

ISSN 2520-4920(Print)

ISSN 2616-4566(Online)

# Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

## 文学跨学科研究

Volume 7, Number 3  
September 2023



Published by  
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited  
Hong Kong

# **Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature**

**文学跨学科研究**

**Volume 7, Number 3  
September 2023**

## **Editor**

Nie Zhenzhao, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

## **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 Guangdong University of Foreign Studies and 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](mailto: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

**Marshall Brown** / University of Washington, USA

**Knut Brynhildsvoll** / University of Oslo, NOR

**Stefan Collini** / University of Cambridge, UK

**Khairy Douma** / Cairo University, EGY

**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

**Shang Biwu** / Shanghai Jiaotong University, CHN

**Igor Shaytanov** / *Problems of Literature*, RUS

**Inseop Shin** / Konkuk University, KOR

**Su Hui** / Central China Normal University, CHN

**Galin Tihanov** / Queen Mary University of London, UK

**Wang Songlin** / Ningbo University, CHN

**Zhang Xin** / Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, CHN

# Contents

## Thematic Studies on Chen Zhongyi's Academic Contribution

- 365-378 Breaking Superstition and Returning to Rationality: An Interview with Mr. Chen Zhongyi  
*Shu Jinyu*  
*Chen Zhongyi*
- 379-389 Presence and Concentration: A Review of Mr. Chen Zhongyi's Academic Research  
*Zong Xiaofei*
- 390-404 Review of Chen Zhongyi's *The Study in Cervantes' Academic History* and Beyond  
*Taciana Fisac*
- 405-424 Echoing Ethical Literary Studies: *So This Is What I Heard* as An Odyssey of Chinese Magical Realism  
*Wei Chenlin*
- 425-437 Wisdom Extracted, Insights Acquired: The Dialectical Dimensions of Chen Zhongyi's Literary Studies  
*Tu Xianfeng*
- 438-452 Research on Literary Principles and Refactoring of the Contemporary Chinese Literary Theory: Proceeding from *Criticism of Literary Principles and Others* by Chen Zhongyi  
*Zhang Tongsheng*  
*Jiang Yuanyuan*
- 453-466 Variables and Constants, Cultural Care and Childishness Discernment: An Exploration on the Progress of Chinese and Foreign Literary and Cultural Studies  
*Yao Rui*

- 467-490 Ethical Literary Criticism in Vietnam: Situation and Prospects  
*Anh Dan Nguyen*  
*Van Thuan Nguyen*
- 491-503 The Spread and Ethical Choice of *Journey to the West* in Vietnam  
*Liu Zhiqiang*
- 504-514 An Ethical Reflection on the Museum Narrative in *News from Nowhere*  
*Li Lixin*  
*Yang Jincai*
- 515-524 African Revolution and its Ethics in *Wizard of the Crow* as Seen in an Era of “Capitalist Fundamentalism”  
*Yao Feng*
- 525-535 On the Centenary Circulation and the Transnational Variation of the Korean Novel *Chunhyangjeon*  
*Zhao Weirong*
- 536-548 A Thematic Study of the Poetry in *Brushstrokes*  
*Xiao Chunduan*
- 549-557 Moral Anxiety and Ethical Choices in Qi Jun’s Family Stories: A Comparative Study of *The Chignon* and *The Orange Turns Red*  
*Chen Lijun*

# 目 录

## 陈众议学术思想研究专栏

- 365-378 破除迷信，回归理性：陈众议先生访谈录  
舒晋瑜  
陈众议
- 379-389 在场与定力：陈众议学术思想述评  
宗笑飞
- 390-404 评陈众议《塞万提斯学术史研究》及其他  
达西安娜·菲萨克
- 405-424 文学伦理学的杰出探索与成功实践：从《如是我闻》看陈众议的学术视野与文化关怀  
魏琛琳
- 425-437 取精用弘，鉴往知来：陈众议文学研究的辩证之维  
涂险峰
- 438-452 文学原理学研究与中国当代文学理论重构：从陈众议《文学原理学批评及其他》谈起  
张同胜  
姜媛媛
- 453-466 变数常数、文化关怀与童心辨析——中外文学与文化研究的进路探赜  
姚 睿
- 467-490 文学伦理学批评在越南——现状与前景  
阮英民  
阮文舜
- 491-503 《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播与伦理选择  
刘志强



504-514 《乌有乡消息》中的博物馆叙事及其文学伦理学反思

李立新

杨金才

515-524 《乌鸦巫师》与“资本主义原教旨主义”时代的非洲革命及伦理问题

姚 峰

525-535 朝鲜族春香故事的世纪流转与跨国变异

赵渭绒

536-548 《聚言集》诗歌典型主题探索

肖淳端

549-557 琦君“故家故事”的道德焦虑与伦理选择：以《髻》与《橘子红了》为例

陈力君

# 破除迷信，回归理性：陈众议先生访谈录

## Breaking Superstition and Returning to Rationality: An Interview with Mr. Chen Zhongyi

舒晋瑜（Shu Jinyu） 陈众议（Chen Zhongyi）

**内容摘要：**陈众议先生早年研究拉美文学，尤其关注加西亚·马尔克斯和博尔赫斯，并藉此影响中国文坛，著有《加西亚·马尔克斯评传》《博尔赫斯》《拉美当代小说流派》等。2022年5月是《百年孤独》出版55周年之际，为了以特殊的方式致敬大师，陈众议先生出版了一部集悬疑、魔幻、荒诞、反讽等多种创作手法于一体的现实主义小说《如是我闻》。这部作品是陈众议先生蕴积十余载的一部抨击封建迷信的力作，用新颖的表达营造出极强艺术感染力的同时，彰显了作者对于当代社会的独特认知和洞察。

**关键词：**批判迷信；比较文学；文学批评；文学翻译；阅读

**作者简介：**舒晋瑜，自1999年供职于光明日报报业集团中华读书报社，著有《风骨：当代学人的追忆与思索》《深度对话鲁奖作家》《深度对话茅奖作家》《以笔为旗：与军旅作家对话》等；陈众议，中国社会科学院学部委员、湖南师范大学特聘教授、西班牙皇家学院通讯院士，曾任中国社会科学院外国文学研究所所长、中国外国文学学会会长、第十二和十三届全国政协委员，发表专著十余种、论文和学术随笔二百余篇，主要从事西语文学与文艺学研究，间或创作长、中、短篇小说。曾获国家留学归国人员成就奖和国家万人计划首批领军人才等称号。

**Title:** Breaking Superstition and Returning to Rationality: An Interview with Mr. Chen Zhongyi

**Abstract:** Mr. Chen Zhongyi studied Latin American literature in his early years, paying particular attention to Garcia Marquez and Borges, and thus influencing the Chinese literary world. He has authored works such as *Commentary on Garcia Marquez, Borges, and Latin American Contemporary Novel Schools*. May 2022 marks the 55th anniversary of the publication of *A Hundred Years of Solitude*. In order to pay tribute to the master in a special way, Mr. Chen Zhongyi published a realistic novel *As I Hear* (2022) that combines various creative techniques such as suspense, magic, absurdity, and irony. This work has been accumulated by Mr. Chen Zhongyi for more than ten years, criticizing feudal superstitions and demagogues,

creating a strong artistic appeal with innovative expressions, while highlighting the author's unique understanding and insight into contemporary society.

**Keywords:** critical superstition; comparative literature; literary criticism; literary translation; reading

**Authors:** **Shu Jinyu** has been working at the Guangming Daily Newspaper Group's Zhonghua Reading Newspaper since 1999. He has authored works such as *Feng Gu: Memories and Reflections of Contemporary Scholars*, *Deep Dialogue with Lu Prize Writers*, *Deep Dialogue with Mao Prize Writers*, and *Taking the Pen as the Flag: Dialogue with Military Writers* (Email: 13311205922@189.cn). **Chen Zhongyi** is Member of the Academic Department of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Distinguished Professor at Hunan Normal University and a corresponding academician at the Royal College of Spain. He has served as the director of the Institute of Foreign Literature of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, the president of the Chinese Society of Foreign Literature, and a member of the 12<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. He has published over ten monographs, papers, and over 200 academic essays, mainly engaged in research on Spanish literature and literary studies, occasionally creating long, medium, and short stories. He has been awarded the National Achievement Award for Returned Scholars and the first batch of leading talents in the National Ten Thousand Talents Program (Email: chenzhy@cass.org.cn).

“你要看，而且要看见。”陈众议先生说，在《如是我闻》中，他努力层层递进，发掘迷信及其魔幻、玄奥背后的真实。

舒晋瑜（下文统称为舒）：您愿意如何概括《如是我闻》？魔幻现实主义？我觉得作品中充满了神秘的文化现象。您的文学创作受谁的影响比较多？

陈众议（下文统称为陈）：文学创作的影响是潜移默化的，除非你有意摹仿某个作家或某些流派。《如是我闻》首先是一部反迷信小说，最初的动因来自一腔愤懑。十年前我太太受人蛊惑，轻信大仙大师，最后离家出走，至今杳无音讯。而当时她的联系人都用难以稽查的网络电话和手机信息与其联系，他们钻了虚拟空间的空子。这也是我缘何进入政协后呼吁网络 and 手机实名制的直接原因。各种迷信沉渣泛起固然原因众多，但信仰的阙如、市场经济条件下各种落差和压力等都是客观因素，但起决定作用的始终是主观。我太太身体不好，刚四十出头就提前退休了。这样的群体最易被蛊惑。当然，一管就死、一放即乱同样是个大问题，有些情况甚至是我始料未及的。如何解决？恐怕有待

体制机制改革过程中找到一个综合方案，即便是国民真正具有不偏不倚、进退中绳的良好素质。此绳既是法律，也是信仰和真善美。

小说有魔幻因素，因为生活忽然变得魔幻起来。就像莫言读了拉美当代小说，尤其是马尔克斯的作品，认为这不就是高密东北乡吗？不过我的小说是反其道而行之，关键在于如何层层发掘迷信魔幻、玄奥背后的真实。

