由的，包括婚姻方面。康妮在德累斯顿主修音乐期间，她就与迈克利斯发生了性关系。在 1913 年回家过暑假的时候，希尔达 20 岁，康妮 18 岁，“她们的父亲已明显地看出来她们已经有过恋爱经历了”（5）。当时的社会传统是不主张女孩子有婚前性行为的，不过父亲并没有对她们的行为提出什么异议。当然这种行为也不是奔着婚姻去的，而只是为了满足好奇心和生理需求，虽然后来康妮不时和迈克利斯偷情作乐一番，但这终究不会长久。在与克里福德结婚后，因克里福德的身体原因，康妮无法与他进行正常的夫妻生活，更无法生育。她的父亲对她说：“康妮，我希望不要让环境迫使你守活寡”（17）。后来，她的父亲又一次提醒她：“康妮，你为什么不找个情人呢？也好享尽人间之福”（20）。当康妮父亲和克里福德两人在一起的时候，他对克里福德说：“我恐怕守活寡的生活不太适合康妮”（17）。在他得知康妮已经怀了别人的孩子时，他告诫康妮：“情感是变动的，你今年可以喜欢这个人，明年喜欢另一个。但拉格比还在，只要拉格比忠于你，你就要忠于拉格比。除此之外，你可以尽情让自己享受。但是如果你要把关系撕破的话，你是得不到多大好处的”（332）。拉格比是克里福德经营的矿区，在这里指代克里福德家族。父亲的意思很明显，就是让康妮在维持婚姻的前提下，满足自己的生理欲求。可以说父亲的“教导”是促使康妮婚内出轨，最终走上婚姻破裂道路的始作俑者。

不过这些反传统的行为都是在黑暗中进行的，不可能公之于众，而合乎传统的行为则是公开进行的。当时英国法律规定，不到 21 岁结婚需要父母的同意，超过这个年龄结婚则拥有较大的自由。¹也就是说，如果不满 21 岁结婚，首先需要得到双方父母的认可。小说特意提到了几个时间点，比如，1913 年时康妮 18 岁，而她和克里福德则是在 1917 年结婚。也就是说康妮是在 22 岁时结婚的，符合法定结婚年龄。1916 年，赫伯特·查泰莱阵亡，于是克里福德成为继承人，接受了准男爵的爵位和拉格比这份家产（8）。但 1918 年年初，克里福德却一身伤残地被送回来，孩子不可能有了（10）。小说没有透露康妮嫁给克里福德的原因，但我们从年份上可以推断出，他们的婚姻是建立在经济利益基础上的，而且克里福德也是在婚后才上战场并负伤的，所以克里福德的瘫痪是婚姻关系的转折点。在此之前一切都是在遵循着当时的社会传统和婚姻伦理，因为门当户对，各方面条件相当是维多利亚中产阶级婚姻缔结中最经常的决定因素。克里福德比康妮更属于“上流社会”（7），康妮是富裕的知识分子，而克里福德属于贵族阶层，他父亲是准男爵，母亲是子爵的女儿。从艺术角度来讲，地位不平等的婚配可以制造出很好的故事和戏剧，但是好故事和戏剧却不一定反映社会现实。尽管中产阶级的婚姻有经济上的谨慎性，但是远非是工具性的。他们的婚姻肯定对各方都有利，但绝

1 参见李宝芳：《维多利亚时期英国中产阶级婚姻家庭生活研究》，北京：社会科学文献出版社，2015 年，第 66 页。

不只是为了利益的婚姻，应该是精明的经济考虑与浪漫的爱情理想并存。康妮和克里福德刚结婚时，除了在性方面差强人意之外，两人表现得还算亲密，康妮甚至对克里福德结婚前的童子之身感到有点欣喜若狂。小说叙述道：“性爱只是偶然的、附带的事，〔……〕并非真正必要的事情”（9）。这虽然以第三人称进行叙述，但反映了当时康妮的心理特征。在克里福德瘫痪之后的一段时间里，康妮仍抱着对克里福德的忠贞，即使有男人对她表示明确的爱意，她也没有动摇过，“因为她知道，如果她对他们稍微表示一点轻佻，将使可怜的克里福德受到什么样的折磨，所以她从不给他们鼓励”（18）。这体现出康妮当时的伦理选择。她能够恪守当时传统的社会道德，坚守自己身为人妻的伦理身份，凡事都以丈夫的身份地位为要。在克里福德没有失去生育能力之前，康妮内心深处还是想要个孩子的。这其中有两个原因：一是因为康妮想成为真正的母亲，为克里福德家族传宗接代，这体现出她的家庭责任感和对自己伦理身份的考量；二是“这样她就可以巩固自己的地位以对抗她的小姑子爱玛”（9）。按照当时的法律，如果她有了查泰莱家族的子嗣，就可以继承家产和爵位了，否则她的小姑子爱玛就有权继承了。康妮这样的想法无可厚非，也符合当时社会传统和伦理秩序，表现出对经济利益和社会地位的追求。

劳伦斯对康妮这些行为的描写是公开化的，合乎当时的社会传统伦理要求。这既体现了劳伦斯的双重性，也同时为主人公的婚变埋下了伏笔，因为康妮身上隐伏着的“斯芬克斯因子”（Sphinx factor）¹在对自己的伦理身份和行为进行着艰苦的抉择。

相比康妮的家庭，查泰莱家庭结构显得不太完整，父亲乔弗利男爵、哥哥赫伯特·查泰莱和妹妹爱玛四个人，以及家里的管家波尔顿太太，但小说没有提及克里福德的母亲，波尔顿太太某种程度上就扮演着母亲的角色。他们相对比较保守，很少与其他人来往。他们尽管有贵族头衔和土地，但由于父亲乔弗利男爵沉思、固执、封闭的天性，甚至与他们自己的阶级也有点疏离。与康妮家成员的选择不同，在一战期间，克里福德的父亲乔弗利男爵全力支持战争，他把自己的树木全部砍掉用来修战壕，把矿上的矿工全部打发到战场上去。另外，他还慷慨解囊，支援战争。“他为国家花的钱比挣的还多”（7）。他甚至把两个儿子都送上了战场，结果一死一伤。更糟糕的是，伤者还失去了生育能力，这表明查泰莱家族失去了繁衍生息的可能。这一切使他自己在懊恼和绝望中死去。可以说，查泰莱一家为保家卫国付出了自己的一切，但劳伦斯在描述这些时，却运用了调侃的语气。他反复用“可笑”一词来形容这些变故，这充分表明了他当时对战争的立场，同时也对查泰莱一家的付出持否定态度。

1 有关“斯芬克斯因子”的概念定义，参见 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评及其它》，武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2012年，第16-31页。

小说虽然没有提及克里福德的母亲，但在他的生活中，管家波尔顿太太对他造成了很大的影响。在战场上受伤回到家后，妻子康妮对他的态度日益冷淡，他一度对生活失去了兴趣，但在波尔顿太太的影响下，“他逐渐找到了归属感。一种新的自我肯定又回到了他身上”（122）。“从某种意义上说，波尔顿太太使他成为一个真正的男人，而他的妻子康妮却从未做到过这一点。康妮的冷眼旁观，总是让他很敏感，让他时刻意识到自己的状态。波尔顿太太则让他只意识到外面的世界”（125）。从心理分析的角度讲，克里福德由于乱伦禁忌，对母亲的欲望受到压抑，但他从战场上回来后似乎增强了这种欲望。他把这种欲望投射到了波尔顿太太身上。她使克里福德显得“生机勃勃”（126）。在得知康妮出轨的事情后，他恼怒万分，但又显得可怜无助。“他用双臂搂着她¹，像个孩子似的偎依着她”（355）。“他会把手放在她的怀里，抚摩她的乳房，并在那儿胡乱欣喜地亲吻，他已经成人，却还自以为是孩子，这是一种反常的欣喜”（356）。他残缺的身体特征使他就像一个摇篮中的婴儿，没有自己行动的能力，只能仰仗别人的帮助。在克里福德无意识中，波尔顿太太兼具母亲和情人两种角色，成为了他的欲望对象。因此，他们之间的爱触犯了无意识中的欲望禁忌。发生这样的事情纯粹是康妮的移情别恋造成的。克里福德在康妮身上得不到爱情关怀，只能在波尔顿太太那里寻求爱的温暖。对他来说，爱人这一漂浮的能指已经悄然指涉到了波尔顿太太。在“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”一文中，劳伦斯这样评价克里福德：“克里福德是个纯粹的个性之人，与他的同胞男女全然断了联系，只同有用的人还有联系。他身上热情全无，壁炉全凉了，心已非人心。他纯粹是我们文明的产物，但也是人类死亡的象征。他善良的时候也不失刻板，他根本不知热情与同情为何物。他就是他，最终失去了他的好女人”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”355）。但在小说的叙述中，我们可以很容易地发现，克里福德并非冷酷无情，也并非没有亲朋好友。而劳伦斯所谓的“好女人”康妮也只是在婚姻存续的初期对克里福德报有一丝的爱意，但随着克里福德身体残疾，失去性功能，康妮就开始对他冷眼相待，并且在家里与昔日的情人幽会，与猎场守护员梅勒斯更是长时间的疯狂做爱。无论从社会伦理还是法律层面来讲，康妮这些在婚姻存续期间发生的风流韵事，都背叛了自己的伦理身份，她根本不是一个“好女人”。正如劳伦斯本人所言：“思与行、说与做是两回事，我们过的就是一种分裂的生活”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”308）。这种生活在康妮身上得到了完美的体现，而劳伦斯互相矛盾的说法其实也体现了他思想上的双重性。

自然选择与伦理选择

美国思想家莱昂内尔·特里林（Lionel Trilling, 1905-1975）说过，19世

1 这里指波尔顿太太。

纪存在这样一种焦虑，即人能够不是人，人与世界的关系不再是一种人的关系（特里林 122）。其意思是，工业文明的出现使人们逐渐脱离了与自然的有机联系，机械已经被充分地运用到一切工作之中，某些非人的力量不仅占据了物理空间，更占据了人们的思想。他希望有一些暴力性的东西来警醒人类，以便将人类的精神从默然的非生存状态中拯救出来。他特别赞许康拉德小说《黑暗的心》中库尔兹的临终“壮举”，认为正是这种勇于作为的可怕之举让库尔兹有权断言生活的真实性。在《查》中，康妮似乎也有类似的“壮举”：她通过与猎场守护人梅勒斯的情感纠葛，冲破了传统社会的等级藩篱，从而为僵化、麻木的社会注入了新鲜的气息。然而，我们在为康妮的“勇敢”行为表示惊叹之余，如果再进行深思的话，就会发现，康妮的行为有点矫枉过正了，她只顾张扬自己的自然特性，而忽视了社会伦理的存在。聂珍钊指出，人与其它动物区别开来的本质特征就是人具有理性，而理性的核心就是伦理意识。¹ 康妮为了自然选择而抛弃了伦理选择，在一定程度上把自己降格为物了。

在婚姻的激情期过后，康妮逐渐感受到了无性婚姻给自己带来的情感上的寂寞和虚无。“他们的婚姻，克里福德谈到的那种基于亲密习惯的完备生活，有些日子竟全都成了彻底的空白和纯粹的虚无。这只是些言辞，只不过是这么多的言辞。唯一的真实就是虚无，在其之上是伪善的言辞”（55）。劳伦斯也在小说中为康妮感慨道：“虚无啊！接受这生命的虚无似乎成了生活的唯一目的。所有那许多繁忙而重要的小事，共同组成了这巨大的虚无！”（61）正如特里·伊格尔顿（Terry Eagleton, 1943-）所言，虚无是世界上最柔弱，同时也最无法突破的东西，欲望最终只是为了虚无（伊格尔顿 100）。由于精神上强烈的虚无感和生理上的欲望，使康妮愈发注意自己的身体：“她脱光了衣服，在一面巨大的镜子前看着自己赤裸的身体”（79）。她感到自己身体原本应该“稳健的、奔流的曲线”现在却变得“平板、粗糙”（79）了，“失去了光泽和活力”（80）。康妮的内心深处，逐渐产生一种不公和受骗的感觉，肉体的不公感也随之被唤醒。她对克里福德产生了深深的失望和蔑视，同时也对自己是否坚守传统的伦理身份产生了动摇。

其实，克里福德和康妮之间并不是在克里福德瘫痪之后才停止了性行为，在此之前就很少过夫妻生活。所以，康妮的出轨不应该全部归咎于克里福德的残疾。二人的差别在于：首先，克里福德有点性冷淡，而康妮则性欲旺盛，在结婚之前她就频频与别人发生性关系。如果说做爱是动物的自然行为的话，很多动物特别是雌性动物只有在发情期才要交配的，其交配的目的就是繁衍下一代，而非为了激情和性欲的满足。其次，克里福德整天忙于管理自己的矿山，还要画画，而康妮只是一个阔太太，整天无所事事，没有正当的职业，丈夫又缺少陪伴。在康妮看来，“爱情、快乐、幸福、家、母亲、父亲、丈夫，

1 参见 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评及其它》，武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2012 年，第 9 页。

所有这些伟大的、充满活力的词汇，现在都奄奄一息，一天天地走向死亡”（69）。在这种情况下，如果有机会，她极易移情别恋，红杏出墙。她与梅勒斯最初纯粹是性力的作用才走到了一起。根据拉康的精神分析理论，语言是没有被满足的欲望的残留物，也是欲望的另类表达，欲望永远不会达到真正的满足。语言在意指上无可避免的失败，是对母亲欲望禁制的必然结果；这个禁制莫立了语言的可能性，同时也标志了语言指涉之举的虚妄性（Balbert 58-9）。“爱情、快乐、幸福、家、母亲、父亲、丈夫”等这些能指词汇对应的所指对于康妮而言已经改变了意义。我们知道，虽然索绪尔认为语言的能指和所指的关系是任意的，但他是把这个任意的关系放在一个必须是完整的语言体系里来理解的。所有语言的词语都必须基于语言结构的整体性这一先决条件。也就是说，任何一个词语要产生意义，就必须预设这个整体，并隐含对它的召唤，离开了这个整体，词语也就失去了意义（Balbert 54）。在康妮看来，克里福德实际上就是一个被阉割的男人，他们之间的生理性别已经没有什么区别了，生理意义上的夫妻关系已经不存在了，承载这些词汇意义的社会婚姻也就名存实亡了，在这种情况下，她的伦理身份已经悄然发生了变化，她也就无需恪守妻子的伦理责任了。

女性主义者西蒙娜·德·波伏娃（Simone de Beauvoir, 1908-1986）指出，女人并非生来就是女人，她是在社会中才成为女人的。¹ 这表明了女人与社会间的关系，指出了社会对女人身份的规定性和女人身体的社会属性。同样，纯粹的天然性身体是不存在的，我们所说的“身体”是“社会规范依赖社会强制反复书写、引用自己的结果”（倪湛舸 5）。朱迪斯·巴特勒（Judith Butler, 1956-）在性别问题上指出，只有当生理性别在某种程度上被理解为与社会性别以及欲望有必然关系的时候，性别才能指涉某种有关生理性别、社会性别与欲望的整体经验（巴特勒 31）。这里的社会性别是指对自我的一种心理或文化上的规定性，也就是满足社会对性别的规定，强调的是人在社会中的伦理选择。在《查》中，克里福德把康妮看作是“阿喀琉斯的脚后跟”，“能给他致命的一击”（127）。为了维系与康妮的关系，他甚至主张她可以和别的男人生孩子，但条件是要姓查泰莱家族的姓。这种要求在当时是无可厚非，而且也是符合当时社会伦理秩序的。因为查泰莱家族为了国家已经做出了巨大的牺牲，而且克里福德的父亲生前的最大愿望就是想让克里福德有自己的孩子。所以，孩子这个虚妄的存在就像语言学概念中穿梭的能指，对应着一个个的所指，同时也反映着不同人物的主体间性。在克里福德没有丧失性功能的时候，康妮盼望和他有个孩子，以防她的小姑子爱玛来分他们的家产。在克里福德丧失性功能之后，康妮的父亲反复游说克里福德和康妮，让康妮借精生子，以保持和克里福德的婚姻关系。他告诉克里福德，为了维护婚姻的稳定性，康妮必须要有自己的孩子。他告诫康妮：“如果你要把关系撕破，

1 参见 西蒙娜·德·波伏娃：《第二性》，陶铁柱译，北京：中国书籍出版社，1998年，第309页。

你是得不到多大好处的。（……）给拉格比生个小男爵吧：这才是件让人高兴的事”（332）。康妮父亲的劝导虽显自私，但也体现了父亲对女儿的关心以及孩子对婚姻的重要性。但康妮和梅勒斯做爱怀孕后，却要和克里福德离婚。这给了查泰莱家族“一记大耳光”（171）。康妮的这种虚伪和自私的行为其实体现出劳伦斯的双重性。他既要赞美康妮的叛逆行为，同时也暴露出她自私虚伪的性格特征，无意识地隐现了康妮真实界的面庞。在见到梅勒斯之前，康妮对克里福德的谦和感到“恐惧”，认为他那种“崇拜的宣言”是“一种完全无能的残忍”（130）。她觉得“她快疯了，要不就是她快要死了”（130）。从此可以看出，康妮已经不满足于表面的尊重和谦和，她的生理欲望已经让她无法忍受这种无性的婚姻生活。性欲望挑战着康妮之前自己能管控自己的认知，推翻了理想的、有意识的自我。批评家琳达·露丝（Linda Ruth）指出，性是自我的非理性力量，它强化了自我的对立面，使真正的自我从可意识到的自我中分离出来（Ruth 16）。康妮的自我是不连贯的、自我否定的，而且还是互相矛盾的。她无意识中充溢着不安分的冲动，她后来与梅勒斯的性行为实际上标志着她对理性的完美主体的弃绝。反人文主义者认为，主体是受欲望和未知的力量所支配的，永远不可能完全是理性和自我控制的，而是受无意识欲望驱动，无意识控制主体而不是被主体控制。劳伦斯把无意识的“生命”作为决定行为的推动力，他所谓的无意识不是缺乏意识，而是有着强烈生物意味的“血性意识”，也就是对生物本性的呼唤，鼓励人们去追求自然选择，摒弃伦理选择。

相较于克里福德和康妮，梅勒斯算是小说中的三号人物。他和克里福德一样，也是一位上过战场的老兵，一个“三十七八岁的男人”（77），有过失败的婚姻，受过高等教育，既会说德比郡的土话，也会说标准的英语。除此之外，小说没有过多披露梅勒斯的过去。作为克里福德家的猎场守护员，他过着一种田园式的闲适生活，住着小木屋，饲养着家禽，用着当兵时的毛毯和水壶。康妮的闯入打破了他平静的生活。不过，与康妮相比，他始终能够保持比较清醒的头脑，即使和康妮疯狂做爱，这对于他来讲，也只是一时贪欢而已。他很清楚自己的处境和地位。因此，在做爱之后，他最希望的就是她能离开，让他一个人待在孤寂中。“他畏惧的是她冷酷的、上层阶级女性的轻率的自行其是，因为毕竟他只是一个佣人，他厌恶她出现在这里”（103）。他提醒康妮：“你是查泰莱夫人，你在跟一个猎场守护人发生暧昧关系。如果我是一位绅士，事情就另当别论。是的，你会在意的，你不能不顾虑”（145）。梅勒斯的话语透露出，他明白康妮找他只是上层阶级女性一时性起的轻率行为，他只是满足她欲望的性工具而已，而且她会在意他们间的阶级差别的。所以，梅勒斯担心他们间的关系不会维持长久，而且也会给克里福德带来巨大的伤害。作者貌似不经意地透露出梅勒斯的年龄，实则含有深意。他比康妮大了十几岁，这意味着他们间存在着代沟，也意味着他们

间存在着乱伦禁忌。梅勒斯离开克里福德的狩猎场回到乡间，在农场找了份工作。他的想法是无论康妮是否能离婚，他都会和妻子离婚的。这表明，他离婚并不全是因为康妮，他对康妮是否离婚抱着怀疑的态度。另一方面，从法律层面讲，如果他们双方不离婚就结婚的话，就会犯重婚罪。这些都表明了梅勒斯性格上的成熟和稳重。在他们的交往中，康妮始终保持着主动，她只是在意自己的生理性别，很少去考虑自己的社会性别，也就是自己的社会伦理责任。克里福德对康妮的评价尽管有些刻薄但也准确：“你跟人不一样，你不合常规，你是那种半疯不傻，不正经的女人，成天追逐着堕落，对污秽之物念念不忘”（363）。

女性学者皮特·保尔波特（Peter Balbert）评价说，在性爱过程中，作者详细描写了梅勒斯的主动行为，体现了作者的男性中心主义思想。她们控诉这些男性具有“男性至上的投机主义和冷淡的操纵欲望”（Balbert 146）。李维屏指出，梅勒斯这一人物形象不仅表明了作者对自然人性和原始再生力量的充分肯定，而且还使作者在人物画廊中树立了一个足以能够与以克里福德为代表的摧残人性、扼杀生机的邪恶势力抗衡的形象。所以梅勒斯是现代工业制度下迫切回归自然的“文明人”的化身（李维屏 283）。通过细读文本就会发现，这些评价只是看到了小说的显性层面，而忽视了其蕴含的深层意蕴，忽视了人物性格的双重性，忽视了作者思想上的双重性。劳伦斯在“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”一文中写道：“我要让男人和女人们全面、诚实、纯洁地想性的事。即使我们不能尽情地享受性，但我们至少要有完整而纯净的性观念”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩” 308）。劳伦斯在这里似乎在为性开放摇旗呐喊，在为自己与老师的妻子私奔一事开脱，但实际上劳伦斯是在强调性开放的前提条件，即要有“完整而纯净的性观念”。这里的纯净指的是摒弃虚伪、自私等消极因素。但他又消极地指出，“没有哪个时代像我们的时代这样人与人之间如此不信任”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩” 319）。他认为，“真正的悲剧在于：我们不是铁板一块，并非完全虚伪也并非完全爱的真切”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩” 321）。我们从这些论述可以看出，劳伦斯也认识到人的双重性和复杂性，他所赞美的“完整而纯净的性观念”是不存在的。他还说过：“现代生活中十有八九的不幸是婚姻的不幸。无论是已婚者还是未婚者，没有几个不强烈地仇视婚姻本身的，因为婚姻成了强加在人类生活之上的一种制度”（劳伦斯，“为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩” 331）。但是，颇具讽刺意味的是，他却给康妮和梅勒斯安排了婚姻的美好前景。《查》描述了无性婚姻的破裂和基于欲望的两性关系的发展。不过，在小说结尾，康妮并没有嫁给梅勒斯，尽管她已经怀了他的孩子，且他们对未来的家庭充满了向往，但最后还是分开了，只能靠写信维系关系，好像他们间的关系也只有靠信件存在了。但对于劳伦斯本人来讲，他倒是在和有夫之妇私奔后结婚了。他虽然极力反对婚

姻，但也是婚姻的践行者。评论家皮特·斯琪可奈（Peter Scheckner）指出，“性激情与守护人的社会意识间存在着矛盾。即使作者意图用心理、宗教或性来掩饰阶级和社会问题，但这些社会和性之间的矛盾始终没有被妥善解决”（Scheckner 13）。这里的矛盾其实指的是社会伦理秩序对性的伦理约束与个人性压抑间的矛盾。劳伦斯的世界观时常受到一战、1917年的布尔什维克革命以及一战前后不时发生的工人罢工等历史事件的影响。困扰他的不是性也不是心理，而是社会。他在信中写道：“比起性本能来说，我考虑更多的是社会本能，社会压抑更具破坏性”（Lawrence, *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence* 990）。性本能突出主体的生理性别，而社会本能则强调的是主体的社会性别，即遵守社会伦理秩序的本能。伊格尔顿指出：“理性越是与其身体相脱离，身体就越碎裂成纯感官的无意义碎片”（伊格尔顿 111）。这里的理性指的是在社会规范、法律制度约束下形成的对伦理身份的认知。主体可以自由支配的身体一旦脱离理性约束的藩篱，就会变成纯粹生理性别意义上的动物，其社会性别也就消失殆尽了。这样看来，劳伦斯的思想里深藏着一种伦理悖论：他既要号召人们打破婚姻，甚至法律和伦理的禁锢，追求一种纯净的、无拘无束的性爱，同时又给予主体回归婚姻的期盼。这也充分暴露了劳伦斯思想上的双重性。

结语

人是有理性的动物，在人类活动的发展过程中，人的理性不断得到发展，人必须利用理性和知识来发展人的社会性和社会情感，使人的社会本能和爱人之心不断增强，使个人情感、利己本能服从于社会情感和爱人本能，把个人和社会结合起来，自觉地服从于社会道德。¹ 法国著名哲学家让·保罗·萨特（Jean Paul Sartre, 1905-1980）指出，道德主体是个体的自我，自由的道德主体具有多种存在特性和存在结构，认识这些主体存在的特性和结构，是理解人的伦理意义、行动和关系的密码（万俊人 23）。在《查》中，劳伦斯试图以性的方式来激活人们麻木、异化的心灵，鼓励人们重返自然乐园，但这种伊甸园式的生存状态全然忽视了社会伦理秩序和伦理身份。不过，劳伦斯在叙述过程中，也隐隐暗示出性的欲望与人的社会本能间的冲突。人的社会本能要求作为个体的人必须生活在一定的社会之中，遵守社会伦理秩序。性爱如果失去了应有的理智、严肃和认真，也必然会给社会和个人带来损害。人非动物，性爱不可能超脱一切。康妮个人欲望的表达也需限制在一定的伦理秩序之内，否则人类赖以存在的社会文明就会分崩离析。作为社会单元的家庭是每一个社会成员的栖身之所，构建和谐稳定的家庭伦理秩序是文明社会健康发展的基石，也是人类区别于其他动物的根本标志。惟其如此，才能保持健康稳定的社会伦理秩序，才能保证人的健康发展。

1 参见 冯俊：《当代法国伦理思想》，上海：同济大学出版社，2007 年，第 10-11 页。

Works Cited

- Balbert, Peter. *D. H. Lawrence and the Phallic Imagination*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1989.
- 巴特勒, 朱迪斯: 《性别麻烦: 女性主义与身份的颠覆》, 宋素凤译。上海: 上海三联书店, 2009 年。
- [Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Trans. Song Sufeng. Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore, 2009.]
- 波伏娃, 西蒙娜·德: 《第二性》, 陶铁柱译。北京: 中国书籍出版社, 1998 年。
- [Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Trans. Tao Tiezhu. Beijing: Chinese Books Publishing House, 1998.]
- 冯俊: 《当代法国伦理思想》。上海: 同济大学出版社, 2007 年。
- [Feng Jun. *The Contemporary Ethics of France*. Shanghai: Tongji UP, 2007.]
- Lawrence, D. H. *Fantasia of the Unconscious*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1974.
- , *The Collected Letters of D. H. Lawrence*. Ed. Harry T. Moore. New York: Viking, 1962.
- D. H. 劳伦斯: “为《查泰莱夫人的情人》一辩”, 《奥维德、劳伦斯论性爱》, 戴望舒、黑马译。北京: 团结出版社, 2006 年, 第 303-359 页。
- [Lawrence, D. H. “A debate on *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.” Trans. Dai Wangshu, Hei Ma. *Ovidius, D. H. Lawrence. The Art of Love, on Eros*. Beijing: Tuanjie Press, 2006: 303-359.]
- : 《查泰莱夫人的情人》, 杨恒达译。北京: 中国友谊出版公司, 2016 年。
- [—, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Trans. Yang Hengda. Beijing: China Friendship Publishing Company, 2016.]
- 李宝芳: 《维多利亚时期英国中产阶级婚姻家庭生活研究》。北京: 社会科学文献出版社, 2015 年。
- [Li Baofang. *A Study of Marriage and Family in Middle Class of British Victorian Period*. Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 2015.]
- 李维屏: 《英国小说人物史》。上海: 上海外语教育出版社出版, 2008 年。
- [Li Weiping. *The History of Characters in English Novels*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2008.]
- 倪湛舸: “语言·主体·性别——初探巴特勒的知识迷宫”, 《性别麻烦: 女性主义与身份的颠覆》, 朱迪斯·巴特勒著, 宋素凤译。上海: 上海三联书店, 2009 年。
- [Ni Zhange. “Language, Subject and Gender: on Butler's Knowledge Puzzle.” Judith Butler. Trans. Song Sufeng. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore, 2009.]
- 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. *An Introduction of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Beijing UP, 2014.]
- : 《文学伦理学批评及其它》。武汉: 华中师范大学出版社, 2012 年。
- [—, *Ethical Literary Criticism and Others*. Wuhan: Central China Normal UP, 2012.]
- Ruth, Linda. *D. H. Lawrence*. Plymouth: Northcote House Publishers, 1997.

Scheckner, Peter. *Class, Politics, and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D. H. Lawrence*.

London: Associated University Press, 1985.

特里林, 莱昂内尔: 《诚与真》, 刘佳林译。南京: 江苏教育出版社, 2006 年。

[Trilling, Lionel. *Sincerity and Authenticity*. Trans. Liu Jialin. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press, 2006.]

万俊人: 《萨特伦理思想研究》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 1988 年。

[Wan Junren. *A Study of Sartre's Ethics*. Beijing: Beijing UP, 1988.]

Williams, Raymond. "Woman in Domestic Life." *Magazine of Domestic Economy* 1(1836): 62-73.

张中载: 《二十世纪英国文学: 小说研究》。开封: 河南大学出版社, 2001 年。

[Zhang Zhongzai. *British Literature in Twentieth Century*. Kaifeng: Henan UP, 2001.]