舒：其中透露出作者作为知识分子的忧思：我国从事人文研究和社会科学的同人何止千万，却始终未能阻止邪教和迷信的泛而滥之。您希望通过写作传达什么？作品完成了，能帮助您、帮助读者获得一些什么启发呢？

陈：我特别希望人们回归理性。文明浩荡，怎么能让这些滋生于数千年前洪荒时期的神神鬼鬼、巫巫雉雉的东西再度复活呢？可遗憾的是邪教尚未肃清，而不少人，包括青少年依然跌入了阴阳八卦、风水运势的陷阱。实在令人触目惊心！我想从心理学和文化人类学的角度巧妙地、润物无声地将它们解剖、打倒。当然，我不指望毕其功于一役，但总得有人先吃螃蟹。

舒：我想《如是我闻》大概是一部学院派的小说，知识点很多，对当下社会的一些问题，如教育、技术等皆有关注，并且在写作中不断提出思考和反省。您觉得知识分子写作有何特点？

陈：学者的毛病之一是好为人师。但我已经尽量克制了，甚至有意让小说浸淫在街谈巷议、各色段子当中。问题是大量的迷信让我不得不对其背后的故事和从出的土壤有所还原和开掘，这就免不了会借用心理学、社会学等有效武器。虽然我尽可能不动声色，但难免还是会露出马脚。这是一种两难选择，也是一般小说家故事家可以避免的问题。

舒：看到女孩关小露，“我”有一番辩白，用“由甲感官挪移至乙感官的纯粹游移，具体说来是将过去生活中某种或某些重要情感由甲目的物向乙目的物迁移的过程”（97）<sup>1</sup>解释“这是移情却并非别恋”，形容关小露是“理所当然的目的物”（97）。这既是“心理学概念，也是量子纠缠，更是人之常情”（97）——阅读的过程中，感觉可以获取到知识点，但对于多数读者来说，有没有吊书袋的嫌疑？您这么用心的写作，也可能被读者一晃而过，会不会有些失落？

陈：一定会有很多类似的细节被忽略，尤其是那些心理学阐释。不过问题不大，读者会对段子和情节感兴趣。我坚信段子是一时的精神自慰，而迷信是一生的神经迷醉。只要这一个目的达到了，那么也算是开卷有益了。

1 本文有关《如是我闻》的引用均出自陈众议，《如是我闻》（北京：作家出版社，2022年）。以下引文仅标注页码，不再一一说明。

舒：您是政协委员，履职期间曾多次提交有关教育的建议和提案，这一身份对于创作是不是也有很多助益，有心的读者会发现在小说中多少有所体现。

陈：开始构思这部小说，适逢校外培训如火如荼。它的问题已为世人所诟病。校内放羊，校外厮杀不仅使亿万孩子及其父母身心俱疲，关键是国家教育体系和意识形态被严重破相。我这一代，包括我孩子这一代，基本没有择校的概念，大家都是就近上学，公平竞争。之所以造成“双减”<sup>1</sup>前的乱象，我认为原因很复杂，除了资本侵入，还有没有优质教育资源权力寻租？或者个别技术官僚滥用职权？总之，问题很复杂，但受害最甚的无疑是孩子。因此我从2015年起开始大声疾呼“救救孩子”。不减负，不切切实实地减负，谁敢要孩子？别说二胎三胎了！念兹于兹，此乃真正国之大者！

小说中有个人物叫夏琴，她命途多舛，与主人公“我”的关系十分暧昧。她便是从事校外培训的，我借她之口道出了一些奥秘。

舒：笑话和段子在《如是我闻》中比比皆是。是人物塑造、情节构造所需，还是叙事节奏的需要，或提振阅读的兴趣？您如何看待幽默桥段在小说中的作用？生活中您也是很幽默的吧？

陈：其实我在生活中过于正经，也过于矜持，而且既不抽烟，也不喝酒，属于比较乏味的那种。但与人为善是我的本性，在社科院工作期间，从副所长到所长长达二十多年，我基本充当了“和善家长”的角色。

至于作品中的大量段子，我用来与迷信对位，就像我前面所说的那样，“段子是一时的精神自慰，迷信是一生的神经麻醉”。段子是极端世俗化的表征，而迷信只有在极端世俗的土壤上在才鱼得水、游刃有余。失去了崇高和理想，等待的就只能是金钱至上和醉生梦死。

舒：小说中石头讲的笑话都是从各色《笑林》或者百度、知乎、抖音之类的网站上攫取改编的；老白在精神病院纵火后逃逸，电台、报纸、微信公众号到处是悬赏通缉；师尊不仅有通灵术，而且现代通信技术也运用自如，写微博，还是最早的网红；“我”无从断定朝露姐妹是克隆还是整容或者人工智能加基因工程的产物——您的创作受新媒体的影响比较多？

陈：是的。虚拟空间已经全方位浸润于现实生活，或者反之。在《如是我闻》的姐妹篇《冥合天人》（即出）中，批判迷信和邪教依然是主题，但对虚拟空间的描写有大幅度提升，并有意警示剧本杀、元宇宙等均有被带偏的危险。而克隆术及其相关的人工智能和基因工程也完全有可能被资本和邪教利用，因此我斗胆提前敲几下警钟，说科幻也好，谓杞人忧天也罢。

---

1 凡未特殊注明，引文均出自采访对象原话。

舒：我们应该如何应对这种（新媒体）的挑战？

陈：新媒体不是法外之地，但新媒体也确实易受资本和各种不法利益入侵。我想除了加强法制建设、严格管理，恐怕还有赖于国民素质的提高。毕竟在虚虚实实、似是而非的海量信息面前，谁都有被淹没的危险。反过来说，别有用心的也就可以乘虚而入了。

舒：小说中为了多少给“朝露”一点提醒，“我准备将枕边的《儒林外史》送给她”（345），能否谈谈您的枕边书有哪些？有什么阅读习惯吗？

陈：枕边书会经常更新。学者最自由，但也最辛苦，几乎没有一个不是五加二、白加黑的；也没有一篇文章、一部著作不是一次重新开始，否则会被当作自我“抄袭”哦。但总有一些是“常客”。我的“常客”中有《老子》和《庄子》，也有唐诗宋词和《红楼梦》、元曲和《本草纲目》。后者这些年有点被束之高阁，原因是网络太方便了，图文并茂，而且还可能有视频作参照。

我读书向来挑剔，因此买得多，读得进去的少。主要习惯大概有两个，一是工作需要，刚性，没什么可说的，必须读。二是真正入目入心的，就像看到心仪的人、碰到会心的事，只消翻两页就知道这书是为我写的。随着阅历的增加、年轮的增长，这样的书越来越少，有点可遇而不可求了。可能是越来越珍惜时间，觉得时间最可宝贵、不容浪费，或者是老了？觉得“学焉未能，老之已至”（转引自 钱钟书 1）？可心里还有一大堆事想做。岂不既犯难又犯愁？

**谈读书，陈众议始终有一个观点：任何时代伟大的文学都是凤毛麟角。**

舒：在《如是我闻》中，“我”博览群书，对古今中外不同领域的书籍皆有涉猎，聊聊您本人的读书情况吧。留学期间，您读得最多的书是什么？您最喜欢哪一种文学类型？有什么不为人知的趣味？

陈：留学期间读得最多的自然是外国文学，尤其是西方文学，在西方文学中又以西班牙语文学为甚，同时兼修西方历史和哲学，后来又扩展到心理学和社会学。要说最喜欢的文学类型倒是有过几次变化，开始是近代文学，尤其是19世纪西方文学，包括俄罗斯文学；而后是拉美当代文学；再而后是西班牙古典文学。对于题材和风格就没有那么挑剔了，但大抵比较喜欢空灵一些的，比如古今玄幻或魔幻小说。

至于不为人知的趣味，大概是委婉地问我西方女孩的认知吧？虽然骨子里东海西海，心理攸同，或谓人同此心，心同此理，但区别还是有的。比如五服之外我们大概率不会喜欢西方女孩，但随着中外交流的日益频繁，尤其是中苏友好关系的建立和好莱坞梦工厂的影响日渐扩大，别说现在，就是



我们的上两代也已经与西方审美渐渐趋同了，如今更甚。但夏日炎炎，且不说体味不同，即使稍有不慎触碰到了胳膊，你也会发现她们固然金发碧眼，但具有几近肤色、不易觉察却颇为扎人的汗毛。悄悄告诉你，我还是更喜欢细腻温婉的中国女子。

舒：在《说不尽的经典》中，您对外著名作家的作品均有精辟的剖析，而且对很多作家的评论还不止一篇。您经常重读作品吗？经常重读的有哪些？

陈：我读书向来挑剔。这可能是比较的结果。但矛盾的是文学艺术可以自立逻辑，它是文艺赖以永恒的不二法门。举个例子，几年前有人对《高玉宝》提出批评，认为它逻辑有问题：半夜鸡叫，谁会相信？但从另一个角度看，它是自成逻辑的，因为雇农们没有钟表，鸡鸣便意味着天要亮了，何况背后有周扒皮这个混世魔王。因此，从文学作品本身的逻辑来看，“半夜鸡叫”的可信性是成立的。类似的情况非常普遍，这归咎于“艰深乍觉诗如讖，消散方知道是虚”。于是，随着年轮的增长，我发现能让我重读，甚至不断重读的书往往有几个特征：一是让我不忍立刻读完的，它们就像孙猴子吃人参果，是需要慢慢品尝，而且乐于慢慢品尝的，以至于生怕它们被吃相难看的猪八戒囫圇吞了。二是可以入梦的，它们会一直萦绕在我的无意识中，无论人物还是情景，非空非色，却能随时撩拨方寸神机。三是经得起理智判断的，譬如我会将不同的文艺作品或其他书籍分门别类。言情的肯定以《红楼梦》为甚，言志的肯定以唐诗宋词为先，载道的如诸子、古来演义和红色经典就难分伯仲了。当然，言情和言志在很多人眼里是同一回事，但在我看来还是有区别的。我反倒觉得古来争论不休的载道和言志是可以杂糅的。谁说二十四史、《三国演义》《水浒传》《西游记》《儒林外史》等许多名著不是既载道又言志的呢？也许只有《红楼梦》是反道统的，但反意识形态也是一种意识形态。