刘宏小说《鹊桥》中的伦理身份与选择分析

Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice: An Ethical Literary Study on Liu Hong's Novel *The Magpie Bridge*

肖淳端 (Xiao Chunduan)

内容摘要:《鹊桥》除了富有历史、文化旨趣,还充满深厚的伦理内涵。本文从文学伦理学批评视角出发,剖析留居英国的女主人公骄梅在流散境遇中面临的伦理困境和选择,以图揭示该作品的深刻思想和文学价值。文章指出,留居海外赋予华人多重伦理环境和伦理身份,中英历史纠葛、中西文化差异和流散中的多重伦理身份交缠,给英国华人带来剧烈的伦理冲突。《鹊桥》在艺术重现鸦片战争这一中华民族创伤的同时,生动展现了深受中英历史恩怨围困的流散个体从华人到英国华人转变的过程中确认伦理身份的困难,并深刻思考英国华人应如何借助道德教诲和伦理反思走出困境重构身份的问题。由此,《鹊桥》揭示了伦理选择对海外华人身份重构的重要意义,并使作品充满情感冲突、叙事张力和伦理关怀。

关键词:《鹊桥》; 英国华人; 伦理身份; 伦理选择

作者简介:肖淳端,暨南大学外国语学院副教授,主要研究方向为英国华人文学和海外华人诗学。本文受广东省社科规划一般项目“英国华人文学刊物《聚言集》整理与研究”【项目编号:GD19CWW06】、中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金【项目编号:19JNQM03】、2019年广东省普通高校特色创新类项目【项目编号:2019WTSCX003】资助。

Title: Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice: An Ethical Literary Study on Liu Hong's Novel *The Magpie Bridge*

Abstract: Apart from being abundant in historical and cultural connotations, *The Magpie Bridge* is also a work with strong ethical values. From the perspective of ethical literary criticism, this article takes a close look at the ethical predicament and ethical choices encountered by the protagonist Jiaomei to explore the novel's profound merit. It finds out that being in diaspora brings to the Chinese in Britain a multi-facet ethical environment and multiple ethical identities, which with the historical entanglements and cultural differences between China and Britain provoke violent ethical conflicts. By representing the Opium Wars as a Chinese historical trauma, this novel not only demonstrates the difficulties shouldered by the

diaspora individuals as they reconstruct themselves from being Chinese to British Chinese, but also explores the possibility of using moral teaching and ethical reflection as a means for the diaspora to step out of their ethical predicament. As a result, *The Magpie Bridge* reveals the significance of making ethical choices on the identity reconstruction of the overseas Chinese, and it also presents itself as an intriguing story with its emotional conflicts, narrative tension and ethical concerns.

Key words: *The Magpie Bridge*; British Chinese; ethical identity; ethical choice

Author: **Xiao Chunduan** is Associate Professor at the College of Foreign Studies, Jinan University (Guangzhou 510632, China). Her academic research focuses on the fields of British Chinese literature and overseas Chinese poetics (Email: txchd@jnu.edu.cn).

《鹊桥》（*The Magpie Bridge*, 2003）是英国华人作家刘宏（Liu Hong）¹的英文代表作，与刘宏创作的其他三部英文小说一样，《鹊桥》关注中国女性在历史风云中所经受的磨难以及她们在困境中展现出的不屈精神，并在钩沉中国近现代历史之余，向西方传播中华传统文化和古典美学。关于这部小说，已有的研究侧重于该小说的文化内涵和女性书写，如李静解读《鹊桥》中的古诗、铜镜、花园等文化意象，认为这些文化意象是“中国文化传统中的固定式公用象征”，在西方语境中产生了“陌生化、再义化的奇异效果”，使得在汉语文化中已经钝化的象征，重新焕发了活力（李静 66-75）。陈美红（Red Chan）分析《鹊桥》的文化意象、语言符号的杂糅书写，认为其作为一份文化翻译实践，揭示了流散个体如何通过杂糅化解中西文化冲突及重构流散身份。² 萧韵华（Yun-hua Hsiao）从《鹊桥》的母系关系和中国文化意象着手，剖析文化书写与女性主体性建构的关联，认为小说对富含中西方文化内涵的花园意象的书写，尤其是通过书写花园为联结的母系关系，“确认了女性的集体权力”（Hsiao 7-28）。然而，这些研究忽略了《鹊桥》丰富的伦理内涵，不管是文化意象还是女性书写，其本质都和伦理身份密切相关。本文拟从文学伦理学批评视角出发，剖析留居英国的女主人公骄梅在中英历史纠葛、中西文化冲突的流散境遇中面临的伦理身份和选择问题，以图揭示该作品的深刻内涵，并探讨伦理选择对海外华人身份重构的意义。

1 刘宏，1965 年生于辽宁，1989 年留学英国后定居英国，新世纪以来开始其创作生涯。除《鹊桥》外，刘宏还出版了《惊月》（*Startling Moon*, 2001）、《触摸》（*The Touch*, 2005）和《东风之妻》（*Wives of the East Wind*, 2007）等英文小说，刘宏同时也是虹影《上海王》（*The Concubine of Shanghai*, 2003/2011）的英文译者。

2 参见 Chan, Red. “Chinese Flower in the English Garden: Hybridity and Cultural Translation in Liu Hong’s *The Magpie Bridge*.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28.4 (2007): 397-412.

一、“鸦片战争”：国恨家仇的道德教诲

《鹊桥》是一个不同寻常的“鬼”故事。留学生骄梅自幼父母离异，从小在中国与父亲、祖母相依为命。后来祖母、父亲相继离世，孤苦伶仃的骄梅获父亲昔日的英国情人芭芭拉资助，赴英留学。留英期间骄梅交了英国男友并有了身孕。就在她怀孕期间，骄梅时常“梦”见自己已故的祖母铁梅，铁梅对骄梅留居英国并与“洋鬼子”亲密无间非常不满。为了挽回家族名誉和民族尊严，祖母的亡灵不惜远赴重洋，来到伦敦劝说骄梅回国，并向她追叙了她们一家几代的辛酸史，控诉近代史上英国对中国曾犯下的历史罪恶，其中，最突出的便是中英鸦片战争，尤其是火烧圆明园事件。原来在清朝年间，铁梅祖上本是南方技艺精湛的园林匠人，得到皇上的赏识被招入京城。随后同为皇家园林御匠的五保和梅（铁梅的曾祖父母）在圆明园相识相爱，二人携手合作、倾尽所学参与打造了精美绝伦的圆明园。然而，英法联军入侵破坏了这原本美好幸福的生活，英法联军不仅残暴地将圆明园付之一炬，还杀死了当时为了保卫家园的五保，甚至为劫掠他们家一面祖传宝镜，杀害了手无寸铁的铁梅：

小女孩 5 岁时，有关洋鬼子入侵的消息传到他们耳中：金发的英国兵和法国兵和我们的武力相差悬殊，他们有枪有炮，而我们只有刀剑。
{……}

梅的脚很疼：她从没有这么快、这么长时间地跑过。她在一棵梅树下停下来喘口气。

等她抬头时，发现一个身穿红色制服的洋鬼子站在了她面前。她想要逃，却已经太迟。他一把夺过她的包袱，里面的东西掉了下来。一件闪光的东西引起了他的注意。是铜镜。他抓了起来。

梅疯了似的冲向他，尽管又小又弱，愤怒和哀痛却给了她极大的力量。她用牙齿当武器，狠狠地咬住那个洋鬼子。他大叫一声。盛怒之下，他举起了另一只手，把枪指向了她。他开了枪，她倒在地上，血从胸口喷涌而出。

那个小女孩是我的外婆，你的曾曾外祖母，她父母遇害那年是 1860 年。(34-35)¹

铁梅的祖辈是英法联军火烧圆明园事件的历史见证人，铁梅是这一事件亲历者的后代，因此她口述的家史再现了 19 世纪英法联军入侵中国的罪恶历史，并真实地描述了英法联军在中国劫掠宝物、杀戮平民的暴行。实际上，

1 本文有关《鹊桥》的引文均来自 Liu Hong, *The Magpie Bridge* (London: Headline, 2003), 译文为笔者译，以下只标注页码，不再一一说明。

铁梅口述的是她一家与英国不共戴天的深仇大恨。小说写道：“对不畏敌众我寡的五保来说，他不止是在保卫皇帝的乐园，而是在保卫他自己的家，他和爱人共同建造的天堂”（34）。美好家园被毁、挚爱双亲被杀、家传宝镜被夺，凸显了英法联军入侵远不止是对中国国家财物的肆意毁掠，更是对中国平民百姓的无情戕害。铁梅随后又接叙了鸦片的祸害：铁梅一家原本家境殷实，自从父亲迷上鸦片后，家道中落，一家人流离失所、穷困潦倒。显然，铁梅家族的衰败起因于英国人在中国走私鸦片的恶行。可以说，对于铁梅的家族来说，鸦片战争不止是国恨，更是家仇，而英国便是导致这一切不幸的罪魁祸首。

这一段几代人口耳相传的家史无不是铁梅及其家族的伦理观念和道德情操的独特表达，揭示了她们关于善与恶的道德评价标准。这个故事铁梅也不是第一次讲给骄梅听，小说写道，从骄梅5岁母亲离开后，祖母便来照顾她，于是每年清明节祖母便会给骄梅讲述这一段历史。文学伦理学批评认为：“伦理启蒙主要是针对儿童而言的，启蒙的主要方法是从讲述童话故事开始，其目的是让儿童从听故事中获得教诲”（聂珍钊 258）。不难发现，这一段故事其实是铁梅一家代代相传的伦理启蒙，其目的便是启蒙后人善恶恩仇，教诲后人不忘家族之仇、民族之殇，甚至还要伺机“复仇”——这位遇害的曾外祖母梅在弥留之际便嘱托姑子玉兰：“帮我照看我女儿，以后叫她替我们报仇”（35）。那么，铁梅的亡灵不远千里来到英国给已经长大成人的骄梅再次讲述这段家史，则是对她的伦理再启蒙和道德教诲。

除了祖母之外，还有一位同样重要的“教诲者”——那就是具有神力的祖传宝镜。小说中，只要是铁梅一家的血脉，便可以从铜镜中看到历史，骄梅也不例外。宝镜后来阴差阳错作为遗物又从芭芭拉的姑母手中传给芭芭拉，回到了骄梅的身边。于是，铁梅指引骄梅端详铜镜，在这面铜镜中，英法联军火烧圆明园的暴行再次上演：

看见了么，她正在抵死挣扎。听见了么，小女孩正在哇哇大哭。看，这个男人手上拿着枪，夺走了她的生命，夺走了她的宝镜。（……）现在，这是那场杀戮过后几天的一个晚上。（……）是的，这就是皇宫，那个曾经是中国最宏伟壮观、最精美绝伦的花园，现在践踏在满身臭奶味的鬼子脚下。他们欢呼雀跃、歇斯底里，他们酒气冲天、纸醉金迷。看见了么，地上全铺满了高到膝盖的丝绸袍缎，这是鬼子们从一间一间房子的柜子里搜罗出来的。看见了么，这个人将皇帝平日里用来款待皇子的翡翠杯摔得粉碎。这群鬼子肆无忌惮地放声大笑，一个接一个醉倒在地上。（196）

铜镜以影像的形式使骄梅进入到一个特定的历史的伦理环境中，使她“亲

眼目睹”了英法联军对铁梅一家和祖国的伤害：正是这些丧尽天良的“洋鬼子”，才让5岁的先祖成为可怜的孤儿，才让承载着中华文化瑰宝的圆明园毁于一旦，才让中国几千年珍贵的宝物流落他乡……如此一来，铜镜集中体现了一种伦理语境，使骄梅有机会真真切切地体会祖母的仇恨缘由和家族的伦理禁忌。可以说，小说巧妙地借助铜镜的“神力”，将宝镜转化为一个记录历史的实体，使得火烧圆明园事件不只是仅存于家族口耳相传中的记忆文本或脑文本，而是有实体介质的影像文本。“文学最初的目的就是将禁忌文字化，使不成文的禁忌变成成文禁忌（……）在成文禁忌的基础上，禁忌被制度化，形成秩序，即伦理秩序”（聂珍钊 262）。铜镜的影像叙述，实质便是将先祖的禁忌“文字化”、“制度化”，使其不仅仅只被口耳相传，由此形成、巩固家族的伦理秩序。此时家族伦理秩序的重新唤起强化了原有的伦理禁忌，也将异国他乡的女主人公骄梅推向一个矛盾重重的伦理困境。

二、历史阴霾下的伦理困境与选择

铁梅重新带来的这一段刻骨铭心的国恨家仇给身在英国的骄梅带来了双重伦理困境。首先，是如何处理与芭芭拉的关系的问题，骄梅面临着的伦理困境是：一边是沉重的国与家的历史创伤，一边是没有亲缘关系的“母女”情深。芭芭拉对骄梅恩重如山，既资助她在英国上学，又提供住宿，并视骄梅若己出。文中多处谈及芭芭拉对骄梅的“母爱”：骄梅每天住在芭芭拉家，每次去上学，芭芭拉总会亲手给她做带餐的三明治；在得知骄梅有喜后，芭芭拉的反应是开心得“红着脸笑着，仿佛她才是怀了身孕的准妈妈”（60）；她对孕中的骄梅关怀备至，一点风吹草动都会让她紧张兮兮，即使后来骄梅结婚了，芭芭拉也执意要骄梅继续住在她身边，以便“随时可以照应”（194）；芭芭拉还和骄梅“讨论尿布、宝宝房墙纸等所有一切关于宝宝的事情”……不难发现，芭芭拉为骄梅所做的一切正如骄梅自己所承认的，“是每一位母亲会为她的女儿做的事”（194），甚至芭芭拉给予的“比亲生父母还多”（59）。而骄梅心底也早已经将芭芭拉视为亲人，甚至是“母亲”。长期缺乏母爱的骄梅自从父母离异后，便一直在寻找母爱，而她不止一次告诉自己：“在芭芭拉身上我找到了”（191），“她就像是我的母亲”（93）。

然而，身在英国受芭芭拉供养、庇护的骄梅认同了芭芭拉的母爱，便是选择了与芭芭拉无血缘的“母女”关系，因此同时拥有了中国受害者后代和“洋鬼子”女儿两种伦理身份。祖母的出现唤醒她原本的受害者后代的身份，从而打乱骄梅选择新的伦理身份收获母爱、重建新生的计划，使得她不得不面对将芭芭拉视为母亲还是仇人的伦理困境，不得不在收获母爱和遵守禁忌的伦理两难中痛苦挣扎。祖母不能理解的是，与家族和民族有着不共戴天之仇的“洋鬼子”，怎么就可以和她的孙女如此亲密甚至母女相认呢？对她而言，骄梅触犯了一个不可侵犯的伦理禁忌——认贼作母，而这可是整个家族的伦

理禁忌。铁梅自述道：“怒火从我心深处燃起”。她责骂骄梅：“无论我怎么苦口婆心，你对祖先的死还是全然忘记了”（93）。折磨骄梅的伦理困境在昔日被夺的宝镜传到芭芭拉手中后犹如雪上加霜。先祖被“洋鬼子”杀害时曾发下毒咒：“所有持有宝镜的外人都不得好死”（35），充满神力的宝镜眼下落入芭芭拉这个“外人”手中也就意味着芭芭拉即将厄运临头，意味着对骄梅恩重爱深的芭芭拉将因为先祖的毒咒而命悬一线，这更将骄梅推向焦灼的深渊，使她坐立不安……可以说，小说描写的这一伦理困境同哈姆雷特在生父与养父之间的两难选择类似，这无不展现了这部作品情感的冲突、叙事的张力和思想的深邃，也给读者带来阅读的震撼。

这一段中英民族恩怨和骄梅先祖的伦理训导也给骄梅带来另一个伦理困境，即如何处理与英国男友肯的关系的问题。如今骄梅不仅“认贼作母”，还要与英国人恋爱生子，对铁梅来说，这就是选择了与杀害先祖的“洋鬼子”后代通婚，也就是与强盗、掠夺者、侵略者结亲，这是十足的大逆不道、背祖忘宗。“伦理身份是道德行为及道德规范的前提，并对道德行为主体产生约束，有时甚至是强制性约束，既通过伦理禁忌体现的约束”（聂珍钊 264）。由此可见，不同的身份决定不同的选择，骄梅留居英国这一系列的选择和行为与其“受害者后代”身份应遵守的道德规范是格格不入的。这就是铁梅死后“重生”、漂洋过海对骄梅进行道德教诲的直接原因。铁梅要唤醒骄梅原有的伦理意识，让原有的伦理秩序回归。正因如此，尽管伦敦被铁梅视为“卑劣之地”（93）甚至是“地狱”（118），她依然不畏险阻穿梭其中；她找到骄梅后第一句话便是语重心长的“醒醒”（5）；而为了阻止骄梅因违反伦理禁忌而滑向不忠不孝的深渊，她不得不三番四次严厉训斥她最爱的孙女：“他占了你的便宜，你还高兴？”（64）“猴子都比你知廉耻！”（93）。

这重重的伦理冲突冲击着骄梅，使她不堪重负，她感叹道：“我生活在不同的世界中”（63）。一方面，被唤起的原有的伦理秩序和伦理意识使骄梅对铁梅满怀愧疚之情，于是原本不信老一套封建传统的骄梅在清明节这一天特意跑去唐人街买来纸钱，在花园的梅树下焚烧纸钱祭奠祖母，并向祖母忏悔。另一方面，骄梅又时常因为受到祖母的道德“操纵”而难遏制住愤怒，甚至不时会因痛苦煎熬而情绪崩溃。她甚至还驱逐祖母：“你这个恼人的鬼，我希望你从没来过！”（65）。正如聂珍钊所言，“人的身份是一个人在社会中存在的标识，人需要承担身份所赋予的责任与义务”（聂珍钊 263），骄梅所受的痛苦便在于她因为流散选择拥有了不同的伦理身份，因此不得不承担几种身份各自不同甚至相悖的责任和义务，却无法同时履行。

三、跨代民族创伤与英国华人的伦理身份重构

在《鹊桥》中，祖母亡灵的出现亦幻亦真。铁梅本人对自己身份的认识也是朦胧不清的：“我不太清楚我自己：仅仅是一阵香气，是她的过去

的一个魂灵”（36），骄梅则意识到铁梅实际上是她“出于思乡、寂寞、渴望而臆想的衍生物”（140）。在弗洛伊德、拉康等的精神分析理论的基础上，心理学家尼古拉斯·亚伯拉罕（Nicolas Abraham）和玛丽亚·托洛克（Maria Torok）提出“跨代幽灵理论”（The Theory of the Transgenerational Phantom），用以分析跨代的心理创伤。他们认为，祖辈所遭遇的创伤会在后代身上隐秘地出现，后代所备受煎熬的心理创伤有时并非“源自自己的亲身经历”，而是“源自别人的精神矛盾、创伤或秘密”（Abraham & Torok 166）。亚伯拉罕和托洛克把“异己的存在”（foreign presence）比作“腹语”（ventriloquism），涉及“幽灵”（phantom）、“鬼魂”（ghost）、“亡灵”（revenant）等形式。关于“幽灵”的由来，亚伯拉罕认为，它实则是对力比多心力投射（libidinal introjection）的抵抗，即是说，“它阻挠我们对言语的感知，暗自指向它们的无意识的部分”，“返世不褪的幽灵证明了埋葬于他者心底的亡者的存在”（174-175）。另一位创伤理论学者玛丽亚·鲁特（Maria Root）也曾指出：“前人遭遇的由各种暴行引起的创伤，也会通过各式故事代代相传……久而久之，此类创伤自然会表现在后代对某种环境刺激的反应中”（Root 374）。因此，与其说小说里面的祖母是一个亡灵，莫如说她是民族历史创伤的一个化身，投映在流散异国的后代的心间。她每次到来，倾诉的都是中华民族一百多年来的苦难创伤，尤其是中英之间的历史恩怨。那么小说中骄梅与祖母的亡灵的冲突，实际上是骄梅身在异国他乡与自己的内心深处一直未克服的跨代民族创伤的冲突和挣扎，而这一切都与跨国流散有关。

流散本质上是一个伦理选择的过程，它既是流散者进行选择之后的结果，又让流散者面临新的伦理环境和伦理选择。骄梅从中国来到英国，并决意留居英国，便赋予了自己多重伦理身份。她的身份标签与原先单纯的“华人”相比，多了“英国”二字。在英国，骄梅与芭芭拉产生了类似亲人般的新的家庭情感伦理，与英国男友相爱并与之结婚生子同样给她带来新的伦理身份和伦理情感，她也因此面临新的伦理冲突和伦理选择。伦理身份的改变“容易导致伦理混乱，引起冲突”（聂珍钊 257），诚如是，从华人到英国华人的身份变化，带来多重伦理身份和认同，也带来多重的伦理责任和秩序，直接导致了上述的伦理困境和混乱。在伴随着新的伦理身份而来的伦理困境中，如何处理新旧伦理冲突，如何处理新旧交替、新旧交缠的伦理身份的重构，是留英华人无法回避的问题。这也是这部小说巧妙构思、深刻思考的命题，它巧妙地将中英鸦片战争这个历史事件与英国华人的伦理身份转变所带来的伦理冲突结合在一起，刻意探讨深受中英历史恩怨围困的流散个体应如何面对复仇与谅解的问题，以及应该如何在身份重构中联结过去、现在和未来。

作为一名英国华人，骄梅与祖母亡灵的交流实际上是她自我叙述民族创伤、再现历史创伤的疗释方式，亦是她在面对民族历史之重与当下异域生活之间精神纠葛的内心投射。骄梅坦言：“过去对我来说是多么的沉重，它是

我很大的一部分——即便是现在的新生活，也不能改变着这一事实”（97）。她甚至时常提醒自己：“我不能老想着过去”（11）。而骄梅对创伤的疗释不仅是对过去的梳理和理解，更关系着流散个体在流散境遇中如何定位自我和定位未来。恰如多米尼克·拉卡普拉（Dominick LaCapra）认为再现创伤是治疗创伤的有效手段，“疗释创伤是一个发声的过程（articulatory process）”，创伤得以治愈才能“分辨过去与现在”，才能“记起过去自己（或亲友）的遭遇，并清楚自己此时此地的生活”，才能“走向未来”（LaCapra 22）。

铁梅的亡灵，除了是华人的民族创伤、民族历史的化身，同时也是中华文化、民族传统的化身。小说中，铁梅总共到访 24 次，每次到访恰好在中国的二十四节气日。故事镶嵌在传统的二十四节气日当中，恰蕴含了中华文化、民族传统对流散华人无处不在的巨大影响，也揭示出骄梅身上背负的传统伦理的重负。小说中，祖母千方百计前来阻止骄梅“犯错”，除了警示其家族伦理禁忌，还带来了中国女性长期以来接受的传统规训——名声 / 贞洁，这同样也是中国女性长期面临的伦理禁忌。而祖母重述“邯郸学步”的故事（48），实质上就是在中西文化差异中，祖母害怕骄梅被西方文化所同化而忘了文化本源、文化传统。祖母亡灵的频频出现和谆谆教诲，无不是中国与西方、传统与现代之间的伦理代沟的巧妙隐喻。

而就在面对中英民族恩怨、中西文化差异的伦理冲突和选择时，骄梅得到伦理意识的重构，其道德行为也得到了反思和修正。骄梅向祖母坦白，她的怀孕是瞒着肯特意计划的。原来，尽管与英国男友肯真心相爱，骄梅却藏有自己的私心——作为一名留英学生，骄梅担心毕业之后无法继续留在英国¹，于是设计怀了身孕。被唤起伦理意识的骄梅此刻面临着是否要向肯坦白的伦理问题：如果坦白，那么就有可能失去肯，也就有可能失去继续留在英国的机会；如果不坦白，那么她就有道德污点。伴随着祖母的道德教诲，骄梅心中善与恶的尺度重又明晰，她选择了向肯坦白并承担了肯可能离去的后果。可以说，在重构伦理身份、重建伦理秩序的过程中，骄梅意识到自己的功利主义道德观，并及时修正，从而得到了心灵的净化、品格的升华。这嵌入了作者对海外华人伦理身份和选择的思考：在缺乏伦理道德指引的情况下，海外华人容易迷失自我，甚至误入歧途，而伦理意识的唤起，伦理道德的规导，有助于重新界定善恶美丑，使海外华人在变化的环境中做出审慎的选择，从而找回自我。“有伦理道德指引的时候，人就容易保持自己的伦理自我”（尚必武 31），人总是“通过自己的选择进行自我身份确认”，“伦理身份决定伦理选择，伦理选择也能建构伦理身份”（何卫华、聂珍钊 7），可以说，借助道德教诲和伦理反思，骄梅在选择自己的伦理身份的同时，选择了做有

1 芭芭拉出于英国人的文化背景，充分给予骄梅选择的自由，尽管愿意却从未主动提出让骄梅继续留下。

道德的人，保持了“伦理自我”。而身在英国社会，不管是为人女还是为人妻，骄梅的伦理选择本质关乎的皆是华人在流散国的社会化问题。只有通过伦理选择确认了自我，才能获得自我的接受和社会的肯定，才能真正地融入社会。可见，伦理选择对海外华人的身份重构有重要的意义。

《鹊桥》后面的故事发展给予了困境中的海外华人以希望和慰藉：肯最终选择了谅解并与骄梅重归于好，骄梅请求芭芭拉赠予她铜镜而破解“宝镜落入敌手”的毒咒，而祖孙两代的伦理裂缝，经过累月的协商，也终于得到理解和修补。骄梅深刻地体会到铁梅的仇恨缘由，“她唤醒了我内心强烈的民族耻辱感和家庭荣誉感”，终于“我对铁梅满怀同情”（201）。而铁梅也认识到芭芭拉与肯这两位英国人对骄梅的发自内心的爱，对他们的态度渐渐由“仇恨”转为“怜悯”，理解并接受了骄梅与他们不可割离的情感。小说结尾，骄梅和男友顺利结婚产子，铁梅的亡灵化作芭芭拉的花园中一朵嫣然绽放的梅花，横亘在骄梅心间的中英历史恩怨在象征着中英联结的爱情结晶以及在异域绽放的中国梅中得到化解。而肯得益于中国桥梁建筑美学及“鹊桥传说”而设计的桥也顺利在英国建成，再次点明了书名“鹊桥”的喻意——联结过去与现在，跨越不同世界、不同伦理身份而团圆美满的“喜”桥。由此骄梅成功重构了流散境遇中的伦理身份，走出困境，重获新生。这一个圆满的句号，无不代表了小说对在民族历史创伤中历经曲折、重构身份的英国华人的深切的伦理关怀。

留居海外赋予华人多重伦理环境和伦理身份，中英历史纠葛、中西文化差异和流散中的多重伦理身份交缠，给英国华人带来剧烈的伦理冲突。《鹊桥》巧妙地融历史叙事与伦理关怀于一体，在艺术重现鸦片战争的中华民族创伤的同时，生动展现了深受中英历史恩怨围困的流散个体从华人到英国华人转变的过程中确认伦理身份的困难，并深刻思考英国华人应如何借助道德教诲和伦理反思走出困境重构身份的问题，由此揭示了伦理选择对海外华人身份重构的重要意义。从伦理身份的角度来切入该作品的解读，有助于我们深入理解该作品的情感冲突和叙事张力，准确把握该作品的深刻内涵和现实价值。

Works Cited

- Abraham, Nicolas, and Maria Torok. "Secrets and Posterity: The Theory of the Transgenerational Phantom." *The Shell and the Kernel: Renewals of Psychoanalysis*. Trans & Ed. Rand, Nicholas T. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1994.
- Chan, Red. "Chinese Flower in the English Garden: Hybridity and Cultural Translation in Liu Hong's *The Magpie Bridge*." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 28.4 (2007): 397-412.
- 何卫华、聂珍钊: “文学伦理学批评与族裔文学: 聂珍钊教授访谈录”, 《外国语文研究》1 (2020): 1-12。

- [He Weihua, Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism and Ethnic Literature: An Interview with Professor Nie Zhenzhao." *Foreign Language and Literature Research* 1 (2020): 1-12.]
- Hsiao, Yun-Hua. *Women in British Chinese Writings: Subjectivity, Identity, and Hybridity*. Oxford: Chartridge Books Oxford, 2014.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.
- 李静: "双重语境中的象征: 论旅英作家刘宏的小说", 《中外文化与文论》2 (2008): 66-75。
- [Li Jing. "Symbols in Double Contextualization: On the Novels by the Chinese Writer in England Liu Hong." *Cultural Studies and Literary Theory* 2 (2008):66-75.]
- Liu, Hong. *The Magpie Bridge*. London: Headline, 2003.
- 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.]
- Root, Maria P. "Women of Color and Traumatic Stress in 'Domestic Captivity': Gender and Race as Disempowering Statuses." *Ethnocultural Aspect of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder: Issues, Research and Clinical Applications*. Eds. A. J. Marsella, et al. Washington DC: APA, 1996, pp. 363-387.
- 尚必武: "寻找伦理存在的自我——《培尔·金特》中的理性意志与伦理选择", 《浙江工商大学学报》1 (2013): 23-32。
- [Shang Biwu. "The Self as an Ethical Being: On the Rational Will and Ethical Choice in Peer Gynt." *Journal of Zhejiang Gongshang University* 1 (2013):23-32.]

帕斯卡·基尼亚尔小说的伦理批评审视

Ethical Critical Approaches to Pascal Quignard's Novels

葛金玲 (Ge Jinling)

内容提要：帕斯卡·基尼亚尔是法国当代杰出作家，自上世纪 70 年代开始创作以来，他将音乐、语言学、历史学、哲学、美学思想糅合在他的文学创作中，为读者呈现了一幅关于人的存在境遇、生死焦虑、心灵痛楚、生活荒诞的全景式画图。与此同时，后工业时代出现了存在焦虑、技术至上、生态危机、恐怖主义等严重社会失衡现象，基尼亚尔的小说世界拒绝业已固化的世俗伦理价值，质疑传统的伦理秩序，宣扬了一种与既有的道德规约、思想认知背道而驰的伦理选择和思维方式，去探索独立自由的个人身份，从而告别虚无之“在”，经由“阅读”而实现“精神自由”的伦理旨归，并以此建立人与工作，人与生活、人与社会的新型伦理关系。

关键词：帕斯卡·基尼亚尔；存在焦虑；伦理困惑；伦理选择

作者简介：葛金玲，浙江越秀外国语学院副教授，广东外语外贸大学法语语言文学博士。主要从事法语教学与法国文学研究。

Title: Ethical Critical Approaches to Pascal Quignard's Novels

Abstract: As an outstanding contemporary French writer, Pascal Quignard has produced many influential works by integrating music, linguistics, history, philosophy and aesthetic ideas into his literary creation since his debut in the 1970s. In his works, he presents readers with a panoramic picture of humans' anxiety over life and death, mental pain, and absurdity of life in the living circumstances. As Post-industrial age has brought with it serious social imbalances such as anxiety, technocracy, ecological crisis and terrorism, etc., Quignard rejects the solidified secular ethical values, questions the conventional ethical order and advocates an ethical choice and thinking mode running counter to the existing ethics and cognition for the exploration of an identity of independence and freedom, the demise of the "being" of nothingness and the realization of his ethical goal of spiritual freedom through reading, thus establishing a new ethical relationship between man and his work, man and his life, man and the society.