上面提到的基本都是我经常重读的作品，除了《高玉宝》《西游记》和《水浒传》，因为它们入眼即化，无须重读。

舒：您有一个观点：任何时代伟大的文学都是凤毛麟角，少数作品幸免于难的原因，要归功于学院派（哪怕是广义学院派）的发现和守护，才得以完成和持续其经典化过程。可以请教您这一观点的依据吗？简单概括，是否所有经典都存在一定的偶然性或必然性？

陈：是的。至少迄今为止是这样的。首先不是每个时代都能创造经典的，也不是所有时代的经典都能流芳百世的。这可以有两大指向，一为纵，二为横。纵向看，不少作品的经典化过程并非一帆风顺，《红楼梦》是最好的例子。如果没有“百日维新”和“五四运动”，它的命运可想而知。也许

被“诲淫诲盗”之类的唾沫永远埋入历史尘埃也未可知啊！结果是书生或谓学院派，如梁启超、王国维、蔡元培、胡适之等人一点点将它从烟尘中抢救出来，并一步步将它推为“四大名著”之首，以至于毛主席当年说我国“地大物博、人口众多”（毛泽东 33）时，还不忘加上“半部《红楼梦》”。这其中就有一定的偶然性。所谓沧海桑田，世风日新，很多中外名著都是在数十乃至数百年后才被重新发现的，有的甚至是“出口转内销”的结果，譬如《堂吉珂德》，将它定于一尊的是塞万提斯去世两百余年后的德国浪漫派。莎士比亚悲剧也是如此。当然，文学作品的内在肌理是决定因素。这是基本的辩证法。

诚然，横向看，当下和在可以预见的未来，资本的作用将大为增强。这几乎不以人的意志为转移。因此，我对当代经典的形成机制颇为悲观。好在最终由时间老人说了算。“一切历史都是当代史”，也是未来史；一切文学亦然。

**学外语或从事外国文学翻译、研究，最终都是为了强健母语和母体文学文化的拿来。**

舒：创作、评论、学术研究……您多方兼顾，皆颇有成就。可否先谈谈您的小说创作，如长篇《玻璃之死》《风醉月迷》及很多短篇小说，在小说创作中您有什么特殊的心得？相对于文学研究，文学创作的心态有何不同？

陈：在当今外国文学界，我是叛逆者。我始终认为学外语或从事外国文学翻译、研究，最终都是为了强健母语和母体文学文化的拿来。借用许渊冲先生关于“三民主义”的译法“of the people, by the people, for the people”<sup>1</sup>，我们何尝不应该是“of the Chinese, by the Chinese, for the Chinese”？归根结底，我们的工作终究是为了强健中文母语和中华文化的拿来及中外互鉴的送去！背离了这个初衷，一切也就无从谈起，至少是舍本求末。因此，我间或从事文学创作便是为了贴心地拥抱中文，同时紧密与母体文学文化的血脉联系。

至于《玻璃之死》，那是一部抽屉小说，始作于上世纪80年代初那个遍地书香的年代。后来一不小心拿出来示人，但内心充满了遗憾，于是又追加了《风醉月迷》。虽然后者起笔于上世纪90年代，但明显较前者成熟稳重一些，尽管标题有点花哨。那些短篇小说是随机写下的，有朋友看到就拿去发表了。当时不像现在，既不论家门，也无所谓名利，毕竟主业是外国文学，

1 1940年，在欢迎陈纳德将军的招待会上，许渊冲与另一名志愿者为美国空军担任翻译。说到“三民主义”的时候，当时的翻译把“民族、民权、民生”，译成了“nationality, people's sovereignty, people's livelihood”。许渊冲当即举手，大声说出了自己的译法“of the people, by the people, for the people”。



总觉得写小说是离经叛道，有时甚至不得不化名发表。

这多少受了老先生们的影响。虽然我所在的单位有一大批“双枪将”，如冯至、钱钟书（后借调至文学所）、杨绛、卞之琳、李健吾、袁可嘉等等。但他们从事文学创作大抵是在青年时期，后来基本都潜心问学了。何况，时移世易，分工越来越细。创作界和研究界有点不厢杂厕，甚至老死不相往来的味道。不过我还算是比较执拗的，一直坚持了下来，因此抽屉或电脑上储存了不少残编断章。最近刚刚由作家出版社出版的长篇小说《如是我闻》的初稿其实是七八年前草就的，另一部刚刚删减删剔的《冥合天人》算是前者的姐妹篇，同样起手于两三年前。写写停停，停停写写，以此接续对母语的亲近感和亲密感。

当然，从事研究与投入创作的心态确实不同。研究要尽可能既有我又（她），创作却是非常自我的一个活计。行当所行，止当所止，海阔天空，全凭个人兴趣，尽管最终会带出内心的好恶和情愫。

**作为外国文学研究家，每年保持二三十部国内原创长篇小说的阅读量，其他中短篇小说和诗歌难以计数。**

舒：您的评论文章鞭辟入里，即便是批评，也是善意的。比如在莫言获诺奖后您写出的评论文章中，就有一篇“莫言的五根软肋”<sup>1</sup>。莫言看到过这篇文章吗？您会和作家交流观点吗？

陈：在我这个不大不小的圈子里——三十余万外国语言文学从业人员，相当于解放战争渡江战役粟裕麾下的主力队伍——我可能是一直同中国作家圈保持往来的极少数之一。我每年坚持二三十部国内原创长篇小说的阅读量。其他中短篇小说和诗歌难以计数。由此，我偶尔也会应约写一些关于国内作家的评论。

做文学批评难免吹毛求疵。因此，当莫言摘取诺奖以后，我除了替他高兴，第一件事便是写一篇自以为切中肯綮的批评。我列数了莫言的五个过人之处，同时又认为这些过人之处或许恰恰也是他的“软肋”，譬如狂放的想象力、旺盛的生命力，以及信马由缰、不拘小节，甚或蝌蚪效应等等。我这不仅是为了批评的批评，而是想说明诺贝尔文学奖不是评判文学的唯一标准。

舒：早在2012年您就写过“文学理论到了该清理的时候”<sup>2</sup>，十多年过去了，您对当下的文学理论批评有何评价？对于批评的重建您有何建议？

1 参见 陈众议：“莫言的五根软肋”，《想象的边际》，广州：花城出版社，2015年，第15-17页。

2 参见 陈众议：“文学理论到了该清理的时候”，《辽宁日报·文化观察版》2012年4月27日，第008版。

陈：我认为这方面的清算还不够彻底。至少对西方现当代理论的盲从依然存在，批判的武器远未转向武器的批判。而文学批评实践也尚未摆脱阿谀和恶搞。如何有礼有节、进退中绳尚需同道努力，“四个自信”<sup>1</sup>和“三大体系”<sup>2</sup>建设任重道远。我的建议之一是重温李健吾对巴金、傅雷对张爱玲的批评，以及方兴未艾的文学伦理学批评、认知叙事学批评、社会历史批评等等。

舒：基于对拉美文学的深入研究，您如何评价魔幻现实主义对您、对中国当代作家的影响？

陈：拉美现当代文学的确是一个富矿。当然，“冷战”时期以美苏为首的两大阵营的推崇和推介也是个不可否认的客观原因。拉美文学左右逢源，加之后发的优势，不仅对我国，而且对全世界产生了深远的影响。魔幻现实主义对我本人的影响毋庸置疑，我曾借用“集体无意识”概而括之。

我想，受拉美文学影响最甚的莫过于“寻根派”<sup>3</sup>和“先锋派”<sup>4</sup>作家，前者得益于马尔克斯<sup>5</sup>，后者受惠于博尔赫斯。这是千真万确的。但究其原因，也许前者基于我国五千年文明积淀的集体无意识和一代人对前现代的反叛冲动，后者则更加取法同现实生活的间离效果。这只是一概而论，具体情况要复杂得多，何况每个作家也在不断地发生窑变。

舒：尤其对马尔克斯，您对他进行过系统研究，发表过《加西亚·马尔克斯评传》《加西亚·马尔克斯传》《二十年后谈孤独》，等等。2022年5月是《百年孤独》出版55周年，您有什么要表达的吗？

陈：《百年孤独》在上世纪80年代被中国作家奉为“圣经”，但在2013年广西师范大学出版社的抽样调查中，却成了“死活读不下去”的作品，而且位列外国文学作品榜首，就像《红楼梦》位居“死活读不下去”的中国文学作品之首一样。马尔克斯倘在世，听到这个消息，又当作何感想？我觉得他会高兴。毕竟他的作品可以同我国的第一名著对位并列了！但话又说回来，以范译本《百年孤独》的销量看，读它的人依然不少。它和《红楼梦》一样，是可以从任何一页开始阅读的。我对儿童和青少年朋友的忠告是多读文学作品，倘使你连文学经典都不肯多读，那么也就错过了许多“美梦”和“艳遇”、“深潜”和“飞翔”的机会喽。何况，连经过时间检验的文学名

1 “四个自信”是习近平新时代中国特色社会主义思想的重要内容，是以习近平同志为核心的党中央治国理政的重要理论创新成果。

2 党的十九大报告提出了打造“现代化经济体系、高效绿色生态文明体系、先进民主法治体系”三大体系的目标。

3 寻根派是一种文学运动，其起源可追溯至20世纪初的中国，这个运动倡导回归中国传统的文化精髓，在其中发掘灵感，并与现代思想融合。

4 先锋派文学是指反对传统文化，刻意违反约定俗成的创作原则及欣赏习惯的文学。

5 这是国人对他的简称，在此随俗。

著都读不下去，那么终身阅读就无从谈起。我始终认为，读名著是培养精神味蕾的唯一途径。

舒：您的译著多吗？能否谈谈当下文学翻译有哪些新的问题？

陈：我年轻时译过一些，但主要是零敲碎打，譬如博尔赫斯、卡彭铁尔、富恩特斯等人的作品，同时还翻译过一些古今诗歌。如果说文学是遗憾的艺术，那么翻译尤其是一件吃力不讨好的活计。首先是阅读趣味的变化，其次是研究家们的发现，再次是语言习惯的移易，这些都可能决定译本的命运和不断被重译的必然，加上错译在所难免，因此不可能没有遗憾。马尔克斯就曾表示《百年孤独》中有二十几个遗憾和错漏，有些已被研究界零星发现，我自己也发现过一两个。可惜其他“马脚”被他永远地带走了。自然啦，一代人有一代人的情趣和使命，我的遗憾是后来退却了：当有人约我翻译马尔克斯时，我婉言谢绝并推荐了青年才俊。

现在翻译有网络的帮助是件好事，但同时也因为有了网络和翻译软件，问题也越来越多。但守望和专注于译德的年轻人依然不在少数。寄希望于他们吧！

舒：您曾著有《帕慕克在十字路口》，您和帕慕克有过深入交流？能否谈谈对他的印象？

陈：我担任社科院外文所所长期间先后邀请过七位诺贝尔文学奖获得者，帕慕克是其中一位。他是个很有个性的作家，这不仅体现于他的作品：率真而不失睿智，同样表现在他的为人。很多见过他、与他打过交道的人都觉得他太任性，而我却喜欢他的这种性情。做事直来直去，讲话有一说一。除了在北京那几天，我还带他去了老家绍兴。他很喜欢那里的风景和黄酒，结果有一次喝多了。我老家有一句箴言：“绍兴老酒后反堂”，意思是它后劲儿足。酒香，又不冲，不知不觉几杯下去便可能被醉倒。同去的许金龙先生也不免多喝几杯，结果连皮夹子都丢了。

**阅读就是蜘蛛织网的感觉：从一点开始，不断延伸，往返穿梭，这也是一般西方高等教育的取法：凡事都讲个学术史视野。**

舒：记得您好像提到自己最早的阅读是听书，那么阅读是从什么时候开始的？可否谈谈童年阅读对您的影响？

陈：我上学比较早，当时未满五周岁，在这之前一直在街头和茶馆酒肆听人说书。此外，江南夏天闷热，于是家家户户都摊一张凉席、搬几把竹椅在街头消夏，街边总有清渠。太热了，孩子们就会跳到水里凉快一会儿，顺便摸鱼捉蟹玩儿。但凡有人讲故事，就会竖着耳朵倾听，也就顾不得玩水

了。听得最多的是《三国演义》和《水浒传》，其次是《北宋杨家将》和《说岳全传》，再次是《聊斋志异》和《徐文长传奇》。后者属于少儿不宜，一般情况下大人会有所避讳，尽管我等偶尔侧耳听说一二也是有的。我开始阅读大概是在七岁那年，因为可以磕磕绊绊连猜带蒙地看书了，就开始大撒把，只要是文学作品，便逮着什么看什么。一直到“文革”和知青年代，阅读便成了习惯。

过去以为“三岁看大”“七岁见老”是一种迷信，如今却被科学证明是有道理的。就阅读习惯而言，我称之为童年的味蕾。由于读得最多的是演义类作品，从隋唐演义到明演义，其中当然还有多种《杨家将》《岳飞传》和《七侠五义》和《小五义》，等等。外国文学最先入目的也是《基督山伯爵》《福尔摩斯探案大全集》之类，同时苏联和国内的红色经典也一股脑儿地入目入心了。因此，义字早于儒释道潜入了我那代孩子的心志。这个义既是古来我国文化四要素之一的侠义，也包含了现代红色经典的凛然正义。

舒：作为政协委员，您一向关注教育，不知您是否关注到当下孩子们的阅读？可否在阅读方面提些建议？

陈：目下孩子们的阅读情况令人担忧。究其原因，一是手机剥夺了孩子们阅读的兴趣，从小沉溺于游戏的不在少数；二是课业的压力过大，我曾多年就中小学义务教育阶段的校外培训提出批评，认为这是资本挺进基础教育、中小学校举手投降的结果。“双减”政策出台以后情况有所好转，但正所谓“病来如山倒，病去如抽丝”，从根本上解决教育内卷的问题还有很长的路要走。孩子们如果不能从小养成阅读习惯，很难想象他们走上社会后还有时间和兴趣沾染书香。

因此，我认为当务之急是从小学开始规定阅读纲目，而且必须同语文、思政和素质教育结合起来，同课业考核结合起来，甚至同中考和高考这两大杠杆结合起来。非如此，很难改变目前的状况。

说到阅读，我不免想起两位前辈来。首先是钱钟书先生，围绕其一生的最大公案之一，便是他1949年缘何谢绝民国要员之约，坚定地留在大陆。关于这桩公案，当然也是私案，坊间曾有过许多揣测。最终杨绛先生在晚年用最简单也最温婉的方式了却的这桩公私案：她说，“为了中文”。原来事情居然这么简单！其次，我的故友柏杨先生毕生致力于探究国民性，尤其是它的美与丑。他不像辜鸿铭先生那么乐观，用一个“gentle”简单概括国人的心性；但也不像钱玄同先生那么悲观，后者几乎偏激到了否定一切、横扫一切传统的地步。柏杨在鞭笞丑陋的中国人和褒奖美丽的中国人的同时，编修了《中国人史纲》，并雄辩地论证了国人何以对外平和、对内严苛的根本原因：几千年一亩三分地，乡土为本的小农经济。他甚至认为这也是中华文化的稳定性之所在。而我曾斗胆替他的这个稳定性附加了另一个关键因素：中

文。如果没有中文，我们的文化也许早就被化掉了。而守护中文、强健中文的最好方法无疑是文学，其中阅读与书写尤为重要。还是那句话，如果连文学名著都读不进去，那还能指望什么？好，不说文学家，看看钱学森、苏步青、杨振宁、李政道、丁肇中等一千科学家吧，居然也都个个饱读诗书、文采飞扬！

《易经》有云：“观乎天文以察事变，观乎人文以化成天下。”人文化成，靠的就是狭义文化，尤其是以中文为载体的文学。后者潜移默化、润物无声，悠悠幽幽地将价值观化作集体意识或无意识。这也是中华文化何以有容乃大的根本：当迄今为止西方还在用血缘论和种族主义侵略、杀戮和“他者化”美洲印第安人和东方民族时，中华文化早就以文化成、以文化合了。就说满族同胞入主中原后，在明朝的基础上兴建的故宫竟然凸显了一个和字，其中最重要的三大殿便是太和殿、中和殿和保和殿。太和乃天人之和，中和乃人人之和，保和乃人己之和。是故，中华民族从不压迫和侵略其他国家、其他民族，而文化所自也。即使在中华民族伟大复兴之日，也不会侵略和压迫其他民族国家，而文化所由也。

舒：您在1977年考入复旦大学，师从于哪些名家，他们对您有怎样的影响？在阅读方面，会给您具体的指导吗？

陈：我1977年进入复旦大学，但半年后就被选拔为“文革”后第一批留学生了。因此，我的本科、硕士、博士都是在国外完成的。要说谁的影响最大，那肯定是时任校长的苏步青。他既是著名的数学家，又是诗人。而且选派留学生的动议还是他率先向邓小平提出的。

由于外语水平太差，我的洋插队比土插队还苦，尤其是开始一两年，那真个儿是两眼一抹黑，两耳成摆设。但咱曾经的口头禅是：“活都不怕，还怕那个苦吗？”（另一个版本是“活都不怕，还怕那个死吗？”）因为成分不好，当兵报国的愿望未能实现，尔后只能硬着头皮读洋文，但心里一直有一个梦想：成为作家，甚至是学者型作家，这可以无限伸展理想的翅膀；也可以尽情潜入别人的生活，无论古人今人、文臣武将。

为此，阅读就是蜘蛛织网的感觉：从一点开始，不断延伸，往返穿梭，这也是一般西方高等教育的取法：凡事都讲个学术史视野。这样有点及面，纵横捭阖，庶乎既见树木也见森林便成了一种阅读习惯。

舒：您目前有什么创作或研究计划？

陈：目前的主要计划是做一个有关文学原理的项目。基于有过20年的外国经典作家作品学术史研究（这是一个系列，包括东西方数十作家作品），以及十余年的学科史研究，文学原理研究也便水到渠成了。我想约邀国内心仪的同仁一起来完成这项工作，分别从西方现当代文学基本原理、文学伦理



学批评原理、现实主义文学原理、文学审美批评原理、女性文学原理和文学书写原理等六个方面梳理现当代西方文学理论，为“三大体系”建设提供可资借鉴的思想与方法。

文学创作方面的计划暂时保密，因为这像夫妻生娃一样，非常隐私，哈哈！可以确定的是，近两三年不会再启动。

舒：如果您有机会见到一位作家，您想见到谁？您希望从这位作家那里知道什么？

陈：这我得想想。也许是巴尔加斯·略萨吧！他一生风流倜傥，可以说是要风得风，要雨得雨，唯一的遗憾可能是竞选总统未果。我曾于2011年6月邀请过他，他来了。当时他还是新科诺奖得主，可谓意气风发、老当益壮。我当时最想知道的是他70年代中后期缘何与马尔克斯拳脚相向，以至于分道扬镳，连文风都为之一变，写起了艳情小说。可出于礼貌，最终我还是没好意思张口。我想现在旧事重提应该没什么忌讳了吧？2011年以后，老马和老略两人似乎渐渐言归于好了，何况人家马尔克斯如今去了天堂。与其谣言满天飞，倒不如说开了来个痛快。谣言之一是马尔克斯看上了略萨（这是国人对他的简称，我也一并随俗）的前妻加舅姨胡莉娅，又说马尔克斯钟情于略萨的第二任妻子加表妹帕特里西娅，总之都是桃色的。问题是他老人家八十多岁了，如今又因为菲律宾名媛闹得满城风雨。呵呵，真想问问他是如何打理文学与生活的。

舒：如果您可以带三本书到无人岛，您会选哪三本？

陈：我可能会带三本最实用的：为了自救的《本草纲目》、为了生存的《鲁滨逊漂流记》和为了跟自己说话的《现代汉语词典》，当然我会把汉语两个字改成中文。

舒：假设您正在策划一场宴会，可以邀请在世或已故作家出席，您会邀请谁？

陈：我会邀请马尔克斯，在他有生之年，我与他有过几面之缘；同时我把略萨也请上。我还会邀请亚历山大大帝，他像个任性的孩子，笃爱听故事。但我最想邀请的是萨福，她是古希腊诗人，据说才貌双全，还男女通吃。俗话说，“三女一男是三娘教子”，那么三男一女呢？

舒：如果您可以成为任意文学作品中的主角，您想变成谁？

陈：我想成为笛福笔下的鲁滨逊或者图尼埃笔下的礼拜五，反正要去无人岛了。

## Works Cited

陈众议：《如是我闻》。北京：作家出版社，2022 年。

[Chen Zhongyi. *So This Is What I Heard*. Beijing: The Writers Publishing House Co., Ltd, 2022.]