Key words: Pascal Quignard; existence anxiety; ethical confusion; ethical selection

Author: Ge Jinling is Associate Professor at Zhejiang Yuexiu University of Foreign Languages. She has her PhD in Language and Literature from Guangdong

University of Foreign Studies. She is mainly engaged in French teaching and French literature research (Email: amedee727@126.com).

法国当代著名作家帕斯卡·基尼亚尔(Pascal Quignard)是一位具有强烈的跨学科意识的作家。他在小说创作中,“将主观与客观融为一体,(……)将自传性或半自传性的叙述与客观的词源学、人类学或历史学分析交织在一起”(Acquisto 85),从而以文学的形式对人类历史进程进行了深入的思考,对人类经过生物性选择之后的伦理选择进行了探索。他的小说《游荡的影子》(*Les Ombres errantes*, 2007)便在虚拟的小说语境里描述的种种社会现实及存在图景中,以及在工作与生活中产生的人生与社会活动、人与人、人与自然生态之间的伦理道德关系中,显现了人的意志,人的精神追求与客观现实之间的矛盾张力。文字背后所隐喻的伦理困惑、伦理选择、伦理价值则拉近了文学与人、文学与社会的距离。马修·阿诺德(Matthew Arnold)认为:“文学批评归根结底是对人生的批评”(阿诺德 147),从而把文学与人的存在,把文学释读与伦理批评放在了同一维度。文学伦理学批评的建构者聂珍钊指出:“文学在本质上是伦理的艺术”(聂珍钊 73),因为“文学作为一种艺术形式,它典型地集中反映了人类社会的道德现实,描写了社会存在的道德矛盾和冲突,因此文学也就必然可以成为伦理学研究的对象”(聂珍钊 111)。以文学伦理学批评的视角审视基尼亚尔的小说创作,使我们对现代人在后工业社会所遭遇的伦理困惑和伦理选择有了深刻的同情与理解。

一、超越死亡的存在体验与伦理选择

海德格尔说:“日常生活恰恰是生与死之间的存在”(海德格尔 78),并提出了“为死而在”的存在假设。显然,生与死是存在的基本条件,构成了个体生命“在”与“不在”的辩证统一,也构成了伦理的本质。人类创造了伦理,伦理使人的操守行为有了尺度,使人的生命有了善良的温度,所以哲人们常常通过创造生命的意义去否定死亡,否定虚无。

事实上,我们不可能是生命的先觉者,就像我们不可能逃避最终的死亡一样。我们无法预知最后死亡的时刻,但是死亡作为人生的终结,总是驱使人们直面自己的欲望,而自己的欲望总是难以解脱的,于是欲望之勒索与解脱之痛苦常常成为形成伦理悖论的伦理结。聂珍钊认为:“由于悖论导致的是两个相互对立的选择结果,因此,悖论进入伦理选择的过程后即转变为伦理两难。逻辑悖论是绝对的,无法解决的,而伦理悖论不是绝对的,无论结果怎样,往往都得到了解决”(聂珍钊 255)。由于意识到生的脆弱和存在的局限,作为思想者的基尼亚尔同样无法摆脱生与死的双重压迫:对生命意义的渴望与对虚无的恐惧。显然,碌碌无为的世俗生活在追求生命敞亮的作者的意识里投下了严重的阴影,作者的生命情状遭遇了艰难的伦理选择。

基内亚尔并不是生命的及时享乐者，也不是生命的悲观沉沦者，危机来自于他对人类当下境遇的诘问，来自于对“如何像人那样活着”的伦理思考。在《游荡的影子》中，作者写道：

人类所知道的最有害的诱惑不是邪恶。不是金钱。也不是金钱带来的惊人快乐和各种陶醉。不是权力及它所牵连出来的各种倒错。不是升华或它所提升的各种想象感觉，而是死亡。（79）¹

死亡窥视着，生命的意义何在？该到哪里去寻找或者该怎样定义自身的存在从而超越死亡？作者面临的恰恰是这样一种伦理困境。作者以思想透视世间万象，他所表现的主观觉悟与肮脏的现实世界却无法调和，于是：

在1944年4月的一天，当天天气晴朗，当太阳耀眼时，当我走出卢浮宫时，我突然加快了步伐？有一个加快了步伐的人穿过了塞纳河，他看着王家大桥桥拱下的河水被闪光的白色完全覆盖，他看着波纳街上蓝蓝的天空，他跑过去推开塞巴斯蒂安·波顿街上的一扇大木门，他一下辞去了身上所有的职务。（154）

这一逃离的愿望由来已久，“他蔑视各项政治义务。他排斥一切只是人类的、只是集体的、只是普遍的关系。他宣扬一种彻底猛烈地摆脱尘世的生活方式。他强烈提出这种悖论，在田园王家港修道院的外面，在一个孤独者的隐修会外面。这个人变得对别人恭敬以便逃避他的遥远的先生。不久后他便永久地隐退到神圣的阅读中了”（53）。

作者的生命感觉植根于现代人的社会现实，刘小枫说：“一种生命感觉就是一种伦理，有多少种生命感觉，就有多少种伦理”（刘小枫3）。在《游荡的影子》中，“我”决心与庸庸碌碌的社会生活分道扬镳，希冀告别灵魂的痛苦，寻找属于自己的生命色彩时，我们读到了社会伦理与个人内在需求不断碰撞下的个人伦理倾向：逃离旧的固有的存在，构建新的“此在”。“我”的生命感觉并未因“逃离”而消泯，相反，叙事在延续，人性的亮色亦可在阅读的世界里熠熠生辉。

归隐阅读，将是一种全新的生活方式，也是作者所做出的伦理选择。阅读让作者获得了自由，认识了自己，磨砺了思想，阅读构成基内亚尔新的存在伦理与写作伦理。他希望以此活跃生命的传达，完成对“存在”的深层创构。他所追求的这一自我身份，颇具寒山诗所描述的形象：“寒山唯白云，寂寂绝埃尘（……）自羡幽居东，长为象外人”（项楚 763），颇有皈依佛道之

1 本文有关《游荡的影子》的引文均来自帕斯卡·基内亚尔，《游荡的影子》，张新木译（南京：译林出版社，2007年）。以下只标注页码，不再一一说明。

境的觉悟意象。“谁能超世累，共坐白云中”（寒山：诗三百三首），（寒山）如此静好之“在”岂是世俗功名利禄所能比拟的？

人生短暂且只能活一次，人作为感性生命的存在，死亡不可避免，也无法替代。作者的生命时空并没有任何历尽劫难的痛苦记录，读者能够猜度的可能是维系其自我主体与外在客体之间的平衡关系遭受到了严重的侵扰，因而构成了某一时空场域下的伦理困境，所以作者的这个选择是两种不同的伦理境遇碰撞的结果：一方面是世俗伦理固化了的欲望世界，在这个有限的时空里，沉沦于日常生活，忙碌于功名利禄。听凭世俗的陈规旧矩，慢慢腐蚀自己的肉体与精神；另一方面是逃离传统伦理建造的世俗藩篱，化身为影子，无拘无束地游弋于思想与阅读的自在世界，从而超越有限，超越这个必然会消失的感性存在。因为，按照海德格尔的说法，“与‘他人共在’，不可能构建任何本真的自我，只有畏惧死亡或面对死亡才能结束‘与他人共在’的局面，使自己‘彻底个性化’，获得独立的人格，领会人生的意义”（谷方304）。《游荡的影子》中的主人公显然拒绝以往生活所维系的“共在”，他不愿意用麻木去换取那份让人倍感安全的归属感，他一心祈求随心所欲的那种自由。

很显然，作者的伦理选择是对死亡情感及存在体验思索的结果。作者的心理是复杂的，时空、生命形象、生命精神面目的迁移变化不仅有作者自己的形象、叙述者的形象、有生活物象与意义情结，有心理不适与文本叙事的别样切换，同时也把社会生态与伦理道德呈现在现代人的批评视阈，使读者得以一窥因世俗生活的异化而引发的与文学、道德、精神、伦理之间的种种摩擦与激荡。由此，我们对作者拒绝苟安，希望遁身于斯的阅读空间多了一分关注。对那个世外桃源，对那个不受压迫，不受限制，自由自在，不为世俗所累的阅读王国多了一分向往。对这位宁愿在阅读的天堂里做一个游荡的影子，做一名孤寂的思想者的当代法国作家多了一分敬仰。

基内亚尔的伦理选择所关注的不仅仅是认识生活，更是在人类经过生物性选择之后对生命本质的诘问与追寻，是对生命的丰富性与多样性的积极尝试与体验，给我们展示了一副不一样的生命图景。

二、在古今穿越中摆脱伦理困境

基内亚尔的小说因其古今穿越、东西方漫游、复杂多变的情节以及主人公多重伦理身份相互重叠，甚至相互否定而变得扑朔迷离。根据文学伦理学批评理论的观点：“伦理困境指文学文本中由于伦理混乱而给人物带来难以解决的矛盾与冲突。伦理困境往往是伦理悖论导致的，普遍存在于文学文本中。伦理困境有多重表现形式，例如，伦理两难就是伦理困境的主要表现形式之一”（聂珍钊258）。

在《游荡的影子》中，“我”的伦理两难首先出现在对于此在生活的态度中。

是继续接受还是拒绝这碌碌无为的现实存在?“我”在既有的生活模式与世俗思维定势中苦苦挣扎。接受意味着肯定虚无,接受意味着承认无意义的生活;拒绝是与既有生存情状的决裂,拒绝是放弃一切世俗的荣耀,拒绝是重新塑造一个全新的独立自主的“我”。于是作者寄身于影子,把我们带进了“我”的觉醒场。

小说题目中“影子”一词承载了作者丰富的内心寄托,“影子”已经被深深地幻影化。“我”希望有一天能摆脱一切束缚,离群索居,与书籍为伴,回归本真,回归宇宙。当然,基内亚尔也没有自失于他创造的人物形象,没有失去理性的判断力与洞察力。他笔下的“影子”是多面的,既可能指代作者自己,又可以指称自然现象中万物的影子,还可以借喻古今中外的历史人物,甚至包括彼岸世界的存在,如“灵魂”、“幽灵”、“鬼魂”等等。

小说中作者列举了大量历史人物,他们的肉身早已归于尘土,但他们对世界的影响无处不在,如同“影子”般游荡,成为“过去的此在踪迹”(斯蒂格勒 79)。比如古罗马的提比略·恺撒皇帝在他退隐的卡普里岛上游荡;罗马人最后一个国王西亚格吕斯在行将倾覆的王国奔走呼号;日本唯美主义文学家谷崎润一郎(Junichiro Tanizaki)在黑暗中徘徊,为了寻找战栗的思想,因为“思想在黑暗中的密度特别接近兴奋在难堪中的强度,难堪会同时侵袭和自行消失,离开灵魂去侵袭递来的躯体”(58)。

在《游荡的影子》的第五十三章《另一个王国》中,作者根据俄耳甫斯神话虚构了一则故事:1602年,布列塔尼省的莫尔比昂,住着一位渔夫,他有五条船,妻子去世后他没有再娶,因为他的心里永远保留着对妻子的爱。有一天,他突然看见穿了一件白色亚麻上衣和一条黄色裙子的妻子从自家门口经过,赶紧追了出去,他冲着妻子大喊:“你不是已经死了三年了吗?”但妻子并没有回答,她的身边站着一位本村唱经班的年轻人。当渔夫问妻子是否还爱他时,妻子说:“我跟这个死人在一起,即使一分钟,也比在你怀里十年还要快乐”(98)。渔夫终于没有留住自己的妻子,他的内心备受煎熬,不是因为妻子变成了幽灵,而是因为“她在另一个世界里更喜欢另一个男人”(98)。俄耳甫斯没能从地府救出自己的妻子,渔夫也未能让妻子从阴间回到自己身边,两位逝去的灵魂只能生活在“另一个王国”(101)。生死离别的“伦理结”虽然没有解开,结局却让生者陷入了自责的反省。

基内亚尔在作品引用了莎士比亚的观点:“当俄耳甫斯演奏时,普路托闭上了眼睛”(298)。在古希腊神话中,普路托是财神,他也生活在另一个世界。这个世界是俄耳甫斯、渔夫和作者所向往的幸福世界,但他们却无法进入,基内亚尔说:“有一个属于勒得河岸的世界。这河岸就是记忆。这就是小说的世界和奏鸣曲的世界(……)这是在坟墓上的喜鹊的世界。这是读书或者听音乐所需要的孤独的世界(……)这里,思想在漫游,突然迸发”(60)。基内亚尔的这种碎片化叙事至少具有两个维度,第一个维度在作者与叙事讲

述者之间展现,在叙事学理论中,叙事讲述者当有别于作者和非叙述性人物;第二个维度在叙述话语和被叙述的外部世界中显示。这两个维度共同建构了作者与叙事讲述者,叙事话语与外部世界的互构关联。人物的身份与情感,叙述形式与历史、叙事声音与文本、错乱的时空秩序与断裂的故事进程以及具有明显自我指称意义的间接性和含混性叙事风格,为我们创造了一个古今混声、中外互鉴,并唤起对话与思考的互文本。

碎片化叙事充分表现了基内亚尔的世界观,他认为世界是一个分块的空间;断裂与跳跃则是空间的表现形式,写作就是再现一系列断裂的话语,断裂是文学对话的基本形式,而跳跃则给读者打开了不同的时空之窗。一个个不同的碎片正可以重塑社会的整体性,因为“最小的一片就是一片,每一片都是整个宇宙”(84)。

亚当和夏娃幸福地住在伊甸园,但有一天,因为夏娃听了蛇的花言巧语后偷食禁果,又将这个秘密告诉了亚当,亚当也吃了禁果,之后,两人都受到了上帝的惩罚。就这样,他们两人的伊甸园消失了。而对于人类而言,地球是伊甸园,但是作者认为这个伊甸园也将会消失了。他说:“到二十一世纪末,现存的植物和动物的一半将会灭绝。将消失 4327 种哺乳动物; 9672 种鸟; 98749 种软体动物; 401015 种鞘翅目昆虫; 6224 种爬行动物; 23007 种鱼。伊甸园渐渐从花园退出”(89)。由于人类的破坏,使自己的家园即将消失。这是一场自己造成的灾难,而亚当夏娃的悲剧结果也是自己造成的。

在小说《秘密生活》中,基内亚尔从另外一个角度让我们理解了亚当夏娃的悲剧故事。他说:

即便在伊甸园里,人类最早的女性也应当是神秘的。甚至上帝也是神秘的:我们看不见他。他的意图无法揣测。他永远沉默无语。夏娃本应该闭口不言。这就是迦太基的教会分立派神学家不断主张的论点。对于蛇在树荫下对她所说的话,她本应该将其封存于心底。她不该向亚当表露她的欲望,也不该透露那秘密的内容,甚至不该提及秘密的存在。(95)

在这个故事中,基内亚尔并没对亚当夏娃偷食禁果而给予批判,在他眼中,由于夏娃把伊甸园中的秘密说出来才导致了最后的结果,因为不管是伊甸园,上帝,还是伊甸园里面的任何东西都是神秘的,每个人都必须保持沉默,只有秘密和沉默才能使生活在另外一个世界的人幸福。正如作者在小说中说:“德尔图良说:即便在天堂也要有所掩饰”(95)。

克莱莉娅和法布利斯也是一对恋人,但克莱莉娅不能违背圣母玛利亚的命令,嫁给了克莱桑齐侯爵。克莱莉娅把自己幽闭在孔塔里尼宫中。法布利斯买通了两个佣人进入了房间,最后他们生了一个男孩,过了一段时间,由于法布利斯无法忍受黑暗,要在光亮中见到自己的儿子,最终酿成了悲剧。

夏娃说出了秘密，让美好的伊甸园消失了；法布利斯说出了秘密，孩子死了，克茉莉娅死了，他自己也死了。

人的命运始终是西方悲剧不朽的主题，无论是情感悖论还是行为悖论，都聚焦于人的存在、人的自由、人的情感，都离不开伦理选择。俄尔甫斯对身后妻子满怀深情的回首一瞥，使他永失挚爱；渔夫妻子面对丈夫的呼唤，选择了拒绝，选择拒绝意味着回归自由，意味着收获另一份爱。法布利斯冲破世俗和权力的禁锢，以死亡为代价换取了生命的真情。伦理悲剧在撕裂了美好的同时，也让我们领略了美的崇高与尊严。

写作是对话语的追寻，是对声音的创设，是对意义的塑造，一如作曲家在寻找他心中消失的天籁，基内亚尔孜孜不倦地追寻湮灭的话语，人类远古的声音，异域的声音，追寻那些失去的片断，为了参悟整体的究竟。文学所蕴含的就是那些忽隐忽现的情感，那些忽近忽远的声音，那些似是而非的消失在历史帷幕中的影子，那些粗砺而活泼的思想。文学理应担此重任，用话语弥合断裂的过去和现在，用声音融通不同文明的咏唱，让生的偶然充满意义，让死的必然了无遗憾。

三、在“回归阅读”中重塑伦理身份

基内亚尔的小说是对历史的回望和对存在的整修，他提醒人们不要因伦理困境而“失声”，“失声”既是对“此在”的疏离，也是对历史的遗忘。他在《游荡的影子》中再次强调这种意识：“我们的社会在令人眩晕的海边悬崖前面，在最深的丛林中发疯。我们的社会拒绝最令人焦虑的、最令人向往的、最美丽的快乐，这种快乐总面临着毁灭和死亡的威胁”（57）。

人类的发展、社会的进步、科技的创新，但这一切并不必然升华人类的精神追求和内心世界。恐怖主义的惨剧、生态环境的破坏、利欲熏心的争夺、宗教冲夺与资源掠夺，构成了人类严重的生存和精神危机，而埃博拉病毒和新冠肺炎更使人措手不及。小说的第二十六章讲到了2001年发生在美国的“9·11”事件，它让全世界震惊和颤抖，作者写道：

数个世纪的不朽王国就是死亡。

人类大约在十万年前发明了死亡。作为发明而不是作为冲动的死亡。

死亡爆炸就在蓝色天空里，肉眼可见，2001年9月11日星期二，在纽约城的上空。

捕食者死了，猎物死了，捕食活动死了，在视觉的瞬间一切都死了。（80）

基内亚尔接着说：“应该这么想一想：猎手就是死亡。人不过是一个猎物”（152），末了，猎手和猎物都死了，这是宿命还是偶然，一如基内亚尔所言，人类所知道的最有害的诱惑不是邪恶，也不是金钱，而是死亡。当然死亡的

时间和方式具有一定的偶然性。在小说的第七章《新生儿》中，作者告诉我们：公元 395 年，圣布利斯当主教多年后，在他的修道院中做洗衣工的一名修女生了一个孩子，修女声称孩子的父亲就是圣布利斯。这就引起了全城民众的愤怒，他们用石块砸向主教。圣布利斯为了证明自己的清白，让人把出生才三十天的婴儿抱到跟前，他开始问婴儿：谁是你的父亲？婴儿没有回答。随后他用拉丁语发问，孩子回答说圣布利斯不是他的父亲。但是民众并不相信婴儿的回答，决定请神意裁决。于是圣布利斯主教捧着火炭一直走到他的老师圣马丁的墓前，所有人都跟着，当圣布利斯把滚烫的火炭放到圣马丁的墓石上时，他的手心却毫无损伤。这时人们相信了圣布利斯的话，把矛头指向婴儿的母亲，人们把洗衣修女的上衣扒下，一名年轻男子割下了她的乳房，行刑后，这个女人身上不仅流血不止，而且乳汁沾满了她的胸脯。修女最后被图尔居民用石块砸死，理由是她撒谎。基内亚尔说：“主流的道德重新求助于神像中的声音，来自图像的声音，成为一个由被敬畏神的专制的死人构成的世界，他们对待人像对待小孩或者奴隶”（51）。

在这样一个神主宰的时代，民众被宗教教义固化了的道德蒙蔽了双眼。对洗衣女工的道德审判其实就是伦理审判，这一审判让人触目惊心，这是对神的控诉！宗教的道德观念以上帝为中心，人只是神的附庸，只能屈从于神的意志，没有任何自主的权力与地位，神权统治下的妇女更是如此，她们的身上贴满了卑微、愚昧、顺从和无需思想的标签。她们逆来顺受，在宗教与世俗规约的裹挟下用死亡去救赎自己的灵魂。基内亚尔则不然，他坚持认为人的思想不能接受孩子般的愚弄，更拒绝奴隶般的存在。基内亚尔不无隐喻地指出：“这个海岸缺乏堤坝。一切都被淹没。仍然浮到水面上来的鱼，大吸一口气，为了不死，大吸一口气，就是阅读”（58）。在他看来，“阅读”是人类经过伦理选择之后，不断完善“人性”，走出伦理困境，重塑伦理身份的重要途径。

海岸象征人类栖居的地球，随时可能面临灾难袭击，而“堤坝”指代安全。人类所处的地球危机重重，令人窒息。而有没有“绝处求生”的良策呢？作者的生存之道是阅读，阅读至于作者犹如空气至于生命，只有在阅读中，他才可以“大吸一口气”，才能活着。基内亚尔将书籍视为一种秘密的可以和人类产生共鸣的东西，他称之为文学，这是一个“非家族的家族，非社会的社会”（80），那里的话语方式“以一种秘密的声音，以一种比共鸣更加隐蔽，比低语更加低沉，欲望的口语表达包围着喉咙，这就是书籍”（250）。因为文化奉献给人类的不仅仅是快乐，还有思想的力量，对抗虚无与死亡的力量。

“捕食者死了，猎物死了，捕食活动死了，在视觉的瞬间一切都死了”（80）。这或许是基内亚尔批判后工业化时代的激进之语。他告诉我们必须对以损害环境与生命为代价的技术进步保持警惕，因为人的存在方向维度上

的迷失就遮蔽其中，人的主体性，人的鲜活的个性正在消失，而基内亚尔所选择的“阅读”世界，正可以激活世人对存在（关涉认知与思维）的记忆，在思考人类的当下与未来时，对看不见的制约与奴役说不。

在重塑伦理身份，完善“人性”时，基内亚尔采取了与无法同在的现实社会“断裂”的话语策略，叙事讲述者与现实社会被置于“他在”与“此在”的二元对立语境。现实生活作为不能相处的“此在”记载了太多不堪回首的痛楚，这就从道德上肯定了叙事讲述者皈依书籍，回归阅读，向往“他在”的合理性与合法性，作者也由此重新获得了“声音”的权利，并有机会构建一种理想化了的社会文化与文学话语环境。

结语

综上所述，帕斯卡·基内亚尔是一位具有跨学科意识的作家。在他的创作中，“每本书都涉及到文化遗产中被忽视的方面和被遗忘的行为者：地方、时期、作家、音乐家和画家”（Pautrot 8）。但无论采用什么样的跨学科手段，他都是在探索从“自然选择”到“伦理选择”的人类进程。他在总结自己的创作活动时曾经声称：“我正在研究一种复述人类历史的形式”（Argand 34）。由此可见他是如何雄心勃勃地对待文学创作。

基内亚尔习惯于从“现实”到“虚幻”的不停迁移，习惯于从历史到当代的多重互构，其小说涵盖深邃的古今历史，广阔的多元文化和别具一格的文学伦理观照，其诗学特征具有丰富的层次，其叙事话语承载着涵意深远的所指隐喻。他以话语的力量关注个体的多样性、关注生死、关注此在、关注人的精神世界的复杂性，让读者从生与死的思考中感悟生命的意义，在模糊不清的历史痕迹中发现存在的真实，为我们展示了20世纪法兰西文学的历史记忆与当下思考，并通过他者与自我的重叠与解构，提示了自我认知可能的方法与路径。

Works Cited

- Acquisto, Joseph. "Listening to Silence in Pascal Quignard's *Vie secrète*." *L'Esprit Créateur* 52.1(2012): 83-95.
- Argand, Catherine. "L'entretien: Pascal Quignard." *Lire* (février 1998): 30-36.
- 马修·阿诺德:《文化与无政府主义状态》，韩敏中译。北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，2002年。
- [Arnold, Matthew. *Culture and Anarchy*. Trans. Han Minzhon. Beijing: SDX Jiont Publishing Company, 2002.]
- 曹刚：“责任伦理：一种新的道德思维”，《中国人民大学学报》2(2013):70-75。
- [Cao Gang. "Responsibility Ethics: A New Moral Thinking." *Journal of Renmin University of China* 2(2013):70-75.]

谷方：《主体性哲学与文化问题》。北京：中国和平出版社，1994年。

[Gu Fang. *Subjective Philosophy and Cultural Issues*. Beijing: China Peace Publishing House, 1994].

马丁·海德格尔：《存在与时间》（修订译本），陈嘉映、王庆节合译。北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，2006年。

[Heidegger, Martin. *Sein und Zeit* (Revised Version). Trans. Chen Jiaying and Wang Qingjie. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2006.]

刘小枫：《沉重的内身·引子》。上海：上海人民出版社，1999年。

[Liu Xiaofeng. *The Unbearable Body*. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 1999.]

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.]

Pautrot, Jean-Louis. *Pascal Quignard ou le fonds du monde*, Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2007.

帕斯卡·基内亚尔：《游荡的影子》，张新木译。南京：译林出版社，2007年。

[Quignard, Pascal. *Les Ombres errantes*. Trans. Zhang Xinmu. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2007.]

亚瑟·叔本华：《作为意志和表象的世界》，石冲白译。北京：商务印书馆，1982年。

[Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Trans. Shi Chongbai. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1982.]

贝尔纳·斯蒂格勒：《技术与时间》第2卷，赵和平等译。南京：译林出版社，2010年。

[Stiegler, Bernard. *La Technique et le Temps*, Vol. 2. Trans. Zhao Heping et al. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2010.]

项楚：《寒山诗注》。北京：中华书局，2000年。

[Xiang Chu, *Notes on Hanshan Poetry*. Beijing: China Publishing House, 2000.]

《鱼王》的生态伦理困境与伦理选择

The Ecological Ethical Dilemma and Choice in *Fish King*

周 露 (Zhou Lu)

内容摘要：阿斯塔菲耶夫的代表作《鱼王》发表于1976年。它以一种超前的生态忧患意识，深刻地反映了生态伦理遭受破坏所带来的混乱与灾难性后果。从文学伦理学批评的视角看，小说生动地描写了大自然与人类之间的关系，展示了善与恶、生与死、爱与恨、文明与野蛮、信仰与怀疑、禁锢与自由之间的较量博弈，呈现了令人难以摆脱的生态伦理困境。摸鱼人的伦理身份与选择代表了陈腐、落后的伦理观，自然之子阿基姆的伦理身份与选择则体现了作者所推崇的现代生态伦理观：热爱大自然，遵从大自然，与大自然和谐相处。

关键词：《鱼王》；生态伦理；伦理困境；伦理选择；自然之子

作者简介：周露，文学博士，浙江大学外语学院副教授，主要从事俄罗斯文学和中俄比较文学研究。

Abstract: Viktor Astafyev's masterpiece *Fish King* was published in 1976, which profoundly reflects the chaos and catastrophic consequences of the destruction of ecological ethics with an advanced ecological consciousness. From the perspective of ethical literary criticism, the novel vividly describes the relationship between nature and people, reflects the crisscross between good and evil, life and death, love and hate, civilization and barbarism, belief and doubt, imprisonment and freedom, and also presents a difficult dilemma of ecological ethics. The ethical identity and choice of the fish-touching man represent the obsolete and backward ethical outlook, while the ethical identity and choice of the son of nature, Achim, reflect the modern ecological ethics advocated by the author, namely, loving nature, following nature, and living in harmony with nature.

Key words: *Fish King*; ecological ethic; ethical dilemma; ethical choice; the son of nature

Author: Zhou Lu is Ph.D. and Associate Professor at the Institute of Foreign Languages, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research interests include Russian literature and comparative literature studies (Email: zhouluye2004@aliyun.com).