——：《想象的边际》。广州：花城出版社，2015 年。

[—, *Boundary of imagination*. Guangzhou: Huacheng Publishing House, 2015]

——：“文学理论到了该清理的时候”，《辽宁日报·文化观察》2012 年 4 月 27 日，第 008 版。

[—, “Time to Clean up Literary Theory.” *Liaoning Daily Wen Hua Guan Cha* 27 April 2012: 008.]

毛泽东：“论十大关系”，《毛泽东文集》第 7 卷。北京：人民出版社，1999 年，第 33 页。

[Mao Tse-Tung. “On the Ten Major Relationships.” *Collected Works of Mao Tse-Tung* Vol.7. Beijing: People’s Publishing House, 1999. 33.]

钱钟书：《管锥编》第 1 卷。北京：三联书店，2008 年。

[Qian Zhongshu. *Limited Views: Essays on Ideas and Letters* Vol.1. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1979.]

# 在场与定力：陈众议学术思想述评

## Presence and Concentration: A Review of Mr. Chen Zhongyi's Academic Research

宗笑飞（Zong Xiaofei）

**内容摘要：**陈众议先生始终坚持自己的学术方向和问学方式。翻检他问学四十年的所著所述，与众不同的首先是他从未追风逐新。其次，他始终关心本国文学。本文便以陈众议先生的几个治学理念为例，从不同角度、不同时期评述其对文学阅读、学术史研究和原理学等较为重要的文学问题的关注。这些关注体现了陈众议先生的在场状态：融通中外，兼及古今。

**关键词：**童年的阅读；拿来的甄别；学术史研究；学科史研究；原理学思想

**作者简介：**宗笑飞，中国社会科学院外国文学研究所研究员，主要从事阿拉伯文学和阿拉伯－西班牙文学比较研究。

**Title:** Presence and Concentration: A Review of Mr. Chen Zhongyi's Academic Research

**Abstract:** Mr. Chen Zhongyi has always insisted on his own academic direction and study style. Looking through his writings over the past forty years, the first thing that distinguishes him is that he has never chased after new trend. Secondly, he has always concerned about the literature of his own country. This article takes Mr. Chen's several academic ideas as examples, and reviews his attention to some important literary issues such as literary reading, academic history research and theoretical studies from different perspectives and at different periods. These concerns reflect Mr. Chen's state of being: integrating Chinese and foreign literatures, as well as the ancient and the modern.

**Keywords:** childhood reading; identification of what was accepted; academic history study; research on the history of the discipline; principles of thought

**Author:** Zong Xiaofei is Researcher at the Institute of Foreign Literature, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (Beijing China, 100732), specializing in Arabic literature and comparative Arab-Spanish literature (Email: waterlilyfeiz@126.com).

陈众议先生作为上世纪 70 年代末的首批公派留学生，从一开始便迈进了改革开放大潮，并从上世纪 80 年代初发表作品，参与我国文坛重建。在长达



四十余年的学术生涯中，他笔耕不辍，且时有作为，为新时期我国文坛和外国文学学科的发展做出了贡献。

## 一、童年的阅读

陈众议先生始终强调“童年的阅读”至关重要，但这个“童年的阅读”是要加引号的。他在“我们为什么需要文学”一文中写道：“读书犹如饮食，从小培养的味蕾其实会伴随人的一生”（212-232）。换言之，“一开始读什么非常重要，因为它关系到能否使小孩子从小喜爱经典，然后渐成习惯。无论做什么，一旦成为习惯，也便成了生命的有机部分”（212-232）。他尤其强调文字的张力，认为文字较之于图像具有无与伦比的熵值。如果在一个孩子的记忆中，《红楼梦》只是连环画或影视作品，那么林黛玉也只能是陈晓旭、张晓旭等，其定格化和束缚性不言而喻。相反，文字赋予读者以无限的想象空间，而且可以随着审美情趣和价值判断的变化而产生相应的变化。这一点，对于今天时人的图像、视频阅读而言，尤其具有警醒意义。在另一篇关于经典的文字中，他还指出“《红楼梦》基本不写好人，这姑且可以看作‘梦中人’林妹妹的了悟吧。既无好人，哪来好事？即或有之，那也是暂时的，是无数悲剧叠加之因”（陈众议，“见过千帆”219-234）。当然，他认为《红楼梦》也不尽是悲剧，并借用鲁迅的话说，《红楼梦》的丰富性提供了不同的读法。其中既有刘姥姥进大观园的陌生化，也有宝黛读《西厢记》的熟悉化或间离化。这些可以看作是他对《红楼梦》这部文学经典的评鹭。

同样，陈众议先生对《三国演义》《水浒传》《西游记》《聊斋志异》等古典名著也多有精彩评点，让人不能不联想金圣叹等前辈亦庄亦谐的问学传统。由彼及此，他针对当代中国作家的评鹭同样令人读后深受启发。在“评莫言”中，陈众议先生于褒奖和祝贺莫言的同时，抽丝剥茧般评析了后者的“五大软肋”，认为正可谓“成也萧何，败也萧何”：狂放的想象力、旺盛的生命力，以及信马由缰、不拘小节，甚或蝌蚪结构等既是莫言成功的秘诀，同时也可能是他的软肋。<sup>1</sup>正因为如此，他认为诺贝尔文学奖不是文学的唯一标准。对贾平凹，他称《秦腔》《高兴》《带灯》为奇妙的“三部曲”，在百年未有之大变局之际留下了千年之变的神来之笔<sup>2</sup>；而《老生》则是一部罕有的“不忍读完”的现代史诗<sup>3</sup>。对当代作家张炜，他直言不讳地提出了作家以不变应万变的执著。<sup>4</sup>至于作家格非，陈众议先生用“矛盾叙事”概而括之，谓作家徘徊于古典与先锋、悲剧与喜剧、玄秘与狂欢、审美与审

1 参见陈众议：“评莫言”，《东吴学术》1（2013）：5-12。

2 参见陈众议：《想象的边际》，北京：作家出版社，2015年，第22页。

3 参见陈众议：“贾平凹的通感——以《老生》为个案”，《东吴学术》6（2016）：6-10。

4 参见陈众议：“评张炜的《独药师》《艾约堡秘史》及其风格”，《上海交通大学学报》2（2020）：48-53。

丑、逼真与失真、一般与个别、陌生与熟悉、情节与主题、大学与小说之间。<sup>1</sup>在此，他旁征博引、有意无意地牵出了不少文学中的历史事件，其中之一是约翰逊（Samuel Johnson）和布莱克（William Blake）之间关于经典的争鸣。前者断言经典记录永恒<sup>2</sup>，后者却反诘说：“哪有这样的东西？”（塞尔登 84-85）此外，他的笔触还伸向了吉狄马加、东西等众多中国诗人作家。

显而易见，陈众议先生的文学笔触远不仅仅指向“童年的味蕾”，而是由兹出发，触及文学阅读的方方面面；其对古今中西文学经典熟稔是专业素质和专业训练的结果，而非自由阅读呈现。

## 二、拿来的甄别

作为外国文学研究者，尤其是西葡拉美文学专家，陈众议先生对当代中国文坛的贡献有目共睹。他在《魔幻现实主义大师》中关于拉美寻根运动和魔幻现实主义的评鹭启发了寻根派作家，并用集体无意识颠覆了某些笼统的界定，也否定了加西亚·马尔克斯（García Márquez）关乎美洲现实的魔幻特征。陈先生指出，尽管在1982年诺贝尔文学奖授奖辞中，加西亚·马尔克斯长篇累牍，炫示了由殖民主义和专制制度造成魔幻现实。然而作家之言不可不信，却也未可全信。他曾援引早期魔幻现实主义作家阿斯图里亚斯（Miguel Ángel Asturias）和卡彭铁尔（Alejo Carpentier），并借鉴卡尔·荣格（Carl Gustav Jung）、列维-布留尔（Lucien Lévy-Bruhl）、列维-斯特劳斯（Claude Lévi-Strauss）等精神分析学家和人类学家关于原始心象的论述，认为集体无意识才是魔幻现实主义的主要表现对象。<sup>3</sup>

的确，阿斯图里亚斯曾经这样描述魔幻现实：“简言之，魔幻现实是这样的：一个印第安人或混血儿，居住在偏僻的山村，叙述他如何看见一朵彩云或一块巨石变成一个人或一个巨人（……）所有这些不外乎村人常有的幻觉，谁听了都觉得荒唐可笑、不能相信。但是，一旦生活在他们中间，你就会意识到这些故事的份量。在那里，尤其是在宗教迷信盛行的地方，譬如印第安部落，人们对周围事物的幻觉能逐渐转化为现实。当然那不是看得见摸得着的现实，但它是存在的，是某种信仰的产物”（Lowrence 77-78）<sup>4</sup>。阿斯图里亚斯称之为现实的“第三范畴”，它既非看得见摸得着的物质世界，也不是理性主义认知，而是信仰的产物。<sup>5</sup>同样，卡彭铁尔认为神奇或魔幻的产生“首先需要一种信仰”（Carpentier 1-3）。

有鉴于此，并基于阿斯图里亚斯、卡彭铁尔，以及鲁尔福（Juan Rulfo）、吉马朗埃斯·罗萨（João Guimarães Rosa）和加西亚·马尔克斯的

1 参见陈众议：《想象的边际》，北京：作家出版社，2015年，第38-59页。

2 参见 Samuel Johnson, *Johnson on Shakespeare*, London: Oxford University Press, 1908, 11.