维克托·彼得罗维奇·阿斯塔菲耶夫（Виктор Петрович Астафьев，1924-2001）是俄罗斯当代著名作家，在苏联时期就已成名。他获得过苏联社会主义劳动英雄称号，曾先后两次获得苏联国家奖，三次获得俄罗斯政府奖，可谓著作等身，功成名就。阿斯塔菲耶夫的代表作有长篇小说《最后的问候》（*Последний поклон*，1968）、《牧童与牧女》（*Пастух и пастушка*，1971）、《鱼王》（*Царь-рыба*，1976）等。长篇小说《鱼王》发表于1976年，1978年作者因该小说的成就荣获苏联国家奖。小说《鱼王》是表现作家创作个性最为充分的一部作品，在思想内容和艺术形式上都展现了作家独特的创作风格。小说由十三个中、短篇小说组成，没有贯穿始终的主人公，没有精心编织的情节故事，有的只是作者的回乡见闻，作者的生活经历。长篇小说的题目取自其中最著名的短篇小说《鱼王》，该长篇小说包括了《在黄金暗礁附近》（*У золотой карги*）、《黑羽翻飞》（*Летит черное перо*）、《鲍家尼达村的鱼汤》（*Уха на Боганиде*）、《白色群山的梦》（*Сон о белых горах*）、《达姆卡》（*Дамка*）等经典名篇。

不同的人从不同的角度去阅读《鱼王》，都会获得不同的审美体验。从文学伦理学批评的视角看，长篇小说《鱼王》以质朴、清新、含蓄、优美的笔调生动地描写了大自然与人类之间的关系，展示了善与恶、生与死、爱与恨、文明与野蛮、信仰与怀疑、禁锢与自由之间的较量博弈，呈现了令人难以自拔的生态伦理困境，深刻地反映了生态伦理遭受破坏所带来的混乱与灾难性后果。

一、大自然与人类之间的生态伦理困境

长篇小说《鱼王》是一部描写大自然与人的作品，大自然被置于首位，而不是人与大自然。阿斯塔菲耶夫是一位一生都生活在家乡西伯利亚的作家，他没有像其他大多数作家一样，成名之后就前往莫斯科、彼得堡等大都市生活与创作，以寻求更好的发展途径。阿斯塔菲耶夫终身眷恋生他养他的故土，始终坚持在故乡创作。广阔无垠的西伯利亚大地、长年极寒的北极圈冻土带、奔腾咆哮的叶尼塞河为作家提供了无尽的创作源泉。他怀着敬畏之心对待大自然，在作品中充分展示了西伯利亚粗犷开阔、美丽迷人、丰富多彩的自然风光。

在长篇小说《鱼王》中，阿斯塔菲耶夫竭力赞美与讴歌了大自然的神奇与美丽。作家富有一双善于观察的眼睛，他笔下的一花、一草、一木都是灵动的，富有生命力的。在《一滴水珠》（*Капля*）中，“我”敏锐地观察到清晨原始森林里树叶上的一滴露珠，与其展开了一场心灵对话。“一颗露珠垂挂在我脸的上方，清莹莹，沉甸甸”（94）¹。“我”在内心祈祷着这颗露

1 本文有关《鱼王》的引文均来自维克托·阿斯塔菲耶夫，《鱼王》（桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2017年）。以下只标注页码，不再一一说明。

珠千万别掉下来，并由此想到了守在大炮旁等待开炮命令的战士、弟弟和儿子的未来、原始森林树木的生死死。最终这颗露珠汇成了千万颗小水珠，给森林带来了黎明与生机。“森林、灌木林、草丛、叶子，四周的一切逐渐洋溢出生机勃勃的气息”（101）。在《图鲁汉斯克百合花》（*Турханская лилия*）中，“我”在乱石堆里、杂草丛中看到了一株百合花：“那样晶莹欲滴，那样娴静典雅！在这灌木林和河边的草丛中间它正悄悄地绽开那娇艳的花瓣”（446）。如果这株百合花生长在南国的花坛里，那丝毫不奇怪，可此刻它却绽放在北方原始森林的草丛中，足见自然界中植物生命力的顽强。

在短篇小说《达姆卡》中，“我”乘飞机在叶尼塞河上空飞行，极目舷窗之外，看到的是美不胜收的叶尼塞河风光：“飞机左翼下方，湖泊水道星罗棋布，纵横交错，波光涟影里野鸭子聚堆成群，那白色的星星点点是天鹅和海鸥的身影（……）水面上时而金光闪烁，时而银色斑斓”（171）。

在中篇小说《白色群山的梦》中，阿斯塔菲耶夫生动地描写了西伯利亚冻土带原始森林的风景。在极圈内的原始森林里，有珍贵的针叶雪松林子、拔地直上的枞树林、灰白的冷杉林和一路生长的黑林。“纬度的这一边是森林、浆果、灌木丛、林中的飞禽和走兽，而在那一边，一下子就变成冻土带的寸草不生之地，东一块西一块的湖汊，那里除了苔草和灌木，野鸭和大雁，北极狐和沙鸡以外，就什么也没有了”（464-465）。在作者笔下，无论是山水草木，还是飞禽走兽，都能与人发生情感交流。作者充分享受夜半时分原始森林深处万物的宁静，他感叹道：“在这天堂般的宁静里，你会相信有天使，有永恒的幸福，罪恶将烟消云散，永恒的善能复活再生”（94）。

可是，这美丽、安详、庄重、雄伟的大自然却遭到了人类的疯狂掠夺与破坏。《创世纪》里的记载表明，所有其他有生命的物种与人类同等重要，它们甚至是人类赖以生存的基础。¹“从生态的立场看，这个世界并不是我们人类所独有的，而应该为一切生物所共有。包括人类在内的不同生物都有自己的生存世界，有着共生的伦理秩序”（聂珍钊 147）。可是人类不愿意怀着谦卑之心倾听大自然的心声，遵守与自然界万物和谐共生的伦理秩序，从自然界中获得美的感受，而是将大自然变成了野蛮掠夺与偷猎的对象，为谋取一己私利不惜践踏和破坏大自然。

在《黑羽翻飞》中阿斯塔菲耶夫写到，游客所到之处，留下的是一片遭遇战争浩劫的景象：“林木烧毁，河岸上乌七八糟，炸死、毒死的臭鱼，比比皆是”（289）。在某地方司法部门工作人员家中的阁楼上竟然挂着 100 多只杀死后被挂起来“风干”的天鹅，而且现如今连天鹅毛也成了抢手货，可想而知有多少只天鹅被猎杀。在楚什镇周围，乌鸦几乎被猎人追踪射杀殆尽，成千上万只鸟被猎人毁掉。大批死亡腐烂的雷鸟被当作垃圾，扔进了池塘。风一起，黑色的羽毛纷纷扬扬翻飞起来，遮蔽了晴空，一派凄然的景象。

1 参见《圣经》，上海：中国基督教三自爱国运动委员会、中国基督教协会，2006 年，第 1-2 页。

小说主人公阿基姆从小生长的鲍家尼达村原本是个生机勃勃、人们团结友爱的渔村，可是原计划要通过整个极北地区的筑路工程突然停工，于是鲍家尼达村就跟着衰败了。“一度炊烟袅袅的渔村如今杂草丛生。作机务房用的小屋倾倒在地，像嘴啃泥似的。墓地上，最后幸存的几个十字架也因地冻而从土地里松脱出来，累累荒冢挤成一堆”（383）。在叶尼塞河畔，同样衰败的渔村又何止成百上千。

因此，面对被人为破坏的、满目疮痍的江河大地，阿斯塔菲耶夫愤怒地追问到：“可是到何年何月我们才能学会不仅仅向大自然索取——索取千百万吨、千百万立方米和千百万千瓦的资源，同时也学会给予大自然些什么呢？到何年何月我们才学会像操持有方的当家人那样，管好自己的家业呢？”（435）

聂珍钊指出：“正是人类有一种表现自己征服欲望的错误伦理意识，结果人类对自然的征服往往破坏了自然，破坏了我们的生存环境，给生态和人类造成了危机”（聂珍钊 147）。人类总是凶狠、倔强地想要驾驭、征服大自然。然而大自然是不会被人类玩弄于股掌之间的。于是，不愿被人玩弄的大自然以它独特的形式展开了报复。

以前一到冬天，叶尼塞河边的两个水潭里，名贵的上等鱼多如劈柴，一尾叠一尾。“可是现在，连盛夏寒秋，这些水塘里也没有上等鱼了”（434）。美丽的乌拉尔，“受人祸害最早，也最厉害：许多湖泊、池塘和河流水色像生了锈似的，什么生物也不长；美丽的乔索瓦亚河受尽了伤害和折磨”（435）。石滩在狂号，它还像千百年前一样喧闹不息，“可是鲟鱼——这些给河流增辉的生灵，已经不再回到河滩的激流中鱼跃翻腾了”（435）。城里的人们再也吃不到鲟鱼等上等鱼了。

在《鲍耶》一章里，柯利亚和两个同伴一起去北极圈冻土带狩猎北极狐。谁知那一年北极狐的食料旅鼠死亡殆尽，北极狐也随之逃亡，没有进入他们的狩猎圈。虽然猎人们做好了一切准备，经历了严寒的种种折磨，却一只北极狐都没有打到，只能空手而归。由此可见，自然界中食物链的断裂，让猎人无功而返，严重影响了人类的经济活动，这也是大自然对人类滥捕滥杀野生动物的报复。

由此可见，作家以细腻优美而略带忧伤的笔调，以层层递进的方式，展现了大自然之美、大自然之痛、大自然之怒以及大自然之报复，表现了人类欲征服与统治大自然，对大自然滥施淫威，造成严重的生态危机，陷入难以自拔的生态伦理困境中。面对人类难以走出的生态伦理困境，作家在作品中着力塑造了两类人形象：摸鱼人与自然之子。通过他们不同的伦理身份与选择，作家给出了他心目中的破解生态危机之道。

二、摸鱼人的伦理身份与选择

摸鱼人伊格纳齐依奇的正式身份是楚什镇锯木厂里的机修工，他的唯一业余爱好就是捕鱼。他从小就喜欢捕鱼，在课堂里根本坐不住，一心想去捕鱼，长大了更是以捕鱼为乐。但是此时他捕鱼已经不只是出于单纯的兴趣爱好，而是掺杂着复杂的商业利益。作者称他为摸鱼人，而非捕鱼人，因为摸鱼人特指那些违反渔业生产队规定、偷偷捕鱼的人。伊格纳齐依奇正是靠着偷偷捕鱼才发家致富，在小镇里过上了奢侈的生活。在工业化之前，人们捕鱼是为了获取鱼肉、鱼皮以维持基本生存的需要，但是现代人捕鱼则是为了追求商业利润和满足贪婪的欲望。例如，伊格纳齐依奇看到上钩的鱼王时想到的第一个念头，就是这条鲤鱼至少可以挖两桶鱼子，可以卖出大价钱。虽然理智告诉伊格纳齐依奇，他一个人制服不了大鱼。可是贪婪的私欲占了上风，他舍不得放掉大鱼，一心要活捉它。因此像伊格纳齐依奇这类摸鱼人的存在，更加导致了渔业资源的过度开发、江河资源的枯竭，恶化了江河生态环境，加剧了人与大自然之间的对立。

“所有伦理问题的产生往往都同伦理身份相关”（聂珍钊 257）。身份同道德规范紧密联系在一起，身份的改变容易导致伦理混乱，引起伦理冲突。在摸鱼人伊格纳齐依奇追逐鱼王的过程中，他混淆了自己的伦理身份，放弃了人类社会的伦理而接受了动物界的伦理——丛林法则，把自己当成了江河生物的同类，从人的角色转变为动物的角色。因此摸鱼人同鱼王之间的搏斗，就不再是人与大鱼的搏斗，而变成了兽与兽之间弱肉强食的搏斗。本来人是有理性的生物，他可以凭借理性认识自然，在人与动物界之间建立起和平相处、共生共存的伦理关系。但是由于摸鱼人把自己当成了鱼，接受了丛林法则，因此在他的伦理意识里，动物界的弱肉强食规则就取代了人类社会所特有的伦理禁忌。

伊格纳齐依奇认为人是自然界中最有力量、最强大的生物，是自然界的主宰，是自然界之王，所以人捕鱼、杀鱼是天经地义的事情，是人类征服自然、战胜自然的外在表现，是动物界弱肉强食、优胜劣汰的自然结果。的确，在过去的伦理价值体系中，人与大自然处于相互对立的状态，而且大自然往往强于人类，给人类的生存带来了莫大的威胁与伤害。所以在中外的古典文学中，都描写、赞颂了与大自然做斗争、战胜大自然的英雄人物与英雄传说。如中国文学中武松打虎的故事深入人心，希腊神话中普罗米修斯盗取天火的故事也广为流传。但是随着科技的进步、时代的变迁，人与大自然之间的关系已经发生了根本性的转变，人的力量变得越来越强大，自然资源变得越来越稀缺，自然界中的其他生物处于越来越弱势的地位，人类凌驾于大自然之上，制造了一个又一个悲剧。所以我们必须从伦理的角度重新思考人类与大自然之间的关系，必须改变陈腐落后的伦理观念，认识到只有同大自然和平

共处、共生共存才是人类唯一的出路。但是摸鱼人伊格纳齐依奇依旧抱着陈旧、过时的伦理观念，不尊重自然界中其他生物的生命权、生存权，仍然根据陈旧的伦理传统向大自然无止境地索取，在珍惜自然资源与滥杀鱼类之间做出了错误的选择。因此，我们今天从生态伦理的立场来分析摸鱼人的偷捕行为时，不应该把他看成是大自然的征服者和战胜者，而应该把他看成是大自然的破坏者，他的行为理应受到谴责与批判。

伊格纳齐依奇经常在深夜驾着快艇，来到叶尼塞河上放排钩，用这种对鱼损伤最大、最残忍的方式捕鱼。终于有一天，一条分量很重的大鱼上钩了。“这条鱼不仅大得离奇，而且外形类似古生动物，它从头到尾都像史前的蜥蜴”（270）。这条鱼力大无比，翻江倒海，竭力想挣脱排钩。虽然伊格纳齐依奇明白，他需要帮手，才对付得了这条大鱼。可是，“这样的鲤鱼决不能白白放掉，鱼王一辈子只能碰上一次，而且还不是每个人都碰得到的”（274）。这时的摸鱼人盛气凌人，认为自己是自然界之王，对付小小的鱼儿自然不在话下，殊不知自己已身处危险之中。在这生死存亡的关键时刻，他没有放走鱼王。如果给鱼王一条生路，也会给自己一条生路。相反，他藐视自然界的力量，过高估计人类本身的能力，遵循动物界的丛林法则，认为人才是动物界的最强者，对其他弱小的动物享有生杀大权，于是他做出了错误的判断与选择，向鱼王发起了激烈的挑战。他拿起斧子、尖钩子，想用它们来征服鱼王。他不顾一切地用斧背猛砍鱼王的脑门，再用钩子把鲤鱼钩个正着，差不多已经要把它拖进小船了。鱼王却猛一转身，掀翻了小船。鱼王和摸鱼人一起往下沉，排钩不仅扎进了鱼王的身体，也扎进了摸鱼人的身体。

按照在自然中形成的伦理法则，伊格纳齐依奇生存的世界在陆地上，鱼王生存的世界在江河里，这两个世界本该有序共生、共存，可是伊格纳齐依奇改变了自己的伦理身份，把自己由自然界中的普通一员变成了凌驾于自然之上的神，认为自己处于生物链的最顶端，根据动物界的弱肉强食的丛林法则，可以对所有弱小动物为所欲为。他不安心于自己在陆地世界的平稳生活，偏偏要做一个江河的入侵者与征服者，以显示自己才是大自然真正的主人。他不仅利用人的智慧与狡诈，引诱鱼王上钩，而且还准备活捉它，卖个好价钱。鱼王没有给伊格纳齐依奇制造任何麻烦，带来任何伤害，可摸鱼人残忍地用排钩来伤害它，一心想活捉它，这充分体现了摸鱼人贪婪、狡诈、虚伪、残酷、野蛮的一面。正是由于摸鱼人自私、贪婪，向大自然无止境地索取，才引来了这条具有灵性的大鱼的报复。鱼王一个大翻身，将摸鱼人一起拖进了水里，拖到了死亡的边缘。这一结果是摸鱼人万万没有想到的。从这一刻起，摸鱼人与鱼王身处相同的绝境。但是与人相比，鱼儿在水中的生存概率甚至更高，更有逃生的可能。这时摸鱼人才真正感受到了鱼王的厉害，感到深深的懊悔和绝望。

在摸鱼人看来，此刻的鱼王代表着自然界的神灵，象征着自然界生物在

遭受人类虐杀之后的反抗与报复。他爷爷曾经说过，当看到鱼王时，“最好把它，这该诅咒的东西放掉，而且还要装得若无其事，似乎是毫不在意地放掉它的”（274）。他原本以为这一切都是封建迷信，可此刻他方才明白，爷爷的话是对的，自然界的万物都是有灵性的，必须尊重大自然，敬畏大自然，才能与自然界和平共处，共生共存。在即将与鱼王共沉河底的危难时刻，伊格纳齐依奇才明白与自然界建立和谐共处、共生共存的伦理关系的重要性，可惜为时已晚。

在阿斯塔菲耶夫的笔下，鱼王虽然外形丑陋，但却具备灵性与母性特征。它好像是摸索着靠向小船，使劲地挨着船帮，如同一切有生之物一样，总喜欢紧挨着点什么。“它扇动着两鳃，发出一种像摇篮曲一般令人诧异的枯燥的吱吱声”，“大鱼把胖鼓鼓的、柔软的肚子紧紧地、小心翼翼地贴着他。这种小心翼翼，这种想暖和一下并保护身上孕育着的生命的愿望含有某种女性的意味”（277）。此处的“摇篮曲”、“柔软的肚子”、“女性的意味”等词汇赋予鱼王温柔善良的母性特征。鱼王先是顶着了摸鱼人的腰，然后直抵他的腋下，用柔软的肚子紧贴着他，这一系列动作给浸泡在冰冷河水里的摸鱼人带来了支撑与暖意，释放出了和解的善意。摸鱼人不顾一切地要置鱼王于死地，布置排钩诱捕鱼王。但是鱼王却以德报怨，在与摸鱼人共处险境的时候，并没有落井下石，而是给予濒临冻毙的摸鱼人某种生命力的支撑。由此不难看出，鱼王对摸鱼人没有赶尽杀绝，而是给予他支持与温暖，体现了大自然对人类的包容，也展示了大自然与人类达成某种和解的可能。

鱼王的母性特征让伊格纳齐依奇想起了他一直避免想起的、被他欺凌过的姑娘格拉哈，他一生都无法回避的道德污点。格拉哈本是他的初恋女友，一个天真、纯洁的姑娘。可是在格拉哈被中尉诱奸之后，他听信伙伴们的唆使，一定要对“变节的女人”（287）实施报复，不仅奸污了格拉哈，而且还让姑娘站在陡峭的河岸上，面对河滩，一脚把她踢到冰冷的河水里，伤透了姑娘的心。他粗暴的凌辱毁掉了姑娘的一生。在这濒临死亡的时刻，他自问自答道：“你在这河上干什么？等待饶恕？等谁饶恕？老弟，大自然也是个女性！你掏掉了它多少东西啊？”（287）阿斯塔菲耶夫将大自然比作女性，指出侮辱女性与侮辱大自然一样罪不可赦。至此伊格纳齐依奇才准确地理解了自己的伦理身份，体会到大自然与人类是身份平等的双方，人类不能接受动物界的伦理观、遵循丛林法则，无休止地掠夺、侵犯大自然。大自然与女性一样，都需要人们温柔以待、精心呵护，践踏大自然和践踏女性一样要受到惩罚。

最终，鱼儿一个翻身，接二连三地用尾巴翻打，终于挣脱了排钩，脱钩而去，伊格纳齐依奇也因此保全了性命。摸鱼人衷心地祝福道：“去吧，鱼儿，去吧！我不向任何人说起你的行踪，尽情地活下去吧！”（288）鱼王最终安然离去，不仅救了自己，也救了渔夫。从某种意义上来说，鱼王是渔夫的救命恩人。在生态伦理选择这个问题上，鱼王站在了比摸鱼人更高的道德

制高点，面对摸鱼人的穷追不舍、咄咄逼人，鱼王释放出的却是善意与母爱，最终它也以实际行动救了摸鱼人，从道德伦理上感化了摸鱼人。所以我们有理由相信，伊格纳齐依奇最后送出的祝福是真诚的、发自内心的。从最初的盛气凌人、不可一世、视鱼儿的生命如草芥，到最终衷心地祝福鱼儿尽情地活下去，摸鱼人经历了生态伦理观与选择的重大改变，接受了自然界万物和谐共生、和平共处的现代生态观，认可了鱼儿也有生存的权利。而且他的这一巨大改变正是在鱼王行为的感召下做出的。可以这么认为，最终在摸鱼人的心目中，鱼王已不仅仅是万物神灵的代、复仇者的象征，而且也是引导他敬畏自然、敬畏生命的引路人，引导他做出了正确的伦理选择。

阿斯塔菲耶夫的短篇小说《鱼王》不禁让我们想到了美国著名小说家海明威的不朽名篇《老人与海》。虽然这两部小说都描写大地之王人类同江海之王鱼儿在水中的搏斗，但是搏斗的结局是截然不同的。在《老人与海》中，老人桑提亚哥虽然最终杀死了大马林鱼，但是大马林鱼鱼身被鲨鱼吞噬殆尽，只剩下毫无用处的一副骨架，而老人本身也伤痕累累，险些送命。这一寓言式的结尾告诉我们，在人同大自然的争斗中，人类与大自然两败俱伤，在两者之间没有胜利者可言。但是，在阿斯塔菲耶夫的笔下，《鱼王》的结局则要平和得多、温暖得多。鱼王并未丧命于摸鱼人布置的排钩之下，而是安然脱钩而去，重新回归水族世界。经历过一番生死磨难、在鱼王行为的感召下，摸鱼人切身体会到了与自然界生物和平共处的重要性，树立了正确的伦理观，做出了正确的伦理选择，对鱼王送出了衷心的祝福，祝愿它尽情地活下去。由此不难看出，人类与大自然达成了某种暂时的和解。阿斯塔菲耶夫特意安排的人鱼两相安的结局，为人类走出生态伦理困境、迈向与自然界万物和平共处、和谐共生的未来增添了一抹亮色与暖色。

三、自然之子的伦理身份与选择

阿基姆的工作身份是城里的汽车司机。他热爱大自然、平等地对待大自然，与大自然融为一体，对大自然怀有真挚情感。在他身上保留着不同于现代人的品质：单纯、朴实、善良、坚忍不拔、乐天知命。这一切都来源于他独特的成长经历：他从小生长在叶塞尼河畔，由鲍家尼达村渔民的集体鱼汤喂养长大。他“上学读书之前从来也不知道世上还有其他的村镇和居住地。他从来没在哪儿受过洗礼，从来没有一本花名册上登记过他的名字，他是自由自在地来到这个世界的”（323）。阿基姆的为人处世犹如西伯利亚大自然一样质朴、醇厚和开朗，他对大自然具有丰富的知识和不可分割的依恋之情。他尽管在城里当上了汽车司机，依旧常常通宵达旦地坐在叶尼塞河畔仰望星空、凝视河水，常常梦见白色的群山和原始森林。在阿基姆的脑海里，那些白色群山散发着某种不可名状的诱人芳香。他之所以坚持一个人到北极圈里狩猎，是因为他感到对于另一种生活、对于爱的幻想，即使不能在这里，在

这白色的群山之间得到实现，那么多少也会有个明朗的结果，他将变得内心宁静，不再浪迹天涯。“阿基姆既然决意让自己的心灵和肉体听任意志的驱使，相信内心的感动，所以他对一切事都泰然处之，对任何人和事通常都不表惊讶，成败得失似乎都是理所当然，因此都能安之若素”（461）；阿基姆了解大自然、亲近大自然，在原始森林中显得非常自信，足智多谋，过得如鱼得水，这一切都得益于他正确理解了自然界与人类相平等的伦理身份，没有把自己凌驾于自然界之上。因此在《鱼王》里阿基姆的伦理身份是自然之子。他被视为大自然在人间的化身，是作者竭力讴歌的对象，是作者面对生态伦理困境而塑造的一个理想人物。从这个人物身上，可以感受到作家对大自然的热爱与赞美，对回归田园生活的向往，对天人合一境界的渴求。在阿基姆身上集中体现了阿斯塔菲耶夫所推崇的伦理选择。

在原始森林的小木屋里，阿基姆在面对生命垂危的女大学生艾丽雅时，事实上是面临着伦理两难的选择问题的。是抛下艾丽雅一走了之、在良心上留下永恒的愧疚，还是留下来救助艾丽雅、冒着生命危险送女孩走出原始森林？他与艾丽雅素昧平生，又身处冬季的原始森林这样极端恶劣的生存环境，他本可以抛下艾丽雅，一走了之，谁也不会知道这里曾发生过什么。可是在阿斯塔菲耶夫的笔下，作为自然之子的阿基姆，片刻都未产生过抛弃艾丽雅的念头，而是时刻陪伴在艾丽雅左右，不顾一切地救治她。听着她微弱的呼吸，“阿基姆的感觉就像是听到了自己的什么亲人被判处了死刑，却无力稍稍减轻这将被处死的人的不幸命运，他感到痛苦的是他自己将依旧活着、呼吸着，这个人虽然近在咫尺，却好像叫人难以够得着，并且逐渐远去，越来越远（……）”（469）。这种对弱者、对疾病的感同身受来源于他长期在原始森林里生活，了解自然界中万物和谐共生的生态伦理法则。他竭尽全力救治艾丽雅，给艾丽雅敷芥末膏，用酒精擦身子，做热敷，忙得不亦乐乎，浑身是汗。他感到自己从来没有被任何人如此迫切地需要过，产生了一种崇高的使命感。虽然他跟人签过合同，拿过五百卢布预支款，如果完不成打猎指标，就得赔钱。可是他似乎完全忘记了这回事，一心只想着救人。“这是戈加这样的人才会把别人看作非亲非故，光顾着自己，只为自己活着，阿基姆却把任何人，任何在原始森林里萍水相逢的人都看成自己人”（476）。这种把在原始森林里遇到的任何人，都当成自己人的选择，表现了阿基姆高尚的伦理道德情操。“伦理选择是人择善弃恶而做一个有道德的人的途径”（聂珍钊267）。不歧视任何生命，努力去拯救每个生命，是阿基姆在任何时候、任何情况下都会做出的伦理选择。例如，阿基姆只带了一个人的口粮，现在却要分成两半。在原始森林里，面包是极其珍贵的食物。所以他尽量节省着每一块小面包，几乎是光吃禽肉而不吃面包，结果弄得肚子很不好受，胸口憋闷。可对于艾丽雅，他却很大方。为了让艾丽雅尽快恢复体力，他尽可能变着法子让她吃好，给她吃面包、肉、腌鱼片、糖渍桑悬钩子、越橘，有时甚至还

加一勺珍贵的炼乳。如果是阿基姆独自一个人，带上滑雪板和一条狗，只要三四天就能赶到小城，重返人类社会。可是他绝对不会丢下艾丽雅一个人去逃生，决定要死也得死在一起。这种在极端恶劣的气候条件下，坚决与他人共存亡，绝不放弃、绝不丢弃的伦理选择，充分展现了阿基姆是一个具有高尚道德情操的人。艾丽雅获救后想道：“有谁写下过或者规定过要人去搭救、去帮助、去忘掉自己和抛下自己的事情呢？况且无私地帮助别人是所有人都能做得到的吗？”（535）。不难看出，阿基姆舍己救人的无私行为最终深深感动了原本有些自私轻浮的女大学生艾丽雅，促使她在内心深处进行了一场灵魂自我洗涤，有助于她在今后的人生道路上做出正确的选择。

但是，这位在森林里那么信心十足、足智多谋、手脚灵活的阿基姆，当他回归到文明社会、到航空港送别艾丽雅时，却显得非常孤独、可怜、手足无措，对所有人都像个外人，而且不为任何人所需要。作者通过这一细节的描写，向读者展示了自然之子在当代科技社会的尴尬处境，在引起人们的同情与警觉的同时，更进一步说明了现代人与大自然的对立程度。作为大自然化身的自然之子，在文明社会里却显得毫无用处，只有回归大自然、回归原始森林，才有他的用武之地。

与阿基姆的自然人形象形成鲜明对比的是来自文明社会的戈加·盖尔采夫。他虽说是个大学生，精明能干，但是说话刻薄，手段硬，性格高傲自大得和年龄不相称，我行我素，不受羁绊。他信奉“我才是我自己的上帝”（487），是个典型的、精致的利己主义者。盖尔采夫极端的自私自利导致他善恶不分，在面临选择时经常犯错。例如，他昧着良心，骗走了退伍残废军人基里亚格的最后一枚奖章，用奖章做成了一枚精致的鱼形钓片，伤透了这位善良的退伍老军人的心；他玩弄图书管理员柳达和女大学生艾丽雅的感情，导致艾丽雅差点命丧原始森林。正如阿斯塔菲耶夫所言：“自然界它自己会在善恶之间制造平衡”（186）。由于盖尔采夫已经习惯于只为自己活着，只对自己负责，所以一旦遇到麻烦事就无法应付，一个接着一个地犯错误，最终他自己钓鱼时不慎摔倒，葬身渔腹，死状可怖，落得非常可悲的下场。作家通过戈加这样一个极端利己主义者的形象塑造，告诉我们人既不能做自然界的上帝，也不能做自己的上帝，只有尊重大自然，敬畏大自然，人才能做出正确的伦理选择，生命才能长久，获得真正的幸福。

在这部作品的最后，阿斯塔菲耶夫写道：“造化有时，万物有期”（630）。的确，万事皆有时，万物皆有期，生有时，死有时；栽种有时，收成有时；哭有时，笑有时（……）道法自然的思想深刻地体现了东西方文化中的共同智慧。

由此可见，从生态伦理学的视角看，《鱼王》以一种超前的生态忧患意识，深刻地反映了生态伦理遭受破坏所带来的混乱与灾难性后果。阿斯塔菲耶夫

在热情歌颂大自然的崇高、雄伟与永恒的同时，强烈谴责了人类对大自然的野蛮掠夺和摧残，呈现了难以摆脱的生态伦理困境。通过对摸鱼人与自然之子这两类人的伦理身份与选择的分析与对比，可以清晰地看出阿斯塔菲耶夫本人所推崇的伦理选择，即对自然之子阿基姆形象的塑造与讴歌。阿斯塔菲耶夫通过长篇小说《鱼王》呼吁人们要热爱自然、尊重自然，与大自然和平相处，达到天人合一的理想境界。

Works Cited

维克托·阿斯塔菲耶夫：《鱼王》，夏仲翼等译。桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2017年。

[Viktor Astafyev. *King of Fish*. Trans. Xia Zhongyi, et al. Guilin: Guangxi Normal UP, 2017.]

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: Beijing UP, 2014.]