3 参见陈众议：《魔幻现实主义大师》，郑州：黄河文艺出版社，1988年，第209-230页。

4 外文引文均出自笔者译。

5 参见 Lowrence, G. W., “Entrevista con Miguel Angel Asturias,” *El Nuevo Mundo* I (1970): 78.

作品，陈众议先生得出结论：魔幻现实主义的主要对象为“集体无意识”，即来自远古的声音，譬如阿斯图里亚斯笔下的印第安人如何浸淫于玛雅神话传说，卡彭铁尔笔下的加勒比非洲族裔如何信奉伏都教；又譬如鲁尔福笔下的墨西哥村民如何“寻梦环游记”般生活在“人鬼之间”<sup>1</sup>，吉马朗埃斯·罗萨的“第三河岸”则显然与阿斯图里亚斯的“第三范畴”有异曲同工之妙；而加西亚·马尔克斯的《百年孤独》除了直接套用古希伯来神话结构，还掺杂了不少鬼故事。<sup>2</sup>

这些不仅让中国“寻根作家”会心，而且那个循环句式也曾引发不小的“骚动”：“多年以后，奥雷良诺·布恩迪亚上校面对行刑队，准会想起父亲带他去见识冰块的那个遥远的下午”（马尔克斯 1）。但陈众议先生似乎并不那么关心这句式本身，倒是它背后的“马脚”，譬如“*Muchos años después, frente al pelotón de fusilamiento, el coronel Aureliano Buendía había de recordar aquella tarde remota en que su padre lo llevó a conocer el hielo. Macondo era entonces una aldea de veinte casas[...]*” (Many years later, as he faced the firing squad, Colonel Aureliano Buendía was to remember that distant afternoon when his father took him to discover ice. At that time Macondo was a village of twenty adobe houses [...]) (Marquez 1)。从西班牙语原文看，主句是“多年以后，奥雷良诺·布恩迪亚上校面对行刑队，准会想起（……）”而那个“父亲带他去见识冰块的遥远下午”只是副句。句号之后，时态或情景应从主句，而非副句。那么马孔多早已不是最初的“20户人家的小村落”，而是朝廷派了镇长和神父的大城镇。

值得一提的是，他对拉美“文学爆炸”时期另一位大师博尔赫斯（Jorge Luis Borges）同样持保留态度，并用知识考古方法找到了其何以被称为“作家们的作家”的原委：上世纪五六十年代拉美左翼作家对他逃避现实、故弄玄虚或“本本主义”的批评；而且由此及彼，对因他而起、因他而终的幻想美学进行了探赜索隐。<sup>3</sup>

### 三、学术史研究

学术体系、学科体系、话语体系（“三大体系”）建设是新时代中国特色学科发展的基础和方向。然而，囿于形形色色、潮起潮落的西方理论思潮，我国外国文学界或多或少陷入了无如的应付和追逐。但是，陈众议先生不苟且。在现代主义与后现代主义和后现代主义之后林林总总的问题，如族裔、身份、身体、创伤、性别、时空、生态、形式主义、结构主义、叙事学、符号学、东方学、认知学等面前，他选择了传统的学术史研究方法，谓历史唯物主义

1 《佩德罗·巴拉莫》第一个中译本便是以《人鬼之间》命名的。

2 参见陈众议：《魔幻现实主义大师》，郑州：黄河文艺出版社，1988年，第209-230页。

3 参见陈众议：《博尔赫斯》，北京：华夏出版社，2001年，124-184页。

所持也。在《塞万提斯学术史研究》中，他指出：

文学经典的产生往往建立在对以往经典的传承、翻新，乃至反动（或数者兼有之）的基础之上。传承和翻新不必说；但奇怪的是，即使反动，也每每无损以往作品的生命力，反而能使它们获得某种新生。这就使得文学不仅迥异于科学，而且迥异于它的近亲——历史。套用阿瑞提的话说，如果没有哥伦布，迟早会有人发现美洲；如果伽里略没有发现太阳黑子，也总会有人发现。同样，历史可以重写，也不断地在重写，用克罗齐的话说，“一切历史都是当代史”。但是，如果没有莎士比亚，又会有谁来创作《哈姆雷特》呢？有了《哈姆雷特》，又会有谁来重写它呢？即使有人重写，他们缘何不仅无损于莎士比亚的光辉，反而能使他获得重生，甚至更加辉煌灿烂呢？（2）

在他看来，这自然是由文学的特殊性所决定的。同时，由于文学是各民族的认知、价值、情感、审美、思想和语言等诸多因素的综合体现，因此，文学既是民族文化及民族向心力、认同感的重要基础，也是使之立于世界之林而不轻易被同化的鲜活基因。陈众议先生认为，大到世界观，小到生活习俗，文学在各民族文化中起到了染色体的功用，而独特的染色体保证了各民族在共通或相似的物质文明进程中保持着不断变化却又不可淹没的个性。惟其如此，世界文学和文化生态才丰富多彩，也才需要东西南北的相互交流和借鉴。同时，古今中外，文学终究是一时一地人心的艺术呈现，它建立在无数个人基础之上，并潜移默化、润物无声地表达与传递、塑造与擢升着各民族活的灵魂。这正是文学不可或缺、无可取代的永久价值、恒久魅力之所在。此外，在他看来，较之于创作，文学研究则更具有意识形态和上层建筑属性，因而更取决于生产力和社会形态、社会发展水平。这也是马克思主义的基本观点之一。如是，我国现代意义上的文学研究起步较晚，外国文学研究更是如此。虽然以鲁迅为旗手的新文学运动十分重视外国文学，但从实际成果看，我国的外国文学研究几乎可以说是在新中国成立以后全面展开的，而系统的外国文学学术史研究，这还是第一次。<sup>1</sup>它是一个旨在清算历史虚无主义和唯文本论的宏大工程。作为丛书发起人和总主编，陈众议先生邀约了我国外国文学研究的不少大家、翘楚。迄今该丛书已出版20余种，凡40余卷。用陈众议先生的话说：

格物致知，信而有证；厘清源流，以利甄别（……）学术史研究既

1 参见 陈众议：《塞万提斯学术史研究》，南京：译林出版社，2009年，第1-8页。这是陈众议先生在新世纪之初“外国文学经典作家作品学术史研究”丛书总序中的表述。丛书萌生于世纪之交，启程于2004年，首批成果出版于2009年。

是对一般博士论文的基本要求，也是一种行之有效的文学研究方法，更是一种切实可行的文化积累工程，同时还可以杜绝有关领域的低水平重复。每一部学术史研究著作通过尽可能竭泽而渔式的梳理，即使不能见人所未见、言人所未言，至少也能老老实实在地将有关作家作品的研究成果（包括有关研究家的立场、观点和方法）公诸于众，以裨来者察考。如能温故知新，有所创建，则读者幸甚，学界幸甚。（《塞万提斯学术史研究》1-8）

#### 四、学科史研究

在学术史研究的过程中，陈众议先生从方法论的角度对后现代主义进行了反思，认为它是用“绝对的相对性取代相对的绝对性”（《当代中国外国文学研究》7）。这很尖锐，也很容易让人联想到袁可嘉先生在中国外国文学第四届年会上发言时所指出的：现代主义具有“片面的深刻性”和“深刻的片面性”。<sup>1</sup>

十余年前，在学术史研究的基础上，陈众议先生开始致力于学科史研究。在其主编的《当代中国外国文学研究》的“序言”中，他开宗明义指出，从学科史的角度看，外国文学同中国现代文学本是一枚钱币的两面，难以截然分割。<sup>2</sup>随后，他对近代以来各种文化活动进行了分类辨析，譬如在他看来，“百日维新”（康有为、梁启超等）延承洋务运动“托洋改制”的“体”“用”思想，是改良派取法西方文艺复兴运动（“托古改制”）思想的一个显证；1898年林纾翻译《巴黎茶花女遗事》也是我国第一次自主引进外国文学，从而与严复、梁启超和王国维等人殊途同归。严复与梁启超分别于“百日维新”期间倡导中国文学的改革路径应以日本与西方文学为准绳；严复提出了译事三字经“信、达、雅”，而且亲历亲为。“信”和“达”于翻译不必多言，而“雅”字不仅指语言，还应包含遴选标准，即价值判断和审美取向；王国维则直接借用叔本华悲剧理论创作了《〈红楼梦〉评论》。其次他谈到“五四”运动。它不仅是一场“反帝反封建的爱国运动”，也是中国思想史的一个分水岭：“五四”运动故而又称新文化运动。如果说“维新变法”取法的是“中学为体”、“西学为用”，那么“五四”运动显然是更为明确的“别求新声于异邦”了。同时，“五四”运动以“忧国感时”、“反帝反封建”为己任，强化了文学的意识形态属性。同为“五四”新文化运动的主将，胡适在评论陈独秀时就曾说过，陈独秀对五四“文学革命”做出了三大贡献：一、由我

1 在中国外国文学学会第四届年会上，袁可嘉先生以“片面的深刻性、深刻的片面性”为题进行发言，转引自 戈异：“外国文学工作者任重道远”，《外国文学研究》4（1991）：147。