女神、未亡人、娼妇：

论松本清张《红签》中被建构的伦理身份

**Goddess, widow, whore: The Ethical Identity Constructed
in Seicho Matsumoto's *The Red Lottery***

曹雅洁 (Cao Yajie) 波瀾刚 (Namigata Tsuyoshi)

内容摘要：从文学伦理学批评视角解读松本清张的小说《红签》可以发现，塚西夫人伦理身份的三次转变来源于末森和楠田两名将军的主观建构，这三次建构过程是他们对夫人的欲望被“掩盖－克制－赤裸裸地表现”的过程。塚西夫人伦理身份逐渐“被堕落”的内部原因为两名军官的伦理选择，外部原因为“男性神话”价值观盛行的伦理环境。在二人的伦理选择中，塚西夫人从未被当作具有独立意志的个体对待，而仅作为被注视的对象出现，这导致了塚西夫人的悲剧性结局。《红签》中关于“沉默”女性的悲剧书写既是对“男性神话”价值观的有力批判，也是对女性运动逐渐发展的社会趋势的有效响应。

关键词：《红签》；文学伦理学批评；伦理身份；伦理选择；伦理环境

作者简介：曹雅洁，江苏大学外国语学院讲师，日本国立九州大学大学院地球社会统合科学府博士生，主要研究方向为近现代日本文学、文学伦理学批评。波瀾刚，日本国立九州大学大学院比较社会文化研究院教授，日本筑波大学文学博士，主要从事现当代日本文学与文化研究。

Title: Goddess, widow, whore: The Ethical Identity Constructed in Seicho Matsumoto's *The Red Lottery*

Abstract: From the interpretation of Seicho Matsumoto's *The Red Lottery* from the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, we can find that, the three different ethical identities of Mrs. Tsukanishi were constructed by Suemori and Kusuda. Those constructions reflected the processes of their “masking-restraint-naked performance” of their desires for the lady. The internal reason for Mrs. Tsukanishi's ethical identity to be “fallen” is the ethical choice of the two officers, and the external reason is the ethical environment in which the values of “male myth” prevail. In the ethical choice of the two men, Mrs. Tsukanishi has never been treated as an individual with independent will, but only as an object of being watched, which leads to her tragic ending. The tragic writing about “silent” women

in *The Red Lottery* not only criticized the values of “male myth” from the positive side, but also responded to the social trend of the development of the feminist movement from the negative side.

Key words: *The Red Lottery*; Ethical Literary Criticism; ethical identity; ethical choice; ethical environment

Author: **Cao Yajie**, Ph.D. candidate at Graduate School of Integrated Sciences for Global Society, Kyushu University (Fukuoka, Japan), is Lecturer at School of Foreign Languages, Jiangsu University. Her research focuses on modern Japanese literature (Email: sooyaketsu@163.com). **Tsuyoshi Namigata**, Ph.D. of Tsukuba University, is Professor at the Faculty of Social and Cultural Studies, Kyushu University. His research interests cover the fields of modern and contemporary Japanese literature and culture (Email: tnamigata@scs.kyushu-u.ac.jp).

日本作家松本清张（Secho Matsumoto, 1909-1992）自 20 世纪 50 年代起活跃于日本文坛，其作品“兼具揭露个人罪恶和组织罪恶的双重性”，“具有强烈的体制批判特征”（平野谦 212-213）¹。松本曾坦言其文学创作深受木村毅（Ki Kimura）的著作《小说研究十六讲》（『小説研究十六講』，1925）的影响。²该书主张，“但凡大作，必定包含着伦理价值”（木村毅 25），“（小说）题材是一张白纸，但最终却会染上道德或非道德的色彩，这完全取决于作者的方法。伦理批判就潜藏在这一方法中”（木村毅 123）。显然，该论旨与文学伦理学批评的重要观点“文学是特定历史阶段伦理观念和道德生活的独特表达方式，文学在本质上是伦理的艺术”（聂珍钊 13）有着一致内涵。松本一生创作了数百部小说，其作品中的“社会性”正是通过伦理书写的方式才得以彰显。所以，运用文学伦理学批评的方法从伦理视角剖析松本的小说更能够呈现作家的创作意图，挖掘作品的伦理价值。

《红签》（『赤いくじ』）发表于 1955 年，是松本文学创作初期的重要作品。然而，由于故事背景为战败前后的日本殖民地南朝鲜，日本学界通常仅将其

1 凡未特殊注明，引文均出自笔者拙译。

2 松本在《实感的人生论》（『実感的人生論』，1962）、《探求叶脉的人——木村毅氏和我》（『葉脈探求の人——木村毅氏と私』，1979）、《半生记》（『半生の記』，1963）等文中多次提及。

置于“返迁文学”¹的视野下展开讨论²，忽视了该小说批判个人和组织罪恶的主旨，以及其中蕴含的作者对于写作当下日本社会动向的隐喻。本文紧扣小说中末森和楠田两名将军对塚西夫人的情感这一伦理主线，剖析他们建构夫人伦理身份的过程及原因，继而阐明作者松本透过作品所要表达的伦理批判意图。

一、从“女神”到“娼妇”：夫人被建构的伦理身份

《红签》讲述了驻朝军官末森和楠田倾心于塚西夫人（以下简称夫人）并为之展开竞争，最终在欲望和嫉妒的驱使下反目成仇的故事。“在文学文本中，所有伦理问题的产生往往都同伦理身份相关”（聂珍钊 263）。考察《红签》中夫人的伦理身份会发现，其中存在着明显的读者认知与人物认知之间的差异。

第三人称叙述者在夫人登场之初便指出她的伦理身份是“一位出征军人的妻子”（191）³，这一表述同时涵盖了夫人的家庭身份和社会身份，并以“讲述者=旁观者”的叙述姿态令读者对该身份予以认同。然而，在此后的故事展开中，夫人的伦理身份发生了转变。但，这些转变并非夫人自身伦理选择的结果，而仅发生在两名军官的意识之中，即夫人伦理身份的转变不是客观事实，而是源于他人意识中的主观建构。笔者试图将这种并非源于自我选择、仅存在于他者意识中的伦理身份称为被建构的伦理身份。被建构的伦理身份是虚拟的、非真实的伦理身份，其产生主要源于建构者在特定伦理环境下基于伦理意识做出的伦理选择。在小说中，两名军官意识中对夫人伦理身份的建构可划分为三个阶段。

在第一阶段，夫人的伦理身份被二人建构为“女神”。军医末森初见夫人是由于某日半夜为其出诊，他觉得夫人“简直美得不可方物”（194）。此后，他充分利用医生身份，即使在夫人已无需继续接受治疗的情况下，仍以复查为由登门探望。参谋长楠田在见到夫人后的感受与末森相同。为接近心中的

1 日语为“引揚げ文学”。“引揚げ”指二战后，日本从（中国）台湾、朝鲜半岛、太平洋诸岛等原日属殖民地撤离普通日本国民这一事件。

2 南富镇（Bujin Num）在《文学的殖民地主义——近代朝鲜的风景和记忆》（『文学の植民地主義——近代朝鮮の風景と記憶』，2006）中，依据松本清张本人的在朝经历，认为该作品是松本对自身“殖民地体验”的表述；新城郁夫（Ikko Sinjyo）在《转移的“胜者欲望”——读松本清张的〈红签〉》（「移転する「勝者の欲望」——松本清張『赤いくじ』を読む」，2005）中提出相反意见，认为作者本人绝不是将其仅仅作为回忆而创作，而是“表达了一种不想‘返迁’、试图回归战时的态度；久保田裕子（Yuko Kubota）在《对返迁记忆的表达与隐藏——论松本清张的〈红签〉》（「引揚げの記憶を表象／隠蔽すること——松本清張『赤いくじ』論」，2016）中指出，该小说作为一部“返迁文学”作品，不仅描写了日本、美国、朝鲜之间的较量 and 返迁后女性的遭遇，还对战后日本主流舆论进行了反思。这些舆论忽视了日本军方在战时的“加害者”身份，而一味强调普通日本国民在战败后的“受害者”身份。

3 本文中相关作品引文均出自松本清张短篇作品集《某〈小仓日记〉传》（左汉卿等译，北京：人民文学出版社，2017年）。以下只标注页码，不再一一说明。

“女神”，他利用自己的参谋长身份，要求警察局成立由日本妇女组成的民间防卫班，并主张由夫人出任会长。至此，二人分别将自己与夫人置于“医生一病人”、“参谋长—会长”的伦理关系之中，并由此获得持续拜访夫人的机会。一方面，受本能欲望驱使，他们假借名目对夫人展开竞争；另一方面，由于夫人的伦理身份被二人建构为“女神”，他们不允许包括自己在内的任何人玷污夫人，否则就是触犯了亵渎神灵的伦理禁忌。可以说，在这一阶段，他们虽对夫人抱有本能欲望，但夫人的高贵气质和美丽容貌令他们认为自己与夫人有如云泥之别。所以，本能欲望为强大的理性意志所控制，甚至连他们自己也未察觉到内心的波动。换言之，欲望被深深掩盖。

在第二阶段，夫人的伦理身份被二人建构为“未亡人”。在与两名军官的交谈中，夫人提及丈夫半年前被派往南洋战场且至今杳无音讯一事。深知战况凶险的军官们猜测夫人的丈夫“十有八九是遇难了”（208）。尽管二人无法证实夫人的丈夫是否已经战死，但“可能战死”的事实无疑刺激了军官本能欲望的恣意释放，由此，他们做出伦理选择——将夫人看成无需再为丈夫坚守贞操的未亡人，心中的“邪念”也随之迸发——末森的“想法开始动摇”（208）；楠田的内心被勾起了“某种可耻的念头”（209）。这种无疑体现了二人理性意志的败退和自由意志的抬头。初识夫人时，出于对伦理禁忌的强烈畏惧，二人的自由意志——对夫人的欲望——被隐藏在意识深处，而将夫人看成是未亡人之后，这种自由意志开始不断膨胀，但仍处于理性意志的可控范围之内，故而此时的二人尚能抑制住内心的邪念，“让自己清醒过来”（209）。

在第三阶段，夫人的伦理身份被二人建构为“娼妇”。这与小说中十分重要的伦理结——抽签事件——息息相关。1945年8月15日，昭和天皇宣布无条件投降。在得知战败消息并听说美军即将进驻京城（现首尔）之后，军官们的内心中满恐慌。他们决定通过抽签方式选出二十名日本妇女作为慰安妇献给美军。夫人不幸抽中红签，意味着她被选中成为慰安妇。从看到夫人手中的红签那一刻起，在两名军官的意识中，夫人“未亡人”的身份土崩瓦解。她不再是遥不可及的女神，亦不再是战友的未亡人。由于抽中红签，在二人的意识中，夫人“堕落为娼妇”（224），成为可以任由他们发泄欲望的对象。这无疑为他们毫不掩饰地“垂涎夫人的美貌”（225），自由地宣泄自由意志，提供了看似合理的依据。至此，二人的理性意志彻底沉沦于自由意志之下。

两名军官对夫人伦理身份的三次建构呈现出他们对夫人的欲望被“掩盖—克制—赤裸裸地表现”的过程。当二人将夫人的伦理身份建构为“女神”时，对神灵的精神崇拜令他们未能意识到内心潜藏的欲望；当二人将夫人的伦理身份建构为“未亡人”时，他们的邪念蠢蠢欲动，但仍能为理性意志所约束；当二人将夫人的伦理身份建构为“娼妇”时，他们便赤裸裸地任由欲

望控制自己。

二、从“理想家园”到“胜者欲望”：军官的伦理选择

两名军官对夫人伦理身份的主观建构是二人基于自身伦理身份进行伦理选择的结果，他们的数次伦理选择导致了夫人被建构的伦理身份逐渐“被堕落”。二人具有相似的伦理身份（高级军官），并处于相似的伦理环境（海外征战）中，所以在面对夫人时做出了相似的伦理选择。

首先，二人对夫人“女神”身份的建构是在思念故乡的伦理情感作用下做出的伦理选择，这种情感在数次造访夫人的“客厅”之后得以释放和强化。因此，在探讨夫人的伦理身份被建构成“女神”的原因时，对夫人“客厅”的考察不可或缺。

塚西夫人的“客厅”是和式风格，约有八张席大，十分雅致。（……）地板上摆放着工笔画，栖凤轴以及随意而又不失雅致的秋菊花艺；一旁书架上的琉璃箱里放置着精巧的人偶和外匣雕有花鸟图案的书籍。每一件物品都让参谋长和军医感受到一股浓浓的日式优雅。壁龛上那把盖着赤鹿花纹绢布的箏为整个客厅增添了几分高贵之感。（202-203）

叙述者不遗余力地描述军官眼中的夫人家的和式客厅，这暗示了两名军官对夫人的欲望不仅源于其美貌，还源于“对她‘和式房屋’的向往”（久保田裕子 65）。一方面，二人离家数年，末森在南洋死里逃生，楠田在中国长期作战，他们的内心充满着对故乡的思念之情。末森与夫人一起回忆东京街景时不由感慨：“真是令人怀念啊”（207）。另一方面，夫人的西方素养恰好贴合经过明治维新西化后的日本社会的价值取向。听闻夫人毕业于东京一所知名英语教育学校后，楠田请求夫人为其朗诵英文诗，此后还向兵团长夸赞起夫人的西方素养。对此，日本史研究者 Jordan Sand 解释道：“由于 19 世纪通过征服和殖民地化的领土扩张大多由欧洲国家完成，因此当日本成为殖民势力时，无论是对殖民地的支配方式还是夸示帝国物质形态的方式都循欧洲先例而来。简单地说，明治时期被输入‘西化’的日本精英又在输出‘西化’”（Jordan Sand 4）。兼具日本气质和西方素养的夫人正是当时日本社会主流价值取向的典型代表。因此，拜访在和式房屋中生活的、具有西方素养的夫人，寄托着两名军官对故乡的思念之情。对二人而言，夫人“宛如梦中殿堂”（203）般的客厅是他们暂时忘却战争，回到记忆中故乡的理想化空间，居住在其中的夫人便是这种理想家园的具象化体现。

其次，二人对夫人“未亡人”的伦理身份建构是自由意志膨胀的产物。在南洋，末森“视女人为玩物”（195）；在中国，楠田“见识过胜者的欲望”（214），这些经历是二人自由意志曾脱离理性意志束缚的证明，同时也成为

刺激他们可能再次做出非理性伦理选择的诱导因素。在得知夫人的丈夫杳无音信之后，二人意识中一度被“女神”光芒所掩盖的自由意志开始挣脱理性意志的束缚，急剧膨胀。但是，就在二人起了“卑劣的想法”（208）和“羞耻的念头”（209）时，夫人良好的西方素养促使二人理性意志回归。一方面，夫人向军官吐露自己倾心于玛丽·洛朗森（Marie Laurencin）的绘画。她认为，尽管洛朗森的绘画技巧略显稚嫩，但其作品给人“一种梦幻的感觉”（208）。而这种似真亦幻、可望而不可及的梦幻感恰恰是此前两名军官对夫人情感的写照，唤起军官对夫人最初的崇拜；其次，夫人向军官朗诵题为《向日葵》（Ah, Sunflower）的诗歌，诗歌表达了人们对理想之国的追求，军官也“理解了诗中的情感”（210），这正契合了他们自身对故乡这一理想家园的思念之情。在与夫人的共情中，二人脑海中曾将夫人看作“理想家园”的记忆被唤醒，从而使他们意识到自己内心的堕落。尽管最终理性意志占据上风，二人保持住了对夫人的推崇之情，做出了符合道德规范的伦理选择，但这一过程中充斥着理性意志与非理性意志的斗争。

最后，二人对夫人“娼妇”身份的建构是面对战败非理性意志完全失控导致的。在这一过程中，他们做出了两次伦理选择。其一，面对战败局面，作为日本军官，正确的伦理选择应为认清自身罪恶，接受法庭审判。然而，见识过“胜者欲望”的他们却毫不犹豫地选择了“取悦美国士兵”（217），放纵自由意志演变成“损人利己式自我保全”的非理性意志，并以“组织抽签”这一非理性行为表现出来，还以“防止其他妇女遭受意外伤害”（217）这一说辞来掩盖其行为的非道德性和他们企图逃避战争惩罚的真实目的。在“牺牲妇女保全自我”的非理性意志的作用下，两名军官完全忘记了心中曾经的“女神”也会被列入慰安妇候选人之列。二人非理性的伦理选择最终导致夫人沦为“娼妇”。其二，在驻朝日军和日本人撤离朝鲜的过程中，两名军官又做出了第二次错误的伦理选择。身为军人，他们理应肩负起护送同胞安全返回日本的重任，然而二人却垂涎于夫人美貌，伺机放纵自由意志。末森诱骗夫人，意图凌辱；楠田妒火中烧，以“末森逃跑”（225）为由领兵搜捕。二人的非理性行为造成了他们悲剧性的人生结局——楠田被末森击毙，而末森成为企图强奸同胞并杀害同僚的逃兵，并最终自杀。可以说，楠田的被杀，以及末森的杀人和自杀均为二人连续做出错误伦理选择的结果。

三、“男性神话”价值观盛行的伦理环境

作者松本曾在战败前被强制服役于南朝鲜，他坦言《红签》的构思来源于其自身经历¹。松本将该经历于十年之后写进小说有两方面原因：其一，在20世纪五十年代的日本，国内经济高度增长，社会发生巨大变革。松本注意

1 松本于《松本清张全集》第35卷《后记》（『あとがき』，1974）、自传体小说《半生记》（『半生の記』，1963）等文章中均有提及。

到主流舆论中的“日本国民受害者”言论，故而试图通过小说揭露逐渐被“明亮的战后”所遗忘的“黑暗的过去”，并以此嘲弄当权者的自私与无情。其二，结合小说中以及小说创作时的伦理环境，文中对驻朝日本军官抽选慰安妇行为的描述极具现实指向性。军官们的伦理选择一方面与他们体验过的“胜者欲望”息息相关，另一方面还投射出“男性神话”价值观盛行的伦理环境。

所谓“男性神话”是指“有必要对男性士兵进行性慰安”（平井和子 220）这一认知。平井和子（2014）在《日本占领与性——美军、买卖春与日本女性》（『日本占領とジェンダー——米軍・売買春と日本女性たち』）中提到，二战时期日本陆军中尉早尾在一份题为《战场上的特殊现象及其对策》（『戦場ニ於ケル特殊現象ト其対策』）的报告中指出“性满足有利于提升军队士气和皇军威严”，并通过实例对当时设置的“慰安妇”制度表示肯定（平井和子 217）。显然，男性被“神话”的同时，女性势必只能主动或被动地选择“沉默”。

首先，此处的“沉默”并非等同于不发声，而是指在叙述策略中对女性自我意识描写的缺失。小说中夫人始终处于他者的视线之下，只作为被注视者出现。尽管小说以第三人称视角展开，然而在对夫人的描述上却采取了完全依凭两名军官的观察、想象来构筑人物形象的叙述策略。可以说，作为女主人公，夫人是缺乏自我意识、形象单薄且片面的。对于军官的到访要求，以及到访过程中的细节描写，叙述者均忽略了对夫人意愿和想法的关照，采取让夫人“沉默”配合的策略。此外，夫人对于二人的物质馈赠也是被动的，因为他们“并没有给塚西夫人任何拒绝的机会”（204）。这种叙述策略使小说中的夫人形象与军官形象形成鲜明对比，同时也体现了男权社会下作为弱势群体的女性自我意识被忽视的社会现实。

其次，女性的“沉默”还来源于为男性所掌控的社会的刻意隐瞒。在小说中，由于军官们的刻意欺瞒，夫人无从知晓组织抽签的真实目的和抽中红签的真实含义。事实上，松本对抽签事件的书写极具现实指向性——战败后仅一周，日本警视厅便授意筹备特殊慰安设施协会（简称 RAA），并大肆宣传其宗旨是“为了保护四千万大和抚子¹的纯洁”（平井 30），这些宣传与小说中军官们的言行如出一辙。尽管 RAA 于 1946 年解散，日本女性在进入 50 年代后逐渐登上社会舞台，但“男性神话”价值观依然普遍存在于日本社会之中。1953 年 7 月的《福生新闻》（『福生新聞』）上，有文章呼吁“希望美军从本国派遣慰安妇”；1953 年 2 月的参议院会议上，出现了“希望美军从本国派遣女性以解决性需求，不再蹂躏日本女性”等呼声（平井 221）。种种声音背后均体现出“有必要对男性士兵进行性慰安”这一价值判断。

松本就是在这样的伦理环境下创作了《红签》，不仅揭露了日本权力阶层的自私与无情，还映射了战时至战败初期伦理环境下的“男性神话”和女

1 “大和抚子”为旧时对日本女性的美称。

性悲哀。以夫人的遭遇批判了战时乃至战后盛行于日本社会的“男性神话”价值观；以夫人的“沉默”揭示出日本女性在该价值观影响下被注视、被定义、被建构伦理身份的社会现实。在小说中，末森和楠田对塚西夫人伦理身份的三次恣意建构反映出他们在不同阶段的伦理选择。在二人的伦理选择中，夫人从未被看作具有自我意识的个体，而仅作为被注视的对象，被定义和被建构，这种不平等的对话关系导致了夫人的悲剧结局。与此同时，“沉默”的女性这一书写方式一方面在行文中隐藏夫人的真实伦理身份，有利于两名军官对其虚拟伦理身份的建构；另一方面也突显了夫人这一被注视、被建构伦理身份者的悲剧色彩。

“文学的根本目的不在于为人类提供娱乐，而在于为人类提供从伦理角度认识社会和生活的道德范例，为人类的物质生活和精神生活提供道德指引，为人类的自我完善提供道德经验”（聂珍钊 14）。《红签》创作于 1955 年，正值日本女性运动开始发展，女性逐渐登上社会舞台的时代。尽管她们在“探索新的方向，确立走向幸福的目标”（石垣绫子 61），但在“男性神话”价值观的桎梏下，日本社会的女性运动依然任重而道远。《红签》中关于“沉默”女性的悲剧书写，既是对“男性神话”价值观的有力批判，也是对女性运动逐渐发展的社会趋势的有效响应。

Works Cited

- 南富鎮：『文学の植民地主義——近代朝鮮の風景と記憶』。京都：世界思想社，2006 年。
[Bujin Nam. *Colonialism in Literature: the Scenery and Memory in Modern Korea*. Kyoto: Sekaishisoshia, 2006.]
- 新城郁夫：「移転する『勝者の欲望』——松本清張『赤いくじ』を読む」，『現代思想』33(3) (2015): 140-153。
[Ikuro Sinjyo. “Moving of the ‘Winner’s Desire’: Analysis of *The Red Lottery*.” *Modern Thought* 33(3) (2015): 140-153.]
- ジョルダン・サンド：『帝国日本の生活空間』，天内大樹訳。東京：岩波書店，2015 年。
[Jordan Sand. *Living Space of Imperial Japan*. Trans. Daiki Amanai. Tokyo: Iwanamisyoten, 2015.]
- 平井和子：『日本占領とジェンダー——米軍・売買春と日本女性たち』。東京：有志舎，2014 年。
[Kazuko Hirai. *Occupied Japan and Gender: American Army, prostitution and whoring and Japanese Women*. Tokyo: Yushisha, 2014.]
- 平野謙：『平野謙全集第 9 巻』。東京：新潮社，1975 年。
[Ken Hirano. *Complete Works of Ken Hirano, Vol.9*. Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1975.]
- 木村毅：『小説研究十六講』。東京：新潮社，1925 年。
[Ki Kimura. *16 Courses of Novel Studies*. Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1925.]
- 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]

石垣綾子：「女性解放を阻むもの」，『婦人公論』8(1955)：61-68。

[Ryoko Ishigaki. "What prevents women from liberation." *Fujinkoron* 40(4)(1955):61-68.]

松本清張：《某く小倉日記>伝》，左汉卿等译。北京：人民文学出版社，2017年。

[Secho Matsumoto. *A "Kokura Diary" Den*. Trans. Zuo Hanqing etc. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2017.]

久保田裕子：「引揚げの記憶を表象／隠蔽すること——松本清張『赤いくじ』論」，『松本清張研究』17(2016)：63-76。

[Yuko Kubota. "Symbol and Hiding of Repatriation: Analysis of *The Red Lottery*." *Secho Matsumoto Studies* 17 (2016): 63-76.]

《管子的玄思》中阿梅丽的伦理身份与伦理选择

Amélie's Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice in *Métaphysique des tubes*

宋 歌 (Song Ge)

内容摘要：比利时小说家阿梅丽·诺冬的《管子的玄思》讲述了一个在日本出生的比利时女孩阿梅丽对伦理身份的探寻与选择的过程。东西方文化的碰撞导致了阿梅丽的身份危机，两种文化的交融与对立构成了她模糊而分裂的独特身份。想要解开身份之谜，阿梅丽必须正视现实、认知自我，通过个人努力在日本公民身份与比利时公民身份之间进行伦理选择。《管子的玄思》反映了部分比利时人在多元文化背景下关于伦理身份观念的思考。

关键词：阿梅丽·诺冬；身份困惑；伦理身份；伦理选择

作者简介：宋歌，武汉大学外国语学院法语系博士研究生，主要研究方向为当代法国文学。

Title: Amélie's Ethical Identity and Ethical Choice in *Métaphysique des tubes*

Abstract: Belgian novelist Amélie Nothomb's *Métaphysique des tubes* focuses on the process of Amélie's pursuit and choice of her ethical identity. The crash between Eastern and Western cultures leads to her identity crisis. The fusion and confrontation of the two cultures have made it possible to form an ambiguous, divided and unique identity of Amélie. In order to clear up her identity confusion, Amélie must face the reality, recognize herself as a multicultural identity, and make a painful choice of her ethical identity between Japanese and Belgian. *Métaphysique des tubes* reflects the unique perspective of some Belgians' ethical identity consciousness in a multi-cultured background.

Key words: Amélie Nothomb; identity confusion; ethical identity; ethical choice

Author: Song Ge, Ph.D. student of French literature at School of Foreign Languages of Wuhan University (Wuhan 430000, China) is mainly interested in researches on contemporary French literature (Email: leosongge@163.com).