2 《当代中国外国文学研究》（1949-2019）是建国 70 周年之际，由中国社会科学出版社修订出版的《当代中国学术思想史丛书》的其中一部，该书总结了我国建国 70 年来在外国文学研究和翻译领域所取得的丰硕成果。



们的玩意儿变成了文学革命，变成了三大主义；二、由他把伦理道德政治的革命合成了一个大运动；三、由他一往直前的精神，使得文学革命有了很大的收获。<sup>1</sup>“五四”运动以降，外国文学被大量介绍到中国。这快速改变了中国的文学生态和中国知识分子对文学的认知，起到了除旧布新、引领风气的功用。鲁迅在“我怎么做起小说来”一文中写道：“因为所求的作品是叫喊和反抗，势必至于倾向于东欧，因此所看的俄国、波兰以及巴尔干诸小国家的东西就特别多”（511）。

联系到后现代主义的形而上学思辨，陈众议先生进而拥抱客观真理，认为真假、善恶、美丑，始终是衡量文艺价值的主要坐标。正因为如此，中外文艺界在认识论、价值论和审美向度上进行了上千年，乃至数千年的论争。由于立场和方法的差异，真假、善恶的界定尚且没有明确的定义，美丑就更不必说了。陈众议先生看到，这其中既有社会历史原因，也有民族、群体、个人取法的相左，很难一概而论。但同时我们又不应当否定相对的客观美、普遍美，譬如母爱，又譬如爱情，乃至自然山水之美。如此，问题的复杂性可想而知。反过来，这种复杂性促使美学不断发展。联系到“三大体系”建设，陈众议先生认为如何找到既有内核又有外延的公约数和同心圆，便是话语之弧必须面对的现实课题，即如何在建构学术体系、学科体系的同时，凸显话语体系之纲，这个任务已然历史地交给当今学界。譬如他论文“重塑文学原理，构建当代文学话语体系”中所体现出的若干思考和观点：

（一）囿于唯文本论、学术碎片化和某些虚无主义风潮的扫荡，近几十年我国在去意识形态与意识形态批评、去审美理性与审美理性批评等二元对立中不断摇摆，以至于催生了“文”与“学”的疏离；

（二）一如解构主义借无限夸大语言所指的延异性否定其与能指的约定俗成，东方西方、男人女人等二元概念也遭到了反本质主义者的攻讦。然而，二元论不等于非白即黑、非此即彼的二元对立，而否定二元论却很大程度上滑向了反本质主义的虚无主义，从而不可避免地陷入反二元论与辩证法的形而上学窠臼；

（三）文学作品是语言的艺术。的确，语言具有一定的不确定性。借用袁可嘉先生对西方现代主义的指涉，解构主义也正是出于片面的深刻性，攻其一点不及其余：无限夸大能指与所指的相对性和延异性，却无视其中约定俗成的规约性和常识性。因此，所谓“文本之外，一切皆无”或“话语之外，一切皆无”不仅仅是结构主义的问题，同时更是解构主义（或后结构主义）的问题，尽管二者与形而上学的思辨传统一脉相承；

（四）随着比较文学与跨文化研究的发展，突破边界成为许多学者的关切。这没有问题，因为文学的触角从来都深远地指向生活的所有面向。问题是，文学及其研究方法固然是发展的，但同时也是叠加的，是加法，而非绝

1 参见 胡适：《胡适学术文集·新文学运动》，北京：中华书局，1998年，第192页。

对的、科技般的替代。惟其如此，文学原理（包括相关概念、理论），才更需要去伪存真的鉴别、去粗存精的辨析。同时，文学原理终究要立足于文学本体，以免被其他学科所淹没或简单替代；但又不能因噎废食，抛弃韦勒克们指摘的“外部研究”，或者片面拥抱新批评、跨学科，甚至遁入卡勒们的“不可定义”；

（五）过去的文学原理很少关注口传文学，同时网络文学也大概率尚未进入有关著述者的视野。但后者具有鲜明的集体创作倾向：作者在创作过程中与读者（粉丝或拥趸）的互动。如是，文学从旧口传到“新口传”或“同构性”的大循环正在形成；同时，数字人文奔腾而来，我们正迎面更大的挑战；

（六）现实主义从摹仿论到再现论、反映论、“无边”说，浪漫主义从“快感”论到“甜美”论、宣泄论、表现论等等，涵括了大量基于具体立场和方法的人物、事件、角度等等的选择与诸多主体与客体、局部与整体、具象性与典型性等复杂关系。同样，从载道说到伦理学，文学的价值天平远未形成守恒定律，其中有关作者意图和读者接受的种种纠葛与撕裂端非三言两语可以廓清。<sup>1</sup>

作为总结，陈众议先生在该论文末尾指出，“从方法论的角度看，时至今日，任何概念必须置于历时性和共时性、唯物主义和辩证法坐标上方能厘清。如何以我为主，为我所用地鉴古知今、洋为中用，使原理成为有源之水、有本之木，并且有点有面，庶乎既见树木又见森林，无疑是重塑文学原理的最大旨归”（1）。当然，适当的规约又是必要的，否则就会陷入无边无际的文学和文学规律探究的汪洋大海。

## 五、原理学思想

所谓话语体系，归根结底是原理建构。学术史和学科史研究使原理学研究水到渠成。原理学牵涉到文学批评史、文学理论史和方法论等相关领域。陈众议先生近年来所着力研究的文学原理学便是攫取数个案例，对其进行历时性梳理与共时性扫描，并在此基础上提出建设性方案。

首先是对马宗霍先生的《文学概论》进行探讨。该专著凡三篇，由“绪论”、“外论”和“本论”组成。陈众议先生认为，作者试图用本体论与方法论相结合的路径建构文学原理，但因攫取的几乎皆为中国本土材料，且偏重于文字学方向，故而略嫌偏狭。虽如此，然作为首创，他却功不可没。<sup>2</sup>

其次是蔡仪先生的《文学概论》。正所谓“时运交移，文质代变”，在陈众议先生看来，蔡仪先生的这部文学概论在原理性揭示方面广泛接受马克

1 参见 陈众议：“重塑文学原理，构建当代文学话语体系”，《中国社会科学报》2021 年 11 月 9 日，第 1 版。

2 参见 陈众议：《想象的边际》，北京：作家出版社，2015 年，第 166-168 页。

思主义文艺观，尽管这一文艺观带有鲜明的苏联色彩。<sup>1</sup>

再次是董学文、张永刚先生的《文学原理》。这是我国近一个时期出版的诸多《文学原理》当中的一部，陈众议先生拿它作个案有一定的任意性，也就是说视它为之一并不意味着特殊的价值判断，但它确实是我国高校文学系使用率较高的。陈众议先生认为从方法论的角度看，该著作缺乏基本的学术史维度，依然像是在文学概念的版图上指点江山，因而依然缺乏纵深感、历史意识和唯物辩证法思想。<sup>2</sup>

此外，陈众议先生针对韦勒克和沃伦在俄国形式主义、英美新批评和布拉格学派的基础上发表的《文学理论》（*Theory of Literature*, 1949）也进行了评鹭。1984年以来，这部著作在我国印行数十次，影响之大，可谓无出其右。至于其用“内部研究”否定“外部研究”则使陈众议先生想到了老舍写于上世纪30年代的一册《文学概论讲义》，后者几乎以同样的方式批评了外部研究，并以《红楼梦》为例否定了胡适、蔡元培等人的考证或索隐方式，认为“文学本身是文学特质的唯一寄存处”（老舍 72）。

在其文学原理学研究的视域内，当然少不了纷纷嚷嚷的后主义。他指出，到了世纪之交之际，利奥塔或德里达的后现代主义或解构主义风潮渐行渐远，韦勒克的非此即彼也成了过去，乔纳森·卡勒、特里·伊格尔顿等则粉墨登场。伊格尔顿在《二十世纪西方文学理论》（*Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 1983）中对文学进行了如下非界定性描述：“文学”和“杂草”不是本体论意义上的名词，而是功能性词汇。<sup>3</sup>同样，乔纳森·卡勒在《文学理论入门》（*Literary Theory*, 1998）中认为“什么是文学”这个问题“很难回答”<sup>4</sup>，因为要回答这个问题，必须首先弄清楚什么不是文学；就像回答“什么是杂草”一样，首先必须弄清楚什么不是杂草。陈众议先生指出，在伊格尔顿看来，现代理论已经涵盖了哲学、历史、文学、语言学、心理学、政治经济学等各种学科，而且“非文学”中同样充满了“文学性”，那么“文学是什么”就不再成为文学的中心问题了。这种诡辩式的偷换概念和非此非彼从世纪之交开始在我国文坛大为流行。譬如影响广泛的《文学理论新读本》（南帆主编）、《文学理论基本问题》（陶东风主编）等新世纪著述就毫不讳言地呼应了卡勒、伊格尔顿等学者们提出的文学不可界定论。<sup>5</sup>

与此同时，陈众议先生还在多次讲座、发言中谈及文学变数与常数的关

1 参见陈众议：《想象的边际》，北京：作家出版社，2015年，第166-168页。

2 这正是马克思在《黑格尔法哲学批判》中所批判的。参见陈众议：《想象的边际》，北京：作家出版社，2015年，第166-168页。

3 参见 Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1983, 8.