比利时女作家阿梅丽·诺冬（Amélie Nothomb，1967—）是当代法国文坛最著名的作家之一，自20世纪90年代以来，她先后创作小说28部。她的主要作品有《杀手保健》（*Hygiène de l'assassin*, 1992）、《午后四点》（*Les Catilinaires*, 1995）、《诚惶诚恐》（*Stupeur et tremblements*, 1999）。《管

子的玄思》（*Métaphysique des tubes*, 2000）是作者阿梅丽·诺冬的第二部关于日本的作品。这本小说以自传体的形式讲述了女主角阿梅丽人生最初五年的时光，阿梅丽的成长轨迹与作者阿梅丽·诺冬几乎一致，在某种程度上女主角阿梅丽所面对的伦理困惑与伦理选择能够反映作者阿梅丽·诺冬的成长经历。阿梅丽出生在日本并在那里长大，起初作为“管子”¹的她对自己的身份没有概念，当祖母的巧克力使她意识到自己的比利时公民身份时，阿梅丽陷入关于伦理身份的困惑，同时也开始了对伦理身份的追寻与选择。本文试图运用文学伦理学批评方法，通过对主人公阿梅丽的分析，考察以作者阿梅丽·诺冬为代表的多元文化背景下成长的个人的伦理身份及伦理选择的嬗变。

一、阿梅丽伦理身份的困惑

人的伦理身份包括自我意识、国籍、性别、社会阶层，有时人们为了确认自己的身份需要寻找某种参照物，如：人们会通过自己与他人生理特征的对比如来确认自己的身份（通过肤色与发色来确认人种，通过生殖器官来确认性别）等。法国精神分析学家雅克·拉康的镜像阶段理论就很好地证实了这一观点。《管子的玄思》中女主角阿梅丽想要确认自己的身份，但她又面对着身份困惑，这种困惑来源于比利时公民身份与日本公民身份之间的冲突。在小说中，阿梅丽第一次确认自己的身份是从无意识的婴儿状态到确认自己比利时身份的阶段。以管子身份出现的女主角阿梅丽与大多数新生儿不同，她既不哭也不闹，除了基本的进食与消化外，仿佛这个世界的一切都与她无关。不过祖母的到来改变了一切，她的比利时巧克力使管子意识到了自己的存在，管子变成了比利时女孩阿梅丽。当谈到白色巧克力的意义时，阿梅丽说道：“白巧克力给了我一个身份，也给了我回忆”（24）。²阿梅丽开始对周遭世界有了意识，并感知到了自己的存在，但是关于自己的确切身份，她却是茫然的。根据拉康的镜像阶段理论，当一个6-18个月的婴儿在镜中认出自己的影像时，婴儿尚不能控制自己的身体动作，还需要旁人的关照与扶持。但是，他却能够认出自己在镜中的影像，意识到自己身体的完整性。在比利时祖母到来前，阿梅丽并未意识到自己的存在，就像未接触镜子的婴儿。当她看到祖母带来的比利时白巧克力时，她意识到了镜中人的存在，但仍然疑惑镜中人的身份——是他人？还是自己？此时，扮演“旁人”角色的是祖母，在她的鼓励下，阿梅丽终于成功吃掉了整个巧克力，同时也确定镜子中的人物是她本身。她不再是“管子”，而是比利时女孩阿梅丽。在“镜像阶段”，

1 阿梅丽在出生之时以“管子”自居，她对周围的一切漠不关心，她的唯一活动是张开所有必要的口子进行吞咽与消化，像一根没有情感活动的“管子”。因此，阿梅丽将从出生到身份意识形成前的自己称为“管子”以强调自己只具备基本的进食与消化功能，而对周围世界毫无认知的状态。

2 本文有关《管子的玄思》的引文均来自阿梅丽·诺冬，《管子的玄思》（深圳：海天出版公司，2002年）。以下只标注页码，不再一一说明。

白巧克力被视为身份之旅开启的起点，它扮演了比利时文化载体的角色，是自我精神分析的关键。通过这面镜子，阿梅丽意识到自己现实中的伦理身份——比利时公民身份。阿梅丽以她的比利时公民身份在祖母营造的比利时文化环境中舒适惬意地生活，并未对自己的比利时公民身份产生怀疑，直到祖母去世。作为婴儿的阿梅丽对周遭事物的感知有限，她只能感知到周边的小环境——住所内部以及亲人。正如尚必武所说：“虽然儿童完成了人类的生物性择，具有人类的外形，但是由于他们缺乏一定的伦理意识，很难完成自己正确的伦理选择，难以实现自己作为人的身份认同”（尚必武 74）。

阿梅丽第二次确认自己的伦理身份是在日本保姆西尾太太到来之后，这说明她已经进入有意识的儿童阶段。此时的阿梅丽对周遭事物有了强烈的感知，因为她需要与西尾太太更融洽地生活以及适应周遭的大环境——家以外的世界及日本文化。此时的阿梅丽并不拥有日本国籍，但是她对日本公民身份的认同感逐渐加强，并最终希望自己成为一个日本人。文学伦理学批评“强调回到历史的伦理现场，站在当时的伦理立场上解读和阐释文学作品，寻找文学产生的客观伦理原因并解释其为何成立，分析作品中导致社会事件和影响人物命运的伦理因素，用伦理的观点对事件、人物、文学问题等给以解释”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”14）。对阿梅丽而言，她所面对的伦理环境影响了她的伦理选择。她进行的伦理选择的原因可分为两方面：一方面，阿梅丽主动进行伦理选择来适应当时的伦理环境，如面对充满敌意的香岛太太，阿梅丽尝试做一个乖巧的日本人来讨好她以便于与其和谐生活。另一方面，出生于异国的阿梅丽并没有选择伦理环境的权利，远离祖国使得比利时文化对她的影响有限，而由日本保姆西尾太太营造的日本文化环境却时时刻刻影响着她。

至此，阿梅丽的比利时公民身份与日本公民身份均已在她的意识中确立，两种身份的碰撞与融合为阿梅丽带来了伦理困惑。在《管子的玄思》中，阿梅丽的伦理身份是围绕“想象与现实”建立的。阿梅丽得到来自日本保姆西尾太太无微不至的关怀，她经常依偎在西尾太太的怀中，听她唱歌、讲故事。西尾太太的关怀营造了良好的日本文化氛围，而阿梅丽对这种文化氛围产生了好感。为更好地融入日本文化，阿梅丽尝试成为一名日本人，如：积极学习日语，日语的使用甚至在母语法语之前。可以说，阿梅丽在无意间获得了想象中的伦理身份——日本公民身份。除了想象中的日本公民身份之外，阿梅丽还具有第二层伦理身份，即现实中的伦理身份，即：通过祖母带来的比利时巧克力而意识到的比利时公民身份。起初，阿梅丽对周遭漠不关心，“她什么都不要，什么都不等，什么都察觉不到，什么都不拒绝，对什么都不感兴趣”（1），她无法意识到自己的存在，更无法认知自己的伦理身份。但是，当祖母将巧克力放入阿梅丽嘴中时，奇迹出现了，巧克力的甜味给阿梅丽带来了味觉上的享受，她感受到了快乐，这种感官上的快乐使她开始对周围的

世界有了反应，而巧克力的属性（比利时特产）唤醒了她的意识，并使她意识到自己是阿梅丽，一个比利时女孩。

想象构成的伦理身份和现实中人物的伦理身份之间，并不是互相平行独立，而是存在着交叉和错位。从想象的角度来看，日本公民身份是指阿梅丽是一个日本人，她在日本文化的熏陶中成长，并深爱着这个国家，她的成长过程几乎不受比利时文化影响。作为出生在东方国度的西方人，阿梅丽的生物学特征本应很明显地使她意识到自己与真正日本人的区别，然而想象中的日本公民身份赋予了阿梅丽自己是日本人的意识，这种意识使得阿梅丽主动将自己与其他比利时人区别开来。她认为，所有的白人都是比利时人，除了她本人，因为她是日本人。由日语歌曲、鲤鱼旗以及能乐等构建的日本文化环境使阿梅丽获得了想象中的日本公民身份，而这个想象中的日本公民身份又使阿梅丽很好地适应现实中的伦理环境。但是从现实生活中的伦理身份来看，阿梅丽是比利时公民，她不仅流淌着比利时人的血液，而且在法理上也拥有着比利时国籍。虽然阿梅丽以一个比利时公民的身份在日本生活，但实际上陪伴她成长的是《丁丁历险记》与《圣经》，然而西方读物的文化影响没有阻止她表达对于日本公民身份的渴望，而这种渴望源于对西尾太太的崇拜与依赖，崇拜和依赖加强了对日本公民身份的归属感，削弱了比利时文化的认同感。对于比利时公民身份的忽视与日本公民身份的认同造成了现实与想象的冲突，从而引发了关于伦理身份的困惑。如果她接受想像中的伦理身份，那么就要忽视自己的比利时特征，不承认自己的比利时血统，忽略自己西方人的容貌，并尽可能不离开日本。因为离开日本意味着远离日本文化的熏陶，而对于只有五岁的阿梅丽来说，在缺少日本文化支撑的情况下在其他国家以日本公民身份生活是不现实的。血统与容貌是与生俱来的，而是否可以长期在日本生活是由父亲的外交官的工作性质决定的。当接到比利时政府的调任通知后，阿梅丽一家在日本的生活随即宣告结束。所以，她将不得不以现实中的伦理身份——比利时公民身份继续生活下去，这意味着她将选择面对既不了解也缺乏感情基础的祖国及其文化。但是，比利时对她来说更多地是一个符号，在十七岁之前她从未踏上祖国的土地，除了法语，阿梅丽身上的比利时元素并不明显，因此尽管比利时公民身份是阿梅丽现实中的伦理身份，但这是一种不完整的伦理身份，不完整是因为阿梅丽并不了解这一伦理身份背后文化及其意义。

在《管子的玄思》中，阿梅丽是事实上拥有比利时公民身份的人，但却认为自己拥有想象中的日本公民身份，交叉错位的伦理身份使她陷入伦理两难的境地。一方面离开日本使她不得不做出伦理身份选择，另一方面对于日本公民身份的不舍与对比利时公民身份的排斥使得她难以做出伦理身份选择。这种伦理两难正是作者阿梅丽·诺冬希望通过小说表达的，即在多元文化背景下成长的个人如何进行伦理身份选择。正如长期从事阿梅丽·诺冬作

品研究的 Laureline Amanieux 所说,“小说家经常以双重身份示人,其中一个身份是比利时人,而另一个则是日本人”(Amanieux 279)¹。

二、阿梅丽伦理选择的三阶段

面对伦理身份的困惑,阿梅丽需要进行伦理身份找寻并做出伦理选择。“人的身份是一个人在社会中存在的标识”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》263),如果一个人的身份定位是不清晰的,那么他就无法感知自己的存在,继而很难享受正常人的自由与权利。阿梅丽身份找寻的过程实际上是在两种伦理身份之间徘徊,这是一种对心理上的归属感的追求。

对于阿梅丽来说,心理上的归属感的追求过程就是进行伦理选择的过程,根据不同时期的不同伦理身份,阿梅丽的伦理选择过程分为三阶段:首先是伦理身份即社会身份找寻及确立阶段。“由于社会身份指的是人在社会上拥有的身份,即一个人在社会上被认可或接受的身份,因此社会身份的性质是伦理的性质,社会身份也就是伦理身份”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》264)。在出生之时,阿梅丽就“像圆柱体一样保持绝对的宁静,她过滤着外部世界,却不留下任何东西”(3)。但是,在祖母及比利时巧克力的引导下,阿梅丽血缘上的伦理身份得到确认,她意识到了自己是比利时人的事实。而当祖母去世后,两个因素影响了阿梅丽对于血缘上伦理身份的认知。一是日本保姆西尾太太开始照顾阿梅丽,她在阿梅丽的成长过程中起到启蒙教师的作用。阿梅丽两岁半时,她意识到当一个日本人意味着被西尾太太宠爱。而且,在西尾太太的影响下阿梅丽逐渐被日本文化所吸引并沉醉其中。为此,她说道:“如果说我懂得日语比懂得母语早,这并不是偶然的,对某人的崇拜会使我去学某人的语言”(42)。二是作为外交官的父亲对于日本文化的喜爱也影响了阿梅丽对于伦理身份的选择。比利时驻日本外交官是父亲在亚洲的第一个职位,“这个三十岁的年轻外交官对这个国家一见钟情。日本成了并且将永远成为他生活中的所爱”(63)。西尾太太与父亲无疑影响了阿梅丽的伦理身份选择。可以说,作为一个成长在日本的比利时人,阿梅丽从出生那一刻起注定要面对身份定位不明确的问题,这种不明确导致了她缺乏对于这个世界的归属感,而复杂的身分找寻经历正反映了阿梅丽寻找一种心理归属感的努力。

其次,阿梅丽伦理选择的第二个阶段是伦理找寻过程中遇到困难以及克服困难的阶段。一次偶然的机会,阿梅丽了解到另一位日本保姆香岛太太关于日本与西方关系的想法。作为日本旧贵族的一员,香岛太太把自己的废黜归罪于白人,因此她对所有的白人持仇视态度。与雇主一家关系良好的西尾太太也被她视为与敌人媾和的叛徒。阿梅丽——一位自认是日本人的西方人,认为香岛太太会像西尾太太一样疼爱她,但香岛太太的言论使她隐约意识到

1 凡未特别注明,均出自笔者自译。

一部分日本人对西方人抱有的敌意。作为一个比利时人，她始终是日本人眼中的敌人，因此无论她怎样努力做得像一个日本人，她都不会被香岛太太所接受。阿梅丽对于心灵上归属感的寻求受到了严重的打击。针对香岛太太的言论，西尾太太选择与香岛太太进行理论，她强调自己受到阿梅丽一家足够的尊重与爱意，认为自己已经成为阿梅丽家庭中的一员。西尾太太的态度使阿梅丽明白，尽管在伦理选择时遇到一些困难，但只要她真心喜爱日本文化，她仍然可以在这位启蒙教师的呵护下继续做想象中的日本人。

最后，是阿梅丽伦理选择的第三个阶段，即在伦理身份冲突中做出选择的阶段。当得知全家必须离开日本时，她意识到将会发生一场灾难，在这场灾难中她将会失去日本公民身份，而失去一个伦理身份意味着她可能需要获得另外一种伦理身份以便在别的国家继续生活下去。阿梅丽不得不被动地做出选择，为此她尝试以跳水自杀的方式表明自己拒绝做出选择的态度——“这是我的国家！如果让我走，我就去死！”（87）。从对两种伦理身份的认知，到对日本公民身份的认同，直至对比利时居民身份的排斥，阿梅丽在不同的成长时期做出了不同的伦理选择。

当谈到自己的伦理身份时，作者阿梅丽·诺冬说道：“我是无国籍人士”（220）。她笔下的同名女主角阿梅丽和她一样给读者留下无国籍人士的印象。当阿梅丽要离开日本时，她选择了被忽视的比利时公民身份开始新的生活，这是对现实进行妥协的结果，因为她已有的血缘伦理身份和即将面对的伦理环境决定了她将无法以日本公民身份继续生活。所以，她不得不接受自己真实的伦理身份，而这个伦理身份是不完整的，因为她并不了解这个伦理身份背后的真正意义。

三、作者的伦理意图

经过了复杂的伦理找寻过程，阿梅丽最终做出了伦理选择——做一名不完整的比利时人，而不完整的比利时人这一形象符合作者阿梅丽·诺冬在现实世界中的形象，可以说阿梅丽这一人物的塑造正反映了作者的伦理意图，即：在生活中，伦理选择高于其他选择（如生存选择），且伦理选择问题往往是与文化差异问题紧密相连的。

在伦理身份找寻过程中，阿梅丽所处的伦理环境很大程度上影响了她对自身伦理身份的认知及选择。她生来就有一个合理合法的比利时公民身份，只是在成长环境的影响下忽视了自己已有的伦理身份，并尝试着选择了日本公民身份，选择做一名想象中的日本人。阿梅丽对自己伦理身份的认知和选择高于生存的基本需求，优渥的家庭条件使得生存对她来说并不是一个问题，而作为在异国出生并在不同国家成长的外国人，阿梅丽常常被伦理身份的不清晰所困扰。阿梅丽的遭遇正反映了以作者阿梅丽·诺冬为代表的多元文化背景下成长的“无国籍人士”所面对的问题，即：现实伦理身份与想象伦理

身份的冲突。作者阿梅丽·诺冬正是通过对阿梅丽伦理身份找寻的过程来展示多元文化背景下成长的个人是如何进行伦理选择的。

作为从小在外国长大的“无国籍人士”，作者阿梅丽·诺冬的作品往往着眼于多元文化间的碰撞与融合。文化间的碰撞与融合带来了文化差异，这些差异反映在《管子的玄思》的女主角阿梅丽身上就具体化为比利时公民身份与日本公民身份的冲突。一方面她喜爱日本的食物，听日本的歌曲，与日本人一起生活，另一方面她又无法理解日本人对于外国人的敌意以及看到她溺水时的冷漠。可以说，作者阿梅丽·诺冬不但希望通过阿梅丽为无国籍人士的伦理身份问题找到可能的解决方法，而且也希望读者可以将部分目光聚焦于引起伦理身份问题的根源即文化差异的重要性上。透过文化差异展示伦理身份问题，又通过伦理身份问题折射出文化差异在身份找寻过程中的重要性始终是作者阿梅丽·诺冬自传体作品所要表达的伦理意图。

在小说结尾处，阿梅丽试图通过溺水自杀使时间停止在离开日本之前，“我不再搏斗了。我被催眠了，掉在了水池中”（104）。如果说死亡可以让阿梅丽永远拥有想象中的日本公民身份，她会毫不犹豫地这样做。当回忆起濒临死亡的时刻，阿梅丽说道：“我在那里一动不动，四周又恢复了宁静，我的忧虑消失了，我感到十分舒坦”（104）。一方面，她担心离开日本，离开意味着失去日本公民身份，另一方面，离开日本意味着重新面对陌生的比利时公民身份，这种未知也给阿梅丽带来了恐惧。因此，在日本公民身份与比利时公民身份之间，她倾向于选择前者，但后者只是面对新的伦理环境不得不做出的选择。阿梅丽还说道：“直到今天我还弄不明白：人生的道路是否最好于1970年8月底在鱼池中停住？”（111）对她始终持排斥态度的香岛太太救了企图自杀的阿梅丽，而比利时女孩也选择了放弃抵抗，她的第一次——直到今天为止仍然是唯一的一次自杀就这样结束了。自杀失败使阿梅丽意识到拒绝离开是徒劳的，所以她最终不得不选择了不完整的比利时公民身份。当谈到她是不是恨别人救了自己的命时，阿梅丽说道：“是的。但同时我是否因为被及时救上来而感到宽慰？是的。所以，我选择冷漠”（111）。阿梅丽的伦理选择是为了适应新的伦理环境而被动做出的，这违背了她自身的意愿，因此不完整的比利时公民身份注定是一次暂时性的伦理选择。作者阿梅丽·诺冬在后续作品中的描述也验证了这一说法——成年后的阿梅丽选择重返日本，她再次尝试着做一名日本人，即再次在日本公民身份与比利时公民身份之间进行了伦理选择。

作者阿梅丽·诺冬区别于传统法国文学家，她用自传体小说的形式将读者的目光转向主人公的内心世界，聚焦于人物的精神世界，通过自己对于东西方文化差异的理解诠释了一个比利时人在多元文化背景下对于伦理身份与伦理选择问题的思考。《管子的玄思》正是作者阿梅丽·诺冬所有作品中最能反映她对于伦理身份这一问题理解的作品。在一次访谈中，她曾说道：“在

某些时候，我还觉得自己是日本人”（143）。作者阿梅丽·诺冬从小远离家乡，生长于外国并深受当地文化影响，在《管子的玄思》中她为女主角阿梅丽构建了日本人与比利时人的双重伦理身份。而阿梅丽关于伦理身份的质疑、找寻与选择的经历，实际上反映了作者自身的伦理身份找寻过程。现实中的伦理身份与想象中的伦理身份间的矛盾、血缘伦理身份与异国文化熏陶下形成的伦理身份的矛盾等涉及到的伦理困境，正是作者阿梅丽·诺冬试图借助小说创作想要探讨的问题。“文学在本质上是伦理的艺术”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”12）。作者阿梅丽·诺冬通过文学创作来表达对于找寻自身伦理身份的诉求。通过描写祖母的巧克力、日本保姆的陪伴、溺水自杀等一系列伦理事件，突出展示了在多元文化背景下成长下的个人所面对的身份确认与伦理选择上的困难。通过阿梅丽向世界发出一个希望关注“无国籍人士”身份问题的呐喊，给读者带来了诸多关于多元文化背景下个人成长和伦理身份选择的思考。

Works Cited

- Amanieux, Laureline. *Le récit siamois: Identité et personnage dans l'œuvre d'Amélie Nothomb*. Paris: Albin Michel, 2009.
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”，《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.]
- ：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014年。
- [—, *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- 阿梅丽·诺冬：《管子的玄思》，许永健译。深圳：海天出版社，2002年。
- [Nothomb, Amélie. *Métaphysiques des tubes*. Trans. Xu Yongjian. Shenzhen: Haitian Press, 2002.]
- 尚必武：“成长的不能承受之轻：麦克尤恩《水泥花园》的伦理意识与伦理选择”，《外语教学》4（2014）：71-75。
- [Shang Biwu. “The Unbearable Lightness of Growth: Ethical Consciousness and Ethical Choice in *The Cement Garden* of McEwan.” *Foreign Language Education* 4(2014): 26-34.]

过度阐释：巴赫金复调小说理论接受的主体性研究

Overinterpretation: Subjectivity in Acceptance of Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel Theory

叶 林 (Ye Lin) 姚婷婷 (Yao Tingting)

内容摘要：任何文学理论的阐释都离不开接受者的主体性，阐释主体往往会根据自身需求，对所接受理论的某个侧面进行“为我所用”的彰显，巴赫金复调小说理论的接受就是如此。20 世纪 50 年代末至 60 年代初“解冻文学”时期的苏联文艺学界、60 年代下半期转向解构主义的法国符号学界以及 80 年代初改革开放的中国学界，对该理论进行过三次主体性极强的，甚至是过度的阐释，凸显了该理论的“对话”思想。事实上，从巴赫金本人的著作和一些史实材料分析来看，“复调”、“对话”是“在艺术构思的范围内”展开的，“多声部”必然是服从于主旋律的。“复调”结构的深层根源是东正教的“聚和性”，即“和而不同”。“和”是前提，是主旋律，绝对的“对话”是不存在的，“对话”的目的是为了“和”。本文通过还原巴赫金复调小说理论的本来面目，为国际学界对巴赫金复调小说理论的认识，对巴赫金其他俄苏文学理论的研究，提供有价值的参考。

关键词：巴赫金；复调；阐释；主体性

作者简介：叶林，文学博士，南京师范大学外国语言文学学科博士后，主要从事俄罗斯语言文学研究；姚婷婷（通讯作者），南京师范大学外国语言学与应用语言学专业博士研究生，皖江工学院副教授，主要从事符号学和翻译学研究。本文系国家社会科学基金重大招标项目“东正教与俄罗斯文学研究”【项目编号：15ZD092】的阶段性成果。

Title: Overinterpretation: Subjectivity in Acceptance of Bakhtin's Polyphonic Novel Theory

Abstract: The interpretation of any literature theory is inseparable from the receiver's subjectivity. The interpretive subject often manifests a certain aspect of the accepted theory according to his own needs, such as the acceptance of Bakhtin's polyphonic novel theory. The Soviet literature and art circles in the period of "unfreeze literature" from 1950s to 1960s, the French semiotics turning to the period of deconstruction from later 1960s to early 1970s, and the Chinese academic circles in the period of Reform and Opening-up since early 1980s, have

once conducted overinterpretation three times on Bakhtin's polyphonic novel theory and especially stressed its "dialogism." According to Bakhtin's works and some historical material, "polyphony" and "dialogism" are actually performed within the conception of poetic, and "multi-voice" is inevitably subject to the theme of a certain literature. "Polyphonic" structure stems from the concept of "integration" of Orthodox Church, which means being integrated while remaining different. "Integration" should be regarded as the precondition and the theme in polyphonic structure. There exists no absolute "dialogism" as one makes a dialogue for the sake of "integration." This paper tries to restore Bakhtin's polyphonic novel theory in order to provide a valuable reference for understanding the theory and other Soviet-Russian literary theories of Bakhtin.

Key words: Bakhtin; polyphony; interpretation; subjectivity

Authors: Ye Lin, Ph. D., is Postdoctoral Fellow at School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Nanjing Normal University (Nanjing 210097, China). His current academic research mainly focuses on Russian linguistics and literature (Email: yl09034@aliyun.com). Yao Tingting (corresponding author) is Doctoral Candidate of Foreign Language and Applied Linguistics at School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Nanjing Normal University (Nanjing 210097, China). She is also Associate Professor at Wanjiang University of Technology (Maanshan 243031, China). Her current academic research mainly focuses on translation and semiotics (Email: Karen1020@aliyun.com).

任何文学理论的接受和阐释都与接受者的主体性密切相关，主体性的过度阐释往往影响着学界对被阐释对象的理解，甚至会导致一定的误读。巴赫金的复调小说理论的接受就存在着过度阐释的问题。早在 20 世纪 80 年代，该理论就引起了我国文艺学界的密切关注，《外国文学评论》等杂志多次发文展开讨论¹，巴赫金的复调小说理论获得了广泛的赞誉。巴赫金的“对话”思想，已经深刻影响了整个东西方学术界。然而，随着研究的不断深入，越来越多的问题不断涌现，甚至难以解决。比如，巴赫金作为一位提倡“对话”的思想家，却很少与别人“对话”。20 世纪 20 年代，除《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》（*Проблемы творчества Достоевского*, 1929）一书，在巴赫金及其同伴撰写的其他著作中，为什么“对话”和“复调”的思想几乎很少反映。巴赫金一生只对涉及复调理论的《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》一书

1 《外国文学评论》自创刊号起就多次刊登研究巴赫金的论文并展开讨论，参见钱中文、宋大图（1987 第 1 期），黄梅（1989 年第 1 期）、钱中文、张杰（1989 年第 4 期），吴晓都、夏忠宪（1995 年第 1 期）等。

做出修改并重新再版¹，其原因究竟何在？

当然，我们可以将巴赫金本人孤僻的性格²与其相对开放的理论思想分别看待。其实，学界就此也早有讨论，甚至有学者开始质疑，在20世纪20年代，巴赫金与瓦·尼·沃洛希诺夫(Волошинов В. Н.)、巴·尼·梅德韦杰夫(Медведев П. Н.)等合著的书，并非出自巴赫金之手。但，当巴赫金本人多次被问及著作权问题时，他虽不愿过多解释，却明确表示这些著作确实出自自己笔下，这一点在鲍恰罗夫(Бочаров С. Г.) 1974年11月21日与巴赫金的谈话记录中就有记载³。在莫尔托瓦大学与巴赫金一起共事25年的孔金(Конкин С.С.)，在《米·巴赫金：生活与创作之页》(Михаил Бахтин страницы жизни и творчества, 1993)中，通过分析这些著作与巴赫金在学术思想上的一致性后，指出：“在这种合作上，对全书具有决定作用的话语只属于其中一位，就是——米·巴赫金”(Конкин & Конкина 134)。

那么，《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》中提出的“复调小说理论”及其“对话”思想，为什么会与巴赫金同时代的其他著作的话语风格如此不同呢？在我们对巴赫金“复调”、“对话”思想的认识中，是否存在“为我所用”的过度阐释呢？本文将依据巴赫金本人的著作和一些史实材料，从思想和宗教文化渊源等方面，对“复调小说理论”及其“对话”思想，进行重新阐释，还巴赫金“对话”思想以本来面目，为国际学界对巴赫金复调小说理论的认识，提供有价值的参考。

一、阐释的主体性：“为我所用”

巴赫金的复调小说理论形成于20世纪20年代末，直到20世纪50年代末至60年代初，才逐步得到学界关注。1961年6月，苏联科学院高尔基世界文学研究所的柯日诺夫(Кожин В.В.)、鲍恰罗夫等专程赶到萨兰斯克，在摩尔托瓦大学与巴赫金会面。巴赫金第一次在苏联学术界受到如此重视，并获得高度评价。此后，巴赫金接受他们的建议，着手修订《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》，并在柯日诺夫的帮助下，将此书更名为《陀思妥耶夫斯基诗学问题》(Проблемы поэтики Достоевского)于1963年再版。

巴赫金理论被发掘似乎纯属巧合，是柯日诺夫偶然阅读到《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》。其实，这又是与当时苏联的意识形态环境息息相关的。在斯大林死后，1954年，第二次全苏作家代表大会对《苏联作家协会章程》(Устав Союза советских писателей, 1934)中的社会主义现实主义进行修订，即删除了“艺术描写的真实性和历史具体性必须与用社会主义精神从思想上

1 1963年再版后更名为《陀思妥耶夫斯基诗学问题》(Проблемы поэтики Достоевского)。

2 参见严志军、张杰：“苏俄文艺符号学在中国的接受与变形”，《江海学刊》4(2013)：194-199。

3 参见钱中文：“理论是可以常青的——论巴赫金的意义”，《巴赫金全集》第1卷，钱中文编(石家庄：河北教育出版社，2009年)12。

改造和教育劳动人民的任务结合起来”（Союз советских писателей СССР 13）。大会同时删去了“要求艺术家从现实的革命发展中真实地、历史地、具体地去描写现实”中的“历史地、具体地”，后来在1959年的第三次全苏作家代表大会上才恢复了这两个副词（张杰，《20世纪俄苏文学批评理论史》6）。1954年的《章程》修订标志着苏联文学的新探索。1956年2月苏共二十大确立了反对个人崇拜的主张，同年在苏联文艺界开展了艺术审美本质的大讨论，文学批评开始关注文学创作的审美功能。1957年4月和1959年3月，苏联科学院高尔基世界文学研究所与苏联作家协会先后共同举办了“世界文学中的现实主义问题”（Проблемы реализма в мировой литературе）和“社会主义现实主义问题”（Проблемы социалистического реализма）学术研讨会。这两次会议对现实主义问题做了深入探讨，也对文艺批评中的教条主义现象进行了批评，推动了文学创作和批评的审美转向。

1956年，在陀思妥耶夫斯基逝世75周年之际，苏联文艺界展开了关于该作家创作的大讨论。各主要报刊杂志几乎均发表了纪念文章，充分肯定了这位19世纪伟大的俄罗斯作家。相关重要论文被收录成集，1959年由苏联科学院出版社出版。¹这次大讨论反映了苏联文艺学界对陀思妥耶夫斯基创作评价的积极转向，以及对社会主义现实主义创作方法的开放态度。

社会存在决定社会意识。²时代环境的巨变必然会导致文学创作和研究的深刻变革。在这场变革中，苏联文艺界急需找到一种理论思想，为文学的审美研究提供有效的方法，为思想解放开辟新的途径。巴赫金提出的“复调”、“对话”等思想，正好迎合了这一时代需求。因此，巴赫金的学术思想才得以在苏联学界被发掘和推介，其中顺应学界需求的理论被突出甚至加倍放大，而不合时宜的部分则被忽视和遮蔽。这实际上与当时苏联文艺界解放思想的需求、文学批评话语的变化等是密不可分的。究其根本，则是因为任何思想的阐释和接受都无法避免接受者自身的主体性限制，而主体性的不同和社会环境的变化，会导致理论或思想的不同阐释。总之，学界对巴赫金的学术思想进行过三次重大阐释，第一次阐释正是发生在20世纪50年代末60年代初的苏联，是带有苏联学术界主体性的“为我”阐释与理论“重构”。这一阐释虽然带有一定的主观片面性，但在学术“解冻”时期，为苏联文艺界在社会主义现实主义框架内的文学创作研究，提供了新的审美批评方法，促进了学界思想的解放，把文学艺术形式的研究引向深处。

巴赫金真正赢得世界声望，还是到了20世纪60年代下半期。当时，法国学者朱莉娅·克里斯蒂娃（Julia Kristeva）把巴赫金介绍到了法国，引起了

1 参见 Институт мировой литературы им. А. М. Горького АН СССР: «Творчество Ф. М. Достоевского» (Москва: Издательство Академии наук СССР, 1959) 546.

2 参见马克思：《〈政治经济学批判〉序言》，载《马克思恩格斯选集》第2卷（北京：人民出版社，1972）82。

欧洲学界对巴赫金的关注。1966年,这位年仅25岁的青年女性在巴黎举办的“话语的语言学:罗兰·巴特研讨班”(Le séminaire de Roland Barthes: La linguistique du discours)上,以“词、对话和小说”(Le mot, le dialogue et le roman)为题,对巴赫金学说进行了介绍。克里斯蒂娃按照自己的逻辑与需求,对巴赫金学说进行了理论改造,实现了对结构主义的超越,并首次提出了互文性(Intertextuality)概念。这篇论文发表在1967年的《批评家》(Critique)杂志上。¹ 克里斯蒂娃对巴赫金思想的改造持续了半个多世纪,巴赫金对她的影响“已经内化到她的学术思想内部,成为其思维方式了”(曾军194)。在巴赫金思想的基础上,克里斯蒂娃及其理论向解构主义转型,提出以“多元逻辑”和“边界门坎”为代表的文化理论思想。巴赫金学说之所以被克里斯蒂娃关注,并受到欧洲学界的欢迎,这也与“为我所用”的阐释主体性关系密切。其主体性根源于20世纪60年代中后期法国乃至整个欧洲思想界的深刻变革。20世纪60年代法国等西方国家知识界对民主和自由的渴望日益增长。特别是在1968年爆发的法国“五月风暴”²(Mai 68)被镇压以后,思想界迫切需要一种能够打破中心和结构的理论。巴赫金的“复调”、“对话”、“狂欢化”等思想恰好契合了这种需求,为从结构主义向解构主义的过渡提供了理论条件。

1995年,卡米尔·艾里-穆阿里(Camille Ally-Mulally)曾受《对话·狂欢·时空体》(Диалог карнавал хронотоп)杂志委托,在巴黎对克里斯蒂娃进行了采访。采访中,克里斯蒂娃承认,她一开始就将预先设计好的“曲解”带入了对巴赫金的接受之中,并在“对话”、“对话主义”之后引入某些她认为必需的新概念——“互文性”(克里斯蒂娃214-224)。可见,克里斯蒂娃也承认了自己阐释的主体性问题。

显然,在20世纪50年代末至60年代初,苏联学界对巴赫金的第一次阐释所表现出的主体性,是基于苏联文艺界由意识形态本质论朝着审美本质论的转向。到了20世纪60年代下半期,法国学界对巴赫金的第二次阐释所表现出的主体性,则是根源于西方文艺学界由结构主义向解构主义的过渡。

巴赫金思想的第三次重大阐释,发生在20世纪80年代初的中国,正值中国改革开放初期。在1978年十一届三中全会召开后的三至四年间,巴赫金理论开始在中国学界被介绍和传播。首先是钱钟书关注到巴赫金的文艺思想。1981年陀思妥耶夫斯基诞辰100周年,夏仲翼在《苏联文学》1981年第1期上,发表了论文《窥探心灵奥秘的艺术〈陀思妥耶夫斯基艺术创作散论〉》。该文对巴赫金的“复调小说”做了简介,并在注释中提及《陀思妥耶夫斯基

1 参见 Kristeva J, "Bakhtine, le mot, le dialogue et le roman." Critique 23 (1967): 438-465.

2 五月风暴(Mai 68)是1968年5月至6月在法国爆发的一场学生罢课、工人罢工的群众运动,反映了由于整个欧洲各国经济增长速度缓慢而导致的一系列社会问题。

的诗学问题》(Проблемы поэтики Достоевского, 1963)。¹不久,关山在《关于陀思妥耶夫斯基研究的一些情况》一文中,正式谈到了巴赫金和该书。²《世界文学》在1982年第4期上推出的一组文章对早期的巴赫金研究影响最大,即夏仲翼对《陀思妥耶夫斯基的诗学问题》第一章的翻译和论文《陀思妥耶夫斯基的〈地下室手记〉和小说复调结构问题》³等。

巴赫金理论在中国的传播是与中国的改革开放进程联系在一起的。1978年关于真理标准问题的讨论带来了社会思想的大解放,也突破了文艺界研究的禁区。改革开放后,各种西方文论相继被引入国内,其中巴赫金的复调理论及其对话思想,为学界带来了文艺研究的新视角和新方法。由此可见,中国学界对巴赫金思想阐释的主体性也是十分清晰的,也是为我所用的。当然,这种主体性阐释推动了我国的文艺理论建设。

20世纪50年代末至60年代初、60年代下半期、80年代初的三次重大阐释,分别推进了苏联艺术审美本质论的转向,欧洲向解构主义的过渡,以及中国的思想解放,对国际学术界产生了积极的影响。然而,这三次过度阐释又难免会造成对巴赫金的学术思想阐释的偏颇,未能完整展示其思想原貌。

二、修订的适时宜:“去历史化”

从巴赫金的一生来看,他是一位主观性极强的思想家。在长达80年的生活中,他很少与人交流,性格孤僻,难得修订自己的学术著作,只对反映其“对话”思想的《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》进行过再版。为什么巴赫金偏偏会修订这本书呢?

这是与20世纪50年代苏联的社会意识形态环境剧变密切相关的。苏联美学家亚·伊·布罗夫(Александр Иванович Буров)在1956年出版了《艺术的审美实质》(Эстетическая сущность искусства),引发了学界艺术审美本质的大讨论。这场讨论无疑与当时苏联反对个人崇拜、突破理论和思想禁区的需求分不开。在50年代以前,苏联文艺界主要坚持的是意识形态本质论,而到了“解冻时期”才真正转向艺术审美本质的探究。

为了让自己的著作更适应时代的需求,巴赫金将《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》做了部分的修改。他删去了不少与社会历史批评相关的部分,凸显了复调和对话,彰显了陀思妥耶夫斯基小说的艺术构造,以便更契合艺术审美本质论的转向。该书的再版就是充分实践了艺术审美本质的美学思想。

然而,被删节的部分恰好反映出巴赫金最初创作中对历史维度的思考。

1 参见夏仲翼:“窥探心灵奥秘的艺术——陀思妥耶夫斯基艺术创作散论”,《苏联文学》1(1981):132-136。

2 参见关山:“关于陀思妥耶夫斯基研究的一些情况”,《外国文学研究》3(1981):142-143。

3 参见夏仲翼:“陀思妥耶夫斯基的〈地下室手记〉和小说复调结构问题”,《世界文学》4(1982):105-115。

在《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》的开头，被删节了“一切历史问题我们都排除不谈（……）相反，我们认为，每一个理论问题均须作历史的考察。在文学作品研究的共时方法和历时方法之间，应有不可分割的联系和严格的彼此制约”（巴赫金 358）。这里，巴赫金其实承认了文学体裁的研究离不开历史维度的考察，甚至表示“我们随时都考虑到了历史的角度（……）历史的角度成了我们感受所研究的每一现象的背景”（巴赫金 358）。再版时，删除这些语句明显是为了突出研究的艺术维度而弱化历史维度。

尽管再版中许多关于历史维度的论述遭到删节，但纵观巴赫金在 20 世纪 20 年代的创作，不难发现巴赫金学术思想总体呈现出社会历史的特征。这一特征在巴赫金同时期的其他著作中，表现得尤为明显，如《文艺学中的形式主义》（*Формальный метод в литературоведении*, 1928）、《弗洛伊德主义：批判纲要》（*Фрейдизм Критический очерк*, 1927）和《马克思主义与语言哲学》（*Марксизм и философия языка*, 1929）等。《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》也未脱离自身创作的总体特征而标新立异，这可以从全书另一处被删除的部分看出：

作为本书分析的基础的，是这样一种认识：任何文学作品本身内在都具有社会性。作品中交织着各种活生生的社会力量，作品形式的每一要素无不渗透着活生生的社会评价。所以，即使纯形式的分析，也应把艺术结构的每一要素看作活生生的社会力量的折射点，看作这样一个艺术的结晶体：它的各个棱面经过加工琢磨，都折射着各种社会评价，并且是在一定视角下的折射。（巴赫金 358-359）

巴赫金完成《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》的写作是在 20 世纪 20 年代中后期。此时，布尔什维克已把工作的重点由巩固政权、稳定社会经济，转向对意识形态环境的关注。布尔什维克作为以马克思主义为指导思想的执政党，坚持社会科学研究的“社会性”和“历史性”。巴赫金的研究也不例外，他在该时期撰写的学术专著中，总会强调自己是马克思主义者。

然而，到了 20 世纪 50 年代中后期，苏联社会意识形态环境的急剧变化，要求巴赫金及其研究者们必须适应这一新的历史潮流。因此，轻历史、重形式分析等就成了巴赫金重新修订《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》的主导思想。为了显示文学的解冻，“复调”、“对话”、“狂欢化”、“时空体”、“未完成性”等关键词，频繁出现在巴赫金创作于 20 世纪 60 年代的论著之中，尤其是在《陀思妥耶夫斯基的诗学问题》与《拉伯雷的创作以及中世纪和文艺复兴的民间文化》（*Творчество Франсуа Рабле и народная культура Средневековья и Ренессанса*, 1965）两部专著中。

巴赫金对其专著的修订和对“复调”思想的彰显，是为了迎合社会历史

环境的“被动修正”，还是为了“主动恢复”其受制于环境而未能表达的真实学术思想呢？弄清这个问题，需要从巴赫金著作出发，给予其思想相对客观的分析，并探究其产生的社会历史文化渊源，从而还原巴赫金学术思想的本来面貌。

三、复调的主旋律：“和而不同”

关于巴赫金的复调理论，学界引用最多的是关于陀思妥耶夫斯基长篇小说基本特点的描述，即“有着众多的各自独立而不相融合的声音和意识，由具有充分价值的不同声音组成真正的复调”（巴赫金 4）。“陀思妥耶夫斯基是复调小说的首创者。他创造出一种全新的小说体裁”（巴赫金 5）。巴赫金在这里借鉴了音乐中“复调”或曰“多声部”的概念，以此来评价陀思妥耶夫斯基小说创作的结构，即主人公“不仅仅是作者议论所表现的客体，而且也是直抒己见的主体”（巴赫金 5），甚至可以与作者平等对话。主人公意识的独立性、主人公与作者的平等对话关系，被视为理解复调理论的关键，也是该理论延伸出“对话”思想的基础。

在复调或曰“多声部”作品中，通常有两条及其以上的独立旋律，通过技术处理，和谐地结合在一起。不同的独立旋律是要交融成一个主旋律，并非脱离和谐的独立。巴赫金再指出：“陀思妥耶夫斯基笔下的主要人物，在艺术家的创作构思之中，便的确不仅仅是作者议论所表现的客体，而且也是直抒己见的主体”（巴赫金 5）。如果离开“艺术构思”前提，“对话”和“复调”是不可能的。任何复调音乐和人物平等对话都是艺术家有意安排的。作家是把争论中的每一观点都发挥到最大的限度，使之具有最强的说服力。在作家的精心策划下，不同话语的对话才形成一个拥有多声部的主旋律。

从作家的伦理身份来看，陀思妥耶夫斯基尽可能给自己的主人公以直抒己见的最大空间，让每一个主人公都可以从自己的伦理身份出发，充分表达自己的观点，并通过自我内心或与他人之间的对话，实现伦理身份的自由选择，作家并不强迫主人公赞同自己的观点，而是使之成为与自己平等的对话者。在这里，作家进入了最高的伦理境界，给主人公以自由，而并非把自己的思想强加给人物。陀思妥耶夫斯基就如同一个高级的指挥家，站在自由伦理选择的舞台上，艺术地指挥着由各种观点交织而成的“交响乐”。显而易见，陀思妥耶夫斯基创作的主体性，是在复调小说的创作艺术中整体实现的。作家在创作中尊重主人公，甚至每一个人物，这本身就是一种高尚道德的体现。例如，在创作长篇小说《罪与罚》的过程中，作家让以“恶”抗“恶”的大学生拉斯柯尔尼科夫，与以“善”待“恶”的妓女索尼娅，从自身的伦理身份出发，均充分表达自己的观点。似乎这时作家的声音只是其中的一种，处于平等之中。其实，陀思妥耶夫斯基实现了自己创作的伦理道德目标，即为创作和阅读争取了最大的自由。作家的主体性并非是某一个主人公的观点

或思想，而是不同声音碰撞中的和谐之音。

从《陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作问题》中的《陀思妥耶夫斯基的对话》（*Диалог у Достоевского*, 1929）一章被删节的部分来看，巴赫金确实充分肯定了作者创作的意向：“作者的创作意向所在，完全不是这些思想本身，不是某种中态的和一成不变的思想。不，意向所指，恰好是通过多种不同的声音展现主题，是这一主题原则上具有的，可以说很常见的多声性和歧声性。不同声音的配置方法本身及其相互作用，正是陀思妥耶夫斯基认为至关重要的”（巴赫金 362-363）。“狭义上的思想，即主人公作为思想家的种种观点，也是根据上述的构建原则进入对话之中的”（巴赫金 363）。巴赫金在这里强调的是，主人公之间或主人公与作者之间的对话是服从于作家构建原则的，“多声性”和“歧声性”是展现主题的。实际上，在陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作中，既不存在完全脱离作家艺术构思的平等对话，也不可能有不体现主旋律的“复调”和“多声部”。巴赫金的文学批评方法，特别是研究陀思妥耶夫斯基的小说创作，也是呈现出“整体性”与“系统化”特征的（张杰，《复调小说理论研究》34-52）。

其实，陀思妥耶夫斯基的复调小说创作是与19世纪俄罗斯社会历史环境息息相关的。巴赫金本人十分清楚这一点，只是故意回避了复调小说产生的思想和社会根源，以免落入社会历史批评的范式。巴赫金在《陀思妥耶夫斯基诗学问题》一书开头就指出：“本书论述的是陀思妥耶夫斯基的诗学问题，因之对他的创作，仅仅是从这个角度加以考察”（巴赫金1）。

然而，陀思妥耶夫斯基创作及其小说“复调”结构的文化渊源和思想根源是不容忽视的。尼·亚·别尔嘉耶夫（Бердяев Н. А.）在论及俄罗斯文学的基本特征时，曾指出：“从果戈理开始的俄国文学成为一种训诫文学。它探索真理，并教示实现真理。俄罗斯文学不是产生于个人和人民的痛苦和多灾多难的命运，而是产生于对拯救全人类的探索。这就意味着俄国文学的基本主题是宗教的”（Бердяев, *Истоки и смысл русского коммунизма* 63）。他认为，陀思妥耶夫斯基发现了俄罗斯人的独特精神建构并以自己的创作反映了俄罗斯民族的东正教精神。他明确指出：“我们是陀思妥耶夫斯基的精神之子”（Бердяев, *Трагедия и обыденность* 144）。陀思妥耶夫斯基并非是通过自己作品中的主人公，简单地宣扬自己的伦理道德观点，而是通过作品的整体艺术效果，给人以高度的自由感，并由此来实现文学创作的伦理表达。这种表达既不是非此即彼的道德说教，而是多声部的包容、自我和他人的自由追求，从而实现心灵“救赎”。

当代东正教文学批评家叶萨乌洛夫（Есаулов И. А.）指出：“陀思妥耶夫斯基诗学中的东正教‘符码’是显而易见的”（Есаулов 130）。从文化渊源来看，陀思妥耶夫斯基小说创作的“复调”结构源自俄罗斯东正教文化的核心理念之一“聚和性”（*соборность*）。这是由斯拉夫派领袖阿·斯·霍

米亚科夫 (А. С. Хомяков, 1804-1860) 最早提出的。他认为: “‘собор’ (教堂) 这个词还有更一般的意义, 即这种集合的永久性观念, 换言之, 它体现了 ‘多样性中的统一’ 思想” (Хомяков 325)。“聚” 就是指为了共同的信仰而聚集到一起, “和” 是 “和而不同” 的 “和”。这里体现了东正教的博爱精神, 即把不同的观点都聚集在一起, 只要信仰一致, 都应该包容。

在陀思妥耶夫斯基创作中, 主人公之间或主人公与作者之间的平等对话, 是在艺术构思中展开的。“和而不同” 中 “和” 是主旋律, 不同话语间的 “对话” 是服从于主旋律的。这种主旋律在陀思妥耶夫斯基的创作中表现为 “救赎”, 也就是从范围上来说, “救赎” 他人、自我、民族乃至整个人类等, 从层次上来看, “救赎” 外在世界、心灵, 追求精神的复活和理想境界等。例如, 在陀思妥耶夫斯基的长篇小说《罪与罚》中, 拉斯柯尔尼科夫的 “用暴力抗恶” 与索尼娅的 “勿以暴力抗恶” 之间的对话, 其实都是服从于 “救赎” 这一主旋律的。“救赎” 就是俄罗斯东正教精神本源之一的 “弥赛亚” (Миссия, 拉丁语 *missio*) 意识的精髓, 也是俄罗斯文学创作的主要思想源泉之一。

任何理论的阐释都无法摆脱阐释者自身的主体性, 而社会意识形态环境又是导致理论阐释结果的重要因素。虽然理论界可以根据自我需求加以阐释, 而且有时这种主体性阐释有助于推动社会向前发展, 但是还原理论的本来面目, 尽量避免过度阐释, 是研究必须持有的科学态度, 对巴赫金复调小说理论的研究也是如此。这种还原不仅不会颠覆对巴赫金 “复调” 理论及其 “对话” 思想的看法, 相反会使我们更加深入和全面地了解这一理论和思想, 更可以为我们对外国文学理论的接受和阐释, 提供值得借鉴的思考。

Works Cited

- 巴赫金: 《巴赫金全集》第5卷, 钱中文编, 白春仁 顾亚铃译。石家庄: 河北教育出版社, 2009年。
[Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich. *The Complete Works of Bakhtin*. Vol. 5. Eds. Qian Zhongwen. Trans. Bai Chunren and Gu Yaling. Shijiazhuang: Hebei Education Press, 2009.]
- Бердяев, Николай Александрович. Истоки и смысл русского коммунизма. Москва: Наука, 1990.
[Berdyayev, Nikolay Alexandrovich. *The Origins and Meaning of Russian Communism*. Moscow: Science Press, 1990.]
- 。Трагедия и обыденность. Москва: Искусства, 1994.
[—。 *Tragedy and Ordinary*. Moscow: The Arts Press, 1994.]
- Есаулов, Иван Андреевич. Категория соборности в русской литературе. Петрозаводск: Издательство Петрозаводского университета, 1995.
[Esaulov, Ivan Andreevich. *The Category of Sobornost in Russian Literature*. Petrozavodsk: Petrozavodsk UP, 1995.]
- Хомяков, Алексей Степанович. Полное собрание сочинений в 8 т. Т. 2. Москва: Университетская типография, 1886.

[Khomyakov, Alexey Stepanovich. *Complete Works in 8 Vols. Vol 2*. Moscow: University Publishing House, 1886.]

Конкин, Семен Семенович & Конкина Лариса Семеновна. Михаил Бахтин: Страницы жизни и творчества. Саранск: Мордовское книжное издательство, 1993.

[Konkin, Semen Semenovitch, and Konkina Larisa Semenovna. *Mikhail Bakhtin: Pages of Life and Work*. Saransk: Mordovian Book Publishing House, 1993.]

朱莉亚·克里斯蒂娃 周启超: “朱莉娅·克里斯蒂娃谈米哈伊尔·巴赫金”, 《马克思主义美学研究》1(2013): 214-224。

[Kristeva, Julia and Zhou Qichao. “About Mikhail Bakhtin.” *Research on Marxist Aesthetics* 1(2013): 214-224.]

Союз советских писателей СССР. Устав Союза советских писателей СССР. Москва: Советское законодательство, 1935.

[Union of Soviet writers. *Charter of the Union of Soviet Writers*. Moscow: Soviet Law, 1935.]

曾军: “克里斯蒂娃接受巴赫金思想的多元逻辑”, 《文学评论》4 (2013): 188-196.

[Zeng, Jun. “Kristeva's Multiple Logic of Acception of the Bakhtin's Thoughts.” *Literary Review* 4 (2013): 188-196.]

张杰等著: 《20 世纪俄苏文学批评理论史》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2017 年。

[Zhang Jie et al. *The History of Russian and Soviet Literary Criticism in 20th Century*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2017.]

张杰: 《复调小说理论研究》。桂林: 漓江出版社, 1992 年。

[Zhang Jie. *A Theoretical Study of Polyphonic Novels*. Guilin: Lijiang Press, 1992.]

萧伯纳戏剧研究的创新：评刘茂生教授的《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》

Innovation in the Study of Bernard Shaw's Plays: A Review of *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays*

聂珍钊 (Nie Zhenzhao)

内容提要：《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》（刘茂生著，人民出版社出版，2019年12月）独辟蹊径，以文学伦理学批评为研究方法，在文本细读的基础上，结合维多利亚文学的背景充分发掘萧伯纳戏剧作品中的伦理价值，系统地论述了萧伯纳戏剧创作四个阶段中伦理思想的独特表达形式及丰富思想，重点解读了萧伯纳戏剧的社会与政治两大基本主题，强调文学反映现实的责任和教诲读者的功能。该著结构完整，逻辑严密，证据充分，观点新颖，无论是从方法论上看，还是从研究中得出的观点和结论看，都具有突出的创新意识，是一项研究萧伯纳戏剧创作的开创性成果，为萧伯纳的研究提供了一种全新的思路和路径，同时亦为重新认识萧伯纳及其在英国文学史中的重要地位提供了成功的研究范例。

关键词：社会与政治；伦理表达；萧伯纳戏剧；刘茂生

作者简介：聂珍钊，浙江大学外语学院教授，浙江大学世界文学跨学科研究中心主任，欧洲科学院外籍院士，中文学术期刊《文学跨学科研究》（A&HCI收录）主编，英文学术期刊《世界文学研究论坛》（ESCI收录）执行主编。本文系国家社科基金重大招标项目“当代西方伦理批评文献的整理、翻译与研究”【项目编号：19ZDA292】的阶段性成果。

Title: Innovation in the Study of Bernard Shaw's Plays: A Review of *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays*

Abstract: Liu Maosheng's new book *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays* (Published by People's Publishing House in 2019) offers a unique and innovative perspective to the works of George Bernard Shaw by adopting Ethical Literary Criticism as the analytical approach. Based on close reading, the book fully explores the ethical values of Shaw's plays against the backdrop of Victorian literature as a whole, and systematically expounds the unique expression and richness of Shaw's

ethical ideals developed in his four phases of play writing, with a special focus on interpretation of society and politics, two fundamental themes in Shaw's plays, and an emphasis on literature's responsibility to reflect reality and its function to educate readers. This book features structural integrity, vigorous logic, sufficient textual evidence and innovative opinions, with both its analytical perspective and the arguments and conclusion drawn being profoundly original. It's a pioneering work in the research of Shaw's play writing which provides a brand-new approach to the study of Shaw's works and serves as successful research model to help us better reflect on Shaw's significant contribution to English Literature.

Key words: Society and Politics; Ethical Expressions; Bernard Shaw's Plays; Liu Maosheng

Author: Nie Zhenzhao is currently Professor of Literature at Zhejiang University, where he is affiliated with the School of International Studies. In December 2017 he launched the university-chartered Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of World Literatures, which he is now directing. He is an elected foreign member of Academia Europaea (Academy of Europe). He also serves as Editor-in-Chief of two journals in humanities: *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* and *Forum for World Literature Studies*. His scholarly interests range across a broad swatch of fields, including ethical literary criticism, literary theory, poetry and poetics, and translation.

经过多年的潜心研究，刘茂生教授的新作、国家社科基金资助课题《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》最终完成，并已由人民出版社出版。这部著作是刘茂生教授继完成国家社科基金课题“艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究”之后奉献给学界的又一重要学术成果。同多年前他完成的王尔德研究一样，这部新作是他长期深入研究萧伯纳的学术结晶，它既是我国萧伯纳戏剧研究的最新成果，也是我国萧伯纳研究的标志性成果。这部学术著作的出版，必将进一步推动我国萧伯纳戏剧研究，把我国萧伯纳研究提升到新的学术水准，可喜可贺。

萧伯纳（George Bernard Shaw, 1856-1950）是出生在爱尔兰的剧作家，在青年时代就离开故乡来到英国。萧伯纳的戏剧创作深受戏剧家易卜生的影响，认为戏剧的主要任务就是反映社会的问题，强调戏剧的主要作用就是通过演绎不同人物的人生，在潜移默化中提升观众的道德水平。在萧伯纳看来，传统的道德观念已经落后于社会发展，因此戏剧创作的主要目标就是寻找和建立新的道德规范用以解决现实社会问题。他在戏剧中倡导“创造进化论”，宣扬易卜生主义、费边（改良）社会主义，目的就是改良社会思想，助力人们的道德水准的提升。

萧伯纳和王尔德一样，也是较早被介绍到中国的英国作家之一。1915年11月，陈独秀在《新青年》杂志上发表的论文《现代欧洲文艺史谭》中指出：“现代欧洲文坛第一推崇者，厥唯剧本……剧作名家若那威之易卜生，俄罗斯安德雷甫，英人王尔德、白纳少（萧伯纳）……皆其国之代表作家，其剧称名于世者也。”1916年，胡适撰文对萧伯纳创作的社会问题剧大加赞赏。此后，当时中国的主流刊物《新青年》不断刊登评论萧伯纳的文章，好评如潮。萧伯纳通过戏剧创作揭露资本主义社会制度的黑暗，对资本主义进行批判的现实主义倾向在当时知识界引起强烈共鸣，受到热烈欢迎。事实上，当时中国学界已经把萧伯纳看成世界上最重要的作家之一。

萧伯纳被认为是继莎士比亚之后英国最伟大的批判现实主义戏剧家，在其长达六十年的文学生涯中，他创作了长篇小说，撰写了大量的政论、评论文章及书信，但萧伯纳的戏剧创作仍代表了其文学创作的最高成就。1892年，萧伯纳创作完成并成功上演了他的第一部戏剧《鳏夫的房产》（*Widower's Houses*）。从这部戏剧开始，他的戏剧创作生涯持续了将近60年。直到1950年去世，他一共创作了五十一部戏剧作品。

萧伯纳是较早介绍到中国并在中国产生了广泛影响的英国作家之一。萧伯纳认为戏剧是“思想的工厂，良心的提示者，社会行为的说明人”，强调戏剧是教育与宣传的工具，坚持戏剧的价值在于提供观察社会的独特视角，鞭挞资本主义社会中的各种丑恶。萧伯纳立场鲜明地强调自己的文学观点，那就是文学创作题材必须反映现实社会生活，要在文学创作中阐明新的思想、道德，促进社会进步。萧伯纳创作的所有戏剧几乎都讨论了当时敏感的社会、政治、经济等问题，蕴含着丰富的思想内涵。同介绍到中国的其他著名西方作家相比，我国外国文学界对萧伯纳及其戏剧的研究仍显不足。但是，这种不足将随着刘茂生教授的《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》一书的出版而得到弥补。

刘茂生长期致力于英国作家的系列研究，在他完成了王尔德的小说和戏剧研究之后，又转而把萧伯纳作为自己的下一个研究目标。他从伦理批评的视角阅读、分析和思考萧伯纳的作品，探讨戏剧创作同伦理道德以及同社会的关系，深刻认识萧伯纳戏剧创作的伦理和社会价值。他采用伦理批评的方法解读萧伯纳的戏剧作品，充分发掘萧伯纳戏剧作品中的伦理价值，引领读者领悟和认识作品中所蕴含的深邃的伦理和社会思想，发现萧伯纳戏剧创作对于我们今天的价值。显然，刘茂生这部《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》一书同此前的研究相比，无论是在研究方法、术语运用方面，还是在戏剧主题、伦理思想、社会价值方面，都有许多创新和突破。

首先，刘茂生能够娴熟地运用文学伦理学批评的基本理论与核心术语，另辟蹊径，重新解读萧伯纳的戏剧创作。萧伯纳认为文学的最终目的就是“一种对生活的批评”，因此关注社会、关注生活、关注现实的政治不仅是时代

赋予作家的责任，也是作家勇于社会担当的自我选择。萧伯纳的戏剧创作始终能够坚持这一创作原则，坚持用戏剧描写社会，揭示社会生活的真相。运用文学伦理学批评的理论及相关术语，可以准确地对萧伯纳戏剧创作的道德倾向性作出评价，深入诠释萧伯纳的戏剧作品，充分认识萧伯纳的戏剧创作作为特定历史阶段独特表达形式的历史价值和现实价值。《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》一书从伦理的视角解读、分析和阐释萧伯纳戏剧作品中丰富的伦理内容，不仅对萧伯纳进行戏剧创作的动力从伦理上进行解说，而且还对萧伯纳通过戏剧表达自己的伦理道德观念进行客观评分，让我们接近一个真实的作家。刘茂生的《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》一书为萧伯纳及其戏剧研究提供了生动的研究范例，为萧伯纳及其戏剧研究的深入研究了奠定了新的基础。

其次，刘茂生这部新著能够突出重点，抓住萧伯纳戏剧的社会与政治两大基本主题展开讨论，能够针对不同作品提出问题，准确运用道德教诲、伦理意识、伦理环境、伦理身份、伦理选择等批评术语进行分析和解读。易卜生的戏剧以揭示社会问题而突出其伦理价值，萧伯纳同样如此。萧伯纳的全部戏剧创作几乎都是社会问题剧，几乎所有的重要社会问题都在萧伯纳的戏剧中受到关注。他的戏剧作品的触觉伸展到了社会生活的各个层面，从上流社会到平民阶级的各式人物都出现在他的戏剧中。他的“社会问题剧”从不回避而是直指当时社会的所有道德问题，目光敏锐，言词犀利，把残酷的事实真相揭示出来。刘茂生从伦理的视角解释萧伯纳戏剧文学中描写的不同生活现象，分析这些生活现象背后的伦理问题，并对这些生活现象作出价值判断。同时，他还根据英国现代戏剧发生、发展的脉络把英国文学传统和社会伦理环境和伦理语境结合在一起，以萧伯纳戏剧创作过程的四个时期为序，全方位、多层面地对萧伯纳戏剧创作的伦理思想进行解读，揭示萧伯纳戏剧的思想价值、艺术价值、现代意义等。萧伯纳戏剧创作的四个阶段也恰好体现了他对社会、政治、伦理等问题关注的进程。刘茂生把萧伯纳创作的每个阶段相互连结在一起，从整体上把握萧伯纳对社会伦理道德问题的关注，在全书中前后呼应、逐步深入，从而使他的研究达到了新的深度和高度。

第三，刘茂生坚持运用文学伦理学批评的方法分析萧伯纳创作的戏剧文本，坚持文学研究必须以文学文本为研究对象，表现出理论结合实际、方法解答问题的优良学风。萧伯纳的戏剧文本以其独特的艺术表现形式，全方位地展现了现代社会中丰富的伦理道德生活。他写作的戏剧文本将现代人的伦理困境、价值取向表现得淋漓尽致。“怎样生活”这个问题本身就是一个道德命题，现实中每一个人都在用这样或那样的方式提出怎样生活的问题。怎样生活的问题就是怎样选择的问题，每一个人都要经历各种自我选择，都要经历自我选择的过程并面对自我选择的结果。所有的伦理选择以及在自我选择过程中表现出来的心理活动和精神状态，都是通过戏剧文本表现的。文学

的伦理价值不能脱离文学文本存在，因此文学的分析与批评也必须以文学文本为对象。无论是心理分析、精神分析还是伦理道德的评价，都不能离开戏剧文本。刘茂生之所以能在萧伯纳研究中取得突出成就，就在于他在整个研究过程中始终能够坚持对戏剧文本的分析研究。

第四，强调文学反映现实的责任，突出文学的教诲功能。刘茂生开始对萧伯纳进行研究之前，已经对王尔德创作的伦理思想进行了系统研究并取得了突破性成就。因此，刘茂生的王尔德研究为他继续研究萧伯纳奠定了坚实基础，创造了条件，提供了借鉴。他把萧伯纳及其创作放在整个维多利亚文学的背景中展开研究，分析萧伯纳戏剧创作发展的内部逻辑，创造性地归纳了从王尔德到萧伯纳艺术创作的内在规律，发现了萧伯纳戏剧创作的伦理传统，这就是文学必须反映现实，必须对读者具有正面的教诲价值。文学伦理学批评强调文学及其批评的社会责任，强调文学的伦理价值在于读者能够从文学阅读中获得教诲。维多利亚时代的文学无论创作还是批评，突出道德教诲是那个时期文学最显著的特征。王尔德以其机智、华丽、幽默的语言对抗维多利亚时代虚伪的道德，他以唯美主义的艺术风格消解了当时盛行的伪善道德。萧伯纳在接受易卜生戏剧创作影响的同时，也从王尔德的创作中获取了营养，因此他在戏剧创作中更加突出戏剧惩恶扬善、教诲人心的特点。王尔德在唯美主义的旗帜下宏扬美德和批判丑恶，而萧伯纳则打着反叛的旗帜追求道德理想和谴责伪善。两位作家都有一种心有灵犀的共同艺术体验，都站在道德的立场上继承了英国文学的道德传统。

最后，从《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》一书中可以看出作者运用新方法研究萧伯纳以求创新的思想。刘茂生采用文学伦理学批评的方法系统研究萧伯纳的戏剧创作，为萧伯纳的研究提供了一种全新的思路和路径，可以极大地丰富萧伯纳戏剧研究的成果。刘茂生在前人研究的基础上，独辟蹊径，沿着一条伦理主线剖析萧伯纳的戏剧文本，全面审视萧伯纳关于社会问题与政治问题的观点，认为他的戏剧创作始终遵循他一贯倡导的“艺术要有自己的使命”的伦理主张。萧伯纳的戏剧关注社会的现实道德、政治伦理等问题，也关心未来的世界。他的戏剧创作不仅揭露现实黑暗，也展现对美好未来世界的期盼。虽然他的思想与主张在一定程度上受到时代的局限，但作品中所传递的诸如社会责任与担当等积极信息仍然可以为现代社会提供借鉴。

《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》是刘茂生研究萧伯纳及其戏剧创作的一部力作，结构完整，逻辑严密，证据充分，观点新颖，无论是从方法论上看，还是从研究中得出的观点和结论看，都具有突出的创新意识。由于刘茂生运用新的研究方法，细致研究文本，因而他能够从研究中得出全新的、符合逻辑的观点与结论。在文本细读的基础上，作者系统地论述了萧伯纳戏剧创作四个阶段中伦理思想的独特表达形式及丰富思想，并通过从王

尔德到萧伯纳的研究对英国文学伦理传统进行梳理，不仅对萧伯纳的戏剧创作进行了认真总结与评价，而且为后续研究留出了思考的空间。完全可以说，刘茂生这部著作是一项研究萧伯纳戏剧创作的开创性成果，为重新认识萧伯纳及其在英国文学史中的重要地位提供了成功的研究范例。

刘茂生教授潜心学术研究，在萧伯纳研究、王尔德研究等相关领域已取得了学界公认的成果。他对待学术研究始终保持着一一种严谨、认真的态度，勤奋钻研，志存高远，既有远大崇高的学术追求，又有脚踏实地的务实精神。他为人谦虚谨慎，善于通过学习别人的优点丰富自己。近年来，他撰写的学术论文和出版的学术专著先后四次获得省级哲学社会科学优秀成果奖，由于研究成果显著被江西师范大学聘为英语语言文学学科的首席教授。2018年，他作为高层次人才被广东外语外贸大学引进，聘为“云山杰出学者”。

刘茂生教授这部学术专著凝聚了他研究萧伯纳的全部心血，在这部著作问世之际，我作为他的博士生导师在表达祝贺的同时，也希望他不忘初心，坚持自己的学术理想，不断攀登学术高峰。他在萧伯纳和王尔德等研究方面已经取得重要成果，这为他未来从事更加宏大的学术研究夯实了基础。他所工作的广东外语外贸大学外国语言文学学科是我国有重要影响的外语学科，为他在学术研究上大展鸿图创造了条件。刘茂生教授在学术研究方面还有巨大的潜力，还有更大的追求，还有更大的贡献。我曾经用“德才谦恭，止于至善”勉励他，现在我仍然用它来激励他。茂生是一个有梦想的人，我完全相信，他通过自己的不懈努力，一定能够实现美好的学术梦想。

Work Cited

刘茂生：《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》。北京：人民出版社，2019年。

[Liu Maosheng. *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays*. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2019.]

信仰在路上：

《自由主义传统的书写者：杰克·克鲁亚克》论要
Faith Is on the Road: An Introduction to *A Writer for the Liberal Tradition*: Jack Kerouac

龚 刚（Gong Gang）

内容摘要：书中以两条脉络展开叙述，一是克鲁亚克个人成长历程，一是他所处社会背景，两者纵横成网，相互影响，每一处交织以“空间截住时间”，克鲁亚克的困顿、迷惘、天真，方成永恒。对信仰锲而不舍无疑是克鲁亚克擅长的题材，为什么“上路”是克鲁亚克笔下聚焦的核心，这种精神追求实质就是“哲性乡愁”。虽受禅宗影响却并没有为禅所囿，对克鲁亚克而言，心中的信仰始终在路上。

关键词：信仰；在路上；哲性乡愁；禅宗

作者简介：龚刚，澳门大学中文系教授、博士生导师，扬州大学访问讲座教授。

Title: Faith Is on the Road: An Introduction to *A Writer for the Liberal Tradition*: Jack Kerouac

Abstract: The author develops her narration by two clues: one is Kerouac's life experiences and the other is his social background. They have mutual influence on each other and formed a net. Every knot in the space would define time. It makes Kerouac's suffering, bewilderment and simple eternal in his life. Firm pursuit of faith being his consistent theme, he mainly focuses on "why on the road." We call the pursuit "philosophical nostalgia". Affected but not bound by Zen, Kerouac sticks to his belief on the road.

Key words: faith; on the road; philosophical nostalgia; Zen

Author: Gong Gang, Professor and Ph.D. Supervisor of Chinese department of Macao University (Macau, E21A-2071, China) and visiting chair professor of Yangzhou University. His research mainly focuses on history of literary and art thought, ethical narrative, and comparative poetics (Email: ganggong@um.edu.mo).

之前很多次看到报章书刊中提起“中年危机”，付诸笑谈之外，也颇受启发，便做了一篇学术论文，分析杨绛与白先勇在同名小说《小阳春》中表

现出的中年危机叙事。¹ 文章写得颇为顺利,研究过程中还发现,“中年危机”一词并非出自文学家之口,而是由美国的精神分析学家——Elliott Jaques 率先提出。阅毕谢志超教授的新著《自由主义传统的书写者:杰克·克鲁亚克》,我翻出 *The New York Times* 原稿,其中有对 Jaques 理论的简述:“Dr. Jaques introduced the phrase ‘midlife crisis’ in 1965 in a paper on the working patterns of creative geniuses. Examining the careers of a number of composers and artists, he found abrupt changes in style or declines in productivity around the age of 35”

(Stuart Lavietes, 17 Mar. 2003)。概言之,Dr. Jaques 认为,艺术家通常在 35 岁左右进入创作力衰退期。我随之想到,公元一九五七年,《在路上》(*On The Road*) 横空出世,其作者杰克·克鲁亚克(Jack Kerouac)声名鹊起。那一年,克鲁亚克 35 岁,甫入中年。

仿佛只是过去一瞬间,但克鲁亚克已然发觉自己正站在中年的悬崖峭壁之上,势不可挡——他似乎丧失了生活中指引方向的“信仰”。偶尔自嘲,他会想到自己当下的处境,颇像厨子手里提着的鸡,只知道缓一口气就好,再无别的主意。斗转星移,阅历日丰,可他无奈地意识到自己从中汲取到的生命慰藉依然稀薄,或者说尚且不足以与“信仰”缺失所形成的生命空洞相弥补。钱锺书在其著作里探究还乡隐喻²,我从中获益匪浅,总结出“乡愁三境”。其中最高境界的“哲性乡愁”³便直指人类性命无处安顿与无法寻得生命本真状态的普遍苦闷。龙应台在《1964》一文中描述过一种无言懂得、转身离开的人生感悟,细品之下能闻到淡淡的认命味道。我希望寻到的方式,应该是自强不息的,亦或是爽利洒脱的;前者是圆融的刚执,后者是崇高的温柔,这两种都更具男性气概,更合我意。

也正是在这段日子,志超新书的书稿进入了我的视野,这是一部克鲁亚克的研究集。我之前和学生笑谈,如果我讲到公路主题的小说,那将无可避免地和大家分享克鲁亚克的《在路上》。最初接触到克鲁亚克的作品,是在北大进学的岁月里。作为美国“垮掉的一代”中最具代表性的作家,克鲁亚克一度是我心中最出色的文字英雄。克鲁亚克直到 35 岁才凭借第二部作品《在路上》而享誉文坛,此前他的生活,也总是在与郁郁坎壈打着交道。有人说渐入中年的他算是大器晚成,但我觉得丰沛的才能就像丰沛的水流,总能随时找到宣泄口,因此他的名声大噪并非一时之幸。第一次读《在路上》时便为这种文字风格迷住,那是和之前菲茨杰拉德“迷惘的一代”截然不同的语言面貌。阅读体验极佳,整本书仿佛一具炼丹炉,而文字于其中如仙丹一般

1 参见龚刚:“‘中年危机’叙事的早期范本——杨绛、白先勇同名小说《小阳春》比较分析”,《扬子江评论》4(2017): 83-90。

2 参见龚刚:“附录二:钱锺书英文论文选译”,《钱锺书与文艺的西潮》。天津:南开大学出版社,2014年,第278页。

3 参见龚刚:“从感性的乡愁到哲性的感悟——论台湾离散诗人的三重乡愁”,《淮北师范大学学报(哲学社会科学版)》1(2017): 2-6。

长生不老。

一晃多年，志超的书稿让我再次得缘闯入克鲁亚克敏感细微的内心世界。这实在是一部诚意之作，统揽来说，整部书中有两条脉络。一是纵向的，一是横向的。所谓纵向的，就是克鲁亚克自身的发展史。从他幼年时期的家庭构成一直谈到与他创作息息相关的诸多朋友，这一条纵线是克鲁亚克的生命线，它贯穿起克鲁亚克一生的轨迹。另有一条横线，这条横线就是当时的社会背景，是整个时代对克鲁亚克的作用。譬如战后美国社会的风气面貌、青年普遍的思想倾向、禅宗哲学敲开美国大门从而将佛学思潮带入美国等等……很多为人立传的作家，都有一个倾向——即过度强调时代对这个人的影响，仿佛处于这样的时代背景下，这个人不功成名就都不行。我读之总会觉得“时势造英雄”的结论得出的过于轻率直接，轻飘飘地浮在空中。但我很喜欢志超这部书的结构安排，纵线与横线错综交织，彼此作用，相互产生影响。这样便不似一个个孤零零的十字架悬在那里，误导人们十字架的中心就是这个人最闪耀的时刻。而是由纵线与横线密密麻麻地大面积交织在一起，经天纬地，不再是一副十字架挂落在时空里，而是一张巨大的网。网，就是生活的本质。若只是一副十字架，那生活的意义似乎过于集中且可怜，一定还要有更多更密集的纵横交织，因此才能有人类生长、觉悟的意义。而构成生活这张网的每一处纵横交织，我称之为以空间截住时间，我想若非如此，不能从逝水流年中，抓住永恒。

志超在全书第一章有一个对克鲁亚克作品简洁又灵巧的概括，即：“克鲁亚克在作品中肆意描述生命中短暂的幸福与满足，亦很真实地袒露人生的困惑与痛苦。在他笔下，孤独、无助、天真、率性等性格描写令人物形象跃然纸上立体而丰盈”（13）¹。简单的两句话却将克鲁亚克的作品点透了，这正是活生生有血有肉的克鲁亚克本人。很多人有一种误解，就是对于一个大文豪大作家来说，无论什么都能写得传神有趣。其实并非如此，对于一个作家来说，真正能驾轻就熟的题材往往不会很多，文体上也不会跨度太大。原因很简单，作家也只是一个普通人。的确，作家创作过程中应该鼓励他全方位闯入生活，但作为一个普通人，他所接触到的生活势必只能是零星与片段的。凭借着敏锐的天性与常年对世界的观察及思考，优秀的作家往往能“力透纸背”，在他描写的题材上，带领读者一窥生活的不朽真谛。然而这仅限于作家最熟悉的那个题材，即他最熟悉的那种生活方式。所以钱锺书写现代儒林，张爱玲写洋场交际，克鲁亚克写追寻信仰。

克鲁亚克写过几部路上小说，《在路上》以外，还包括《达摩流浪者》《科迪的幻想》等。志超在书中第二章评价克鲁亚克为“路上小说的开拓者”，并写到：“受‘垮掉的一代’的影响，很多年轻人放弃安逸舒适的生活，在

1 谢志超《自由主义传统的书写者——杰克·克鲁亚克》（北京：中国社会科学出版社，2018年）。以下出自此书的引文，只标注页码，不再一一说明。

路上恣意驰骋，只为寻找、探索渴望已久的自由和生命的终极意义，证明自己的存在”（90）。“这场革命，以《在路上》中各色人物在路上的玩世不恭和离经叛道，在路下则居无定所和离群索居为鲜明特征。他们三五成群寻求心中的终极真理。他们在路下忙于生计，在残酷的现实面前任凭理想一次次褪色”（109）。这两段话很是锋锐，直指克鲁亚克笔下的核心，也就是“上路”的原因。对于书中的人物，亦或克鲁亚克本身来说，角色们在路上找到了什么并不重要，真正重要的是他们为什么要“上路”。因为“信仰”缺失，所以他们这一代才被称为“垮掉的一代”。只可惜信仰缺失并非一个简单的问题，而是现代人类面对的普遍困境，只是当时尚未有人意识到问题的严重性。于是《在路上》中的角色们一有理由就横跨整个美国来回奔波，沿途寻找刺激。他们的作为看似逾越了道德与法律的界限，但论起出发点，也仅仅是希望在另一侧找到信仰，所以他们真正的旅途，其实落在了精神层面上。

尤为喜欢书稿中的第三个章节——禅宗思想的实践者。克鲁亚克的创作受到禅宗、佛家思想的影响，这已然是一个学界共识。但颇令我惊喜的是志超在介绍完禅宗与克鲁亚克的联系后，并没有一味将禅宗与克鲁亚克捆绑在一起，而是说道：“当然不能因此得出结论认为克鲁亚克在感情上和创作中因为遇到重重困难，所以才沉迷于东方宗教以期获得顿悟和解脱。克鲁亚克或曾寄望在禅宗思想中寻找慰藉、寻求公正和信仰替代，但禅终究不能彻底释放他的身体和精神，他的身体、精神乃至心灵也未曾为禅所囿”（160）。这个部分说的真好，如果克鲁亚克这样的作家也会自负纍纍，拖着沉重的枷锁上路寻找信仰，那真是糟透了。正因为克鲁亚克自身也未曾为禅所囿，所以他笔下的人物才能自强不息，一次次在路上寻找信仰。

第一次读克鲁亚克时我尚是学生身份，那时没发表过一行诗，但却觉得那时的自己更像一个诗人，一如曾经的吟游诗人，在马上为自己吟诗，度过漫漫寒夜。时至今日再读志超书作，我已不复青春。放下书稿那一刻，仿佛看到志超在写这部书时经历的畅快与迷惘，她带着写作者独特的神性，缓慢却稳健地穿过光明与黑暗，姿态伟大又谦卑。刹那间我灵台清明——人的性命安顿之处，是一种抽象的可能，它犹如迷雾中的灵山，每一个人都必须独自寻觅通往山顶的门径，没有人可以代替，没有人可以引领，你的救赎，你的信仰，只能由你自己来完成。这是一个人的战争，也是一个人的宗教。如若再遇迷失，我亦可用志超的这部书稿渡己渡人。信仰在何方？——信仰在路上。

Works Cited

Stuart Lavietes. "Elliott Jaques, 86, Scientist Who Coined 'Midlife Crisis.'" *The New York Times*, 17 Mar. 2003.

谢志超：《自由主义传统的书写者——杰克·克鲁亚克》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2018年。
[Xie Zhichao. *A Writer for the Liberal Tradition: Jack Kerouac*. Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences Press, 2018.]

文学研究的反思与未来构想： 评居里·塔尔维特《世界文学、比较文学与他者》

Reflection and Potentiality on Literature Studies: A Review of Jüri Talvet's *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the "Other"*

李 卓 (Li Zhuo)

内容摘要：居里·塔尔维特 (Jüri Talvet) 教授的学术专著《世界文学、比较文学与他者》对“世界文学”和“比较文学”的概念进行了连贯的理论论述，特别是从“他者”、“边缘”“少数民族/种族文化”等视角反思当下文学研究中的不同现象，提倡多种创造性的对话以及“中心”与“外围”之间的共生关系，尤其肯定了聂珍钊教授的“文学伦理学批评”理论对世界文学研究的贡献与影响。该专著是文学研究创新的成功范例，对当前的文学研究不无裨益。

关键词：《世界文学、比较文学与他者》；文学研究；反思；构想

作者简介：李卓，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院博士研究生，主要从事美国文学、文学伦理学批评研究。本文受中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金【项目编号：2020FZA111】和中国国家留学基金【项目编号：CSC201906320105】资助。

Title: Reflection and Potentiality on Literary Studies: A Review of Jüri Talvet's *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the "Other"*

Abstract: Prof. Jüri Talvet's *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the "Other"* offers coherent theoretical treatment of the conceptions of "World Literature" and "Comparative Literature", in parallel with their practical application to the research of different literary phenomena, especially, as viewed from the perspective of the "other", "peripheral", "(minor) ethnic culture". It advocates a plurality of creative dialogues and a mutually enriching symbiotic relationship between "centers" and "peripheries", particularly affirms the contribution and influence of Prof. Nie Zhenzhao's ethical literary criticism to the study of world literature. This book is a pioneering work in literature studies and it provides significant inspiration for current literature research.

Key Words: *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the*

“Other”; literature studies; reflection; potentiality

Author: Li Zhuo is a Ph.D. candidate at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). His research interest is American Literature and Ethical Literary Criticism (Email: li-zhuo@zju.edu.cn).

自歌德在 19 世纪上半叶提出“世界文学”（Weltliteratur）¹的概念以来，各派学者针对此概念一直颇有争议。纵观世界文学的发展历程，基于比较文学的“世界文学”研究成了国际比较文学界的热门议题，不仅有大量论文发表，也有多种著作问世，但专门从“他者”、“边缘主义”角度来审视世界文学研究还并不常见。爱沙尼亚塔尔图大学比较文学系首席教授居里·塔尔维特（Jüri Talvet）倾数十年之力撰写的学术专著《世界文学、比较文学与他者》（*Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the “Other”*, 2019）对“世界文学”和“比较文学”的概念进行了连贯的理论论述，独辟蹊径地从“他者”、“边缘”“少数民族 / 种族文化”的视角反思不同的文学研究现象，如文艺复兴和巴洛克创作、文学经典、翻译哲学等，并提倡多种创造性的对话以及“中心”与“外围”之间相互丰富的共生关系，尤其肯定了聂珍钊教授的“文学伦理学批评”理论对世界文学研究的贡献与影响。该专著独特的研究视角给人耳目一新之感，是文学研究创新的成功范例，对当前的文学研究不无裨益。

正如居里·塔尔维特教授在“前言”中提到的，这本专著的标题恰如其分地反映了他本人的学术生涯道路，即从世界文学到比较文学，再到他者研究，而本书是作者在先期已发表论著的基础上所做出的进一步思考与延伸。全书可分为三个部分，共十二章。第一部分（第一至第四章）对世界文学与比较文学的概念、历史、发展趋势进行了深入的挖掘与论述，讨论了比较文学与世界文学的理论化、文学研究与文化研究的重新定位等问题，并对文学经典名著《乌托邦》与莎士比亚文艺复兴时期的一些经典剧作进行实证分析，凸显出在文学研究过程中，从“他者”角度来审视文学作品的重要性，并希冀当下文学研究者不要一味地对西方文学和方法去盲目借鉴和模仿，而要以开放的姿态去包容一切。文学作品的内容本身是开放的，既可以是对现实世界和生活的反映与再现，也可以表现超现实、完全虚构的神话和想象的世界。文学批评和研究也是如此，可以吸收各种各样的理论和方法（如借鉴哲学、语言学、人类学等各种人文学科的理论方法），但没有一成不变、固定的方法。虽然现在西方大学中跨学科研究蔚然成风，但作者仍然坚信“文学研究的根

1 参见 Fritz Strich, *Goethe und die Weltliteratur* (Bern: Francke, 1946) 397.

本任务还是在于文学本身”（19）¹。比较文学作为人文学科应要打通不同文化、不同文学传统，通过了解不同文化的价值和传统，比较认识不同传统、不同价值之间的异同，这是比较文学的任务和特性。进一步来说，比较文学必须研究不同文学传统，深层意义在于通过文学来看思想观念的变迁，所以不是以文学作为研究对象的话，比较文学就会失去它的特点；第二部分（第五至第八章）以中国学者聂珍钊教授提出的“文学伦理学批评”为例，肯定了文学伦理学批评在批判、借鉴和吸收古今中外文学批评理论和方法的过程中，不对西方学术迷信盲从，而是回归到文学文本本身的正确导向。文学伦理学批评从伦理的视角对文学文本中处于特定历史环境中不同的伦理选择范例进行剖析，对文学中反映的社会伦理道德现象做出客观公正的评价，揭示出文学作品中所蕴含的道德启示和教诲价值，成功构建了具有中国特色和中国风格的理论体系和话语体系，同时作者认为“文学伦理学批评不仅仅适用于东方文学研究，同样适用于研究古今中外、融贯东西的经典杰作”（54）；第三部分（第九至第十二章）从文学的创作与跨族性、翻译等角度来论证文学研究中“他者”研究的重要性，并对世界文学的未来趋势提出了构想。在全球化时代，文学研究更多地表现为多元走向和多样性特征，翻译在各种文化之间始终充当着协调者和中介的作用，其作用非但没有减弱反而变得愈加重要。同时以浪漫时期的西班牙与拉美小说为例，“提倡多种创造性的对话以及‘中心’与‘外围’之间相互丰富的共生关系”（108）。总体而言，《世界文学、比较文学与他者》一书具有以下特色：

首先，本书具有强烈的批判性反思意识。作者打破英美中心主义的窠臼，将非主流外国文学的叙事声音纳入论述讨论中，呈现多元文化共生共存的文学研究发展趋势。《世界文学、比较文学与他者》的核心任务之一在于厘清世界文学与比较文学两个重要概念以及两者之间差异与联系，认为“比较文学是一门跨语言、跨民族、跨文化和跨学科的文学研究”（8）。比较文学既研究国际文学史的文学关系，又研究不同民族文学的共同规律，并探讨文学与其他学科之间的相互关系。作者认为，比较文学与世界文学之间既有本质上的不同，又有程度上的差异。从空间上看，“地理意义上的比较文学往往探讨两个国家或不同国籍的两个作家、或一个作家和另一个国家之间的关系，而世界文学则意味着研究全世界”（2）。这意味着比较文学取其世界民族文学之一二进行研究，而世界文学则囊括生存与地球上的所有民族文学。因此空间意义上的世界文学研究范围比较文学研究更为广泛。从时间上看，世界文学与比较文学往往意味着获得世界声誉的经典文学，两者之间既有相对的独立性，又有紧密的相互作用。另外，作者从“他者”、“边缘主义”等

1 参见 Jüri Talvet, *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the "Others"* (London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019). 以下凡出自该书的引文只标注出处页码，不再另行加注，引文均出自笔者拙译。

角度来关注文学发展的特征与趋势。尤其作者用全书近三分之一的篇幅来阐明中国学者的“文学伦理学批评”理论,阐释了何为文学伦理学批评,文学伦理学与世界文学、比较文学的关系,以及文学伦理学对当下文学研究的启示。这不仅证明西方学者积极关注并参与文学伦理学批评与他者文学研究的话语体系,而且足以彰显作者在文学研究中强烈的问题意识。同时,作者认为,文学研究应改变其在西方和世界范围内仅仅作为形式主义逻辑科学和社会学附属的现状。当下的主要任务,是保持一种永久的开放状态,对现存的世界文学经典进行比较研究。总之,比较文学研究与文学伦理学批评的理想结合是从“根本上增强了‘他者’在以西方‘中心’地区以外语言创作的世界重要经典文学作品的吸收与融入”(66)。

其次,该专著一改盛行于西方的文化政治研究模式,体现了文学研究方法论的独特性,即以中国“文学伦理学批评”理论来烛照世界文学研究。文学伦理学批评“不是西方伦理批评的照搬移植,而是借鉴创新。它将文学伦理学转变为文学伦理学批评方法论,从而使它能够有效地解决具体的文学问题”(聂珍钊1)。作者指出,“在备受后现代、后结构主义思潮影响的今天,文学不应该看做是以市场经济为导向的一种产物,更多的应该是追寻文学作品中蕴含的真实价值,而文学伦理学批评恰逢其时、应运而生”(70)。可以说,“在西语理论过于倚重政治话语的当下,文学伦理学批评对于文学批评向德育和审美功能的回归提供了动力,与西方主流批评话语形成互动与互补的关系”(夏延华、阿贝勒172)。自2004年至2020年,文学伦理学批评历经了十六个春秋,“从理论的提出及体系的建构,到理论推广和丰富及实践运用,再到理论拓展和深化及批评实践的系统化,文学伦理学批评日益发展成熟并产生广泛的影响,已经建构了独特的理论体系和话语体系,并拥有大量的批评实践成果,学术影响力日益扩大”(苏晖36)。至今,文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会已成功举办了九届,其国际化程度逐届增高。九届年会分别于中国华中师范大学(2005)、中国三峡大学(2012)、中国宁波大学(2013)、中国上海交通大学(2014)、韩国东国大学(2015)、爱沙尼亚塔尔图大学(2016)、英国伦敦大学玛丽女王学院(2017)、日本九州大学(2018)、中国浙江大学(2019)召开。其中,第五至八届都在国外召开,第九届年会与欧洲科学院联合主办,吸引了世界三十余个国家及地区的一大批专家学者参加,充分体现了文学伦理学批评在国际上的学术潜力和社会价值。再者,作者通过大量的西方文学作品实例论证了文学伦理学批评方法的可行性。一方面打破了对西方文论的过度强调与依赖,预示着未来文学研究发展的新方向;另一方面突显文学伦理学批评与世界文学研究的互通互补之处。作者认为,“文学伦理学批评为比较文学、世界文学研究提供了一种无形且强有力的动力,拓宽与加深了文学研究的广度和深度”(83)。这无疑为当下中外文学研究提供了良好的范例。

最后，独特的研究视角与研究视野是该作的又一大特色。该书弥补了新世纪对世界文学与比较文学难以深入的缺憾，全面细致地从非主流视角来考察文学研究，揭橥文学研究中“他者”与“边缘化”视角的观点，并独具匠心地解释了文学研究创造力和图像真实性的深层来源，引入了“次他者”（infra-other）和“跨族性”（transgeniality）的概念，超越传统西方意识形态和文化中心的独白。同时作者对世界文学研究提出了大胆的设想，认为“当下世界人文学科面临的内在挑战即要致力于将美学和哲学紧密结合在一起的价值转向，并牺牲‘自我’的专制和以利益为目标的独白，以实现各种‘他者’之间持续不断的、以精神为导向的对话，这些‘他者’包括世界的‘中心’和‘边缘’，以及各个民族、种族的文化”（182）。其实，新的世界文学应该不只是各种优秀作品的、互不相关的聚合，而是互识、互证、互补的、带有比较文学意味的、有机的结合；新的世界文学也不是融多种文学为一体的新的合金，而是保持着、发展着各自特点，既从其他文学吸取着营养，也为其他文学不断做出独特贡献的各不相同的文学的共同体。

一言以蔽之，《世界文学、比较文学与他者》既有对核心概念的追溯和辨析，又有对具体文本的深入分析，涉及莎士比亚戏剧、但丁诗歌、中国彝族诗人吉狄马加、西班牙及拉美小说等文学作品。作者理论视野广阔，引经据典，视角新颖独特，文本解读内容详实。该书是一项优秀的学术研究成果，是外国文学研究的创新之举，其选题代表着当前文学研究的新趋势。该专著不仅体现了作者对当下文学研究发展趋势的终极关怀，也使读者对于文学研究中的他者研究有一定的了解，有助于系统把握世界文学与比较文学的发展阶段、演化过程与未来构想。

Works Cited

- 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.]
- Strich, Fritz. *Goethe und die Weltliteratur*. Bern: Francke, 1946.
- 苏晖：“学术影响力与国际话语权建构：文学伦理学批评十五年发展历程回顾”，《外国文学研究》5（2019）：34-51。
- [Su Hui. “Academic Influence and the Construction of International Discourse Power: The Development of Ethical Literary Criticism in the Past Fifteen Years.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2019): 34-51.]
- Talvet, Jüri. *Critical Essays on World Literature, Comparative Literature and the “Others”*. London: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2019.
- 夏延华、乔治斯·梵·邓·阿贝勒：“让批评理论与世界进程同步——首届加州大学欧文分校‘批评理论学术年会’侧记”，《外国文学研究》6（2015）：170-172。
- [Xia Yanhua and Georges Van Den Abbeele. “Synchronize Theory with the Course of the World: A Synopsis of the 1st UCI Critical Theory Conference.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2015): 170-172.]



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920