4 参见乔纳森·卡勒：《文学理论入门》，李平译，沈阳/牛津：辽宁教育出版社/牛津大学出版社，1998年，第19-44页。

5 参见陈众议：“文学的变数与常数”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：95。



系问题。他指出,目前,向下、向内、向弱、向窄、向小等是世界文学的基本走向,尽管他认为这中间充满了逆袭与辨正。后者彰显了常数的恒定。除了一些文学家的逆袭与辨正,还有文学固有的审美传统、伦理传统、人物塑造、情景呈现、情感抒发、修辞机理等诸多基因或元素。值得注意的是,陈众议先生很少谈论自己,却不惮以最好的心意褒奖同行,其中经常提及的就有聂珍钊先生的文学伦理学批评、王守仁先生的现实主义文学研究、傅修延先生的价值叙事学、蒋承勇先生的19世纪西方文学再审视、吴笛先生的经典发生学,以及王宁先生的纵横捭阖,等等。至于其对中国社科院的同行,就更是赞赏有加。

综上所述,无论从介入中国文坛方式还是从外国文学学科“三大体系”建设看,陈众议先生都始终在场,而且坚定地走在了前面。这是自觉的作为,也是责任的体现。我攫取的可能只是其学术轨迹的冰山一角。不当之处,敬请同行方家批评指正。

## Works Cited

- Carpentier, Alejo. *Prólogo, El reino de este mundo*. México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1949.
- 陈众议:“见过千帆 蓦然回首”,《世界文学》6(2020):219-234.
- [—.“Beauty Is Inside, Not in the Distance.” *World Literature* 6 (2020): 219-234.]
- :《博尔赫斯》。北京:华夏出版社,2001年。
- [—.*Borges*. Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2001.]
- :《想象的边际》。北京:作家出版社,2015年。
- [—.*Boundary of Imagination*. Beijing: The Writers Publishing House, 2015.]
- :“评莫言”,《东吴学术》1(2013):5-12。
- [—.“On Mo Yan.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2013): 5-12.]
- :“评张炜的《独药师》《艾约堡秘史》及其风格”,《上海交通大学学报》2(2020):48-53。
- [—.*On Zhang Wei's The Secret Pharmacist and The Secret History of Aiyue Castle and His Writing Style*.” *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University* 2 (2020): 48-53.]
- :“贾平凹的通感——以《老生》为个案”,《东吴学术》6(2016):6-10。
- [—.“The Synaesthesia of Jia Pingwa: A Case Study of *Lao Sheng*.” *Soochow Academic* 6 (2016): 6-10.]
- :《魔幻现实主义大师》。郑州:黄河文艺出版社,1988年。
- [—.*The Master of Magical Realism*. Zhengzhou: Huanghe Literary Publishing House, 1988.]
- :“重塑文学原理,构建当代文学话语体系”,《中国社会科学报》2021年11月9日,第1版。
- [—.“Reinventing Literary Principles and Constructing a Contemporary Literary Discourse System.” *Chinese Social Sciences Today* 9 November 2021, late ed.: C1.]
- :《塞万提斯学术史研究》。南京:译林出版社,2009年。

- [—, *The Study in Cervantes' Academic History*. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2009.]
- : 《新中国外国文学研究》。北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2020 年。
- [—, *The Study in Cervantes' Academic History*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2020.]
- : “文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”, 《中国社会科学》4 (2023): 83-98.
- [—, “Variables and Constants in Literature: ‘Extrinsic Research’ and ‘Intrinsic Research’.” *Social Sciences in China* 4 (2023): 83-98.]
- : “我们为什么需要文学”, 《世界文学》1 (2018): 212-232.
- [—, “Why Do We Need Literature?” *World Literature* 1 (2018): 212-232.]
- 乔纳森·卡勒: 《文学理论入门》, 李平译。沈阳/牛津: 辽宁教育出版社/牛津大学出版社, 1998 年。
- [Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory*, translated by Li Ping. Shenyang/Oxford: Liaoning Education Press/Oxford UP, 1998.]
- Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1983.
- García Márquez, Gabriel. *Cien años de soledad*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1967.
- [García Márquez, Gabriel. *One Hundred Years of Solitude*. Buenos Aires: Editorial Sudamericana, 1967.]
- 加西亚·马尔克斯: 《百年孤独》, 范晔译。海口: 南海出版公司, 2011 年。
- [García Márquez, Gabriel. *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, translated by Fan Ye. Haikou: Nan Hai Publishing Co. 2011.]
- 戈异: “外国文学工作者任重道远”, 《外国文学研究》4 (1991): 147.
- [Ge Yi. “It's A Long Way for Foreign Literature Researchers.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 4 (1991): 147.]
- 胡适: 《胡适学术文集·新文学运动》。北京: 中华书局, 1998 年。
- [Hu Shi. *Hu Shi Academic Anthology • New Literary Movement*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1998.]
- Johnson, Samuel. *Johnson on Shakespeare*. London: Oxford UP, 1908.
- 老舍: 《文学概论讲义》。北京: 北京出版社, 2016 年。
- [Lao She. *Lecture Notes on Introduction to Literature*. Beijing: Beijing Publishing House, 2006.]
- Lowrence, G. W.. “Entrevista con Miguel Angel Asturias.” *El Nuevo Mundo* 1 (1970): 77-78.
- 鲁迅: 《鲁迅全集》第 4 卷。北京: 人民文学出版社, 1981 年。
- [Lu Xun. *Lu Xun Complete Works* Vol.4. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 1981.]
- 塞尔登: 《文学批评理论》, 刘象愚等译。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2003 年。
- [Selden, Raman. *The Theory of Criticism*, translated by Liu Xiangyu et al. Beijing: Peking UP, 2003.]

# Review of Chen Zhongyi's *The Study in Cervantes' Academic History and Beyond*

Taciana Fisac

**Abstract:** Professor Chen Zhongyi has written extensively and pertinently as a central member of the study of Spanish literature in China. Over the years, he has produced an impressive body of analytical criticism on Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American literary culture, ranging from studies of the works of authors to intergenerational and general literary histories. His work is particularly noteworthy for its ability to bring new color to traditions and light to classics. This article will discuss three areas: the study of Cervantes' academic history, the general documented account of Spanish and Spanish American literature, and the relationship between capital and literature.

**Keywords:** academic history; general history of literature; capitalism

**Author:** Taciana Fisac is Professor at the Autonomous University of Madrid, linguist and literary translator (Madrid 28049, Spain). Her major translations include Ba Jin's *Family*, Qian Zhongshu's *Fortress Besieged*, Yan Lianke's *The Four Books*, and many others (Email: taciana.fisac@uam.es).

**标题:** 评陈众议《塞万提斯学术史研究》及其他

**内容摘要:** 作为中国西班牙文学研究的核心成员，陈众议教授在该领域的著述甚丰。多年来，他对西班牙、葡萄牙和拉丁美洲文学文化进行了深入的分析 and 批评，涵盖作家作品以及文学断代史和文学通史研究。尤其值得关注的是，其著述为传统和经典增光添彩。本文将探讨以下三方面：塞万提斯学术史的研究、西班牙和西班牙语美洲文学的综述以及资本与文学之间的关系。

**关键词:** 学术史；文学通史；资本主义

**作者简介:** 达西安娜·菲萨克，马德里自治大学汉语语言文化专业教授、翻译家，主要研究方向为中国现当代文学和中国古典文学。译著包括巴金的《家》、钱钟书的《围城》、阎连科的《四书》等。

## I. Study in Academic History

The study of academic history is a conventional tool for academic research, but in an age of modernism and postmodernism, it has been put on the back burner. It

evokes one of the old Chinese saying: “The sword and the spear go into the treasury, and the horse is let loose in the south.” Therefore, all sorts of fancy new things came on the scene, each leading the way for a year or two. Among them, there are both the words that are detached from the essence of literature and the words merely broken from one extreme to another. Professor Chen seems that has followed a seemingly old-fashioned path, but he always hit the nail on the head of trends, as in his *The Study of Cervantes' Academic History*.

According to him, this work had its beginnings early on, but it was really put into action at the turn of the century. In 2004, he began designing the project for the Studies of the Academic History of Foreign Literature, which was included in the Eleventh Five-Year Plan of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. This was a program of integration towards reconstruction, and its creation marked the beginning of a group of “three sets (i.e. the 1960s to the 1990s—interrupted during the Cultural Revolution—of the Institute of Foreign Languages).” The project marked the beginning of the consolidation of the original “three series:” the “Masterpieces of Foreign Literature Series,” the “Foreign Classical Literary Theory Series” and the “Marxist Literary Theory Series.” It also means that the study of foreign literature in China has begun to reckon more systematically with the academic relativization, fragmentation and nihilism that followed the wave of deconstruction.<sup>1</sup> As a result, a series of questions concerning the classics have been raised anew in this systematic project. For example, what is a classic? Is the classical inevitable or accidental? Do classics focus on the eternal contradictions of human beings (in the words of Qian Zhongshu, “the basic root of bipedal animals”), or do they mainly point to the real contradictions of the society of the times? What are their characteristics in terms of cognitive approach, value judgement and aesthetic orientation? How do the classics and classical criticism relate to the society, economic base and superstructure of the times? What is the role of criticism and critics, including their positions, perspectives and approaches, and their general and specific relationship to the society of the time? In addition, questions such as the circumstances and temperament, experience and gifts of classic writers, the content and form, inheritance and innovation of the classics, as well as the general laws of literature and the specificity of the literary canon, are all the subject of this project.<sup>2</sup>

Specifically, the *Study in Cervantes' Academy History*, which I have reviewed in a relevant journal. Sad to say, it is actually the first study of Cervantes' academic history in the world, even though it cannot be all-encompassing. In Professor Chen's

1 See Chen Zhongyi, *Study in Cervantes' Academy History*, Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2011, 3.

2 Idem.

words, “Cervantes’ studies are vast and boundless” (*Study in Cervantes’ Academy History* 1). In order not to be overwhelmed by the vastness of the material, this work captures almost only the most prominent tip of the iceberg of Cervantes’ academic history, and that tip is the study of *Don Quixote*, which is the absolute center. Even so, however, it is only possible to pick out the best of the best; it is inevitable that one will lose sight of the rest. Moreover, academic history, no matter how objective it may be, can be intentionally or unintentionally tainted by the researcher. This color is both ideological and inevitably reflects the researcher’s vision and learning, temperament and preference. Therefore, Professor Chen has done his best to be unbiased and objective, but the truth is: absolute objectivity and comprehensiveness is impossible. “As for the part of the study to be presented in this work, it naturally cannot cover many of the issues in the whole of Cervantes, or even the main ones; for the four hundred years of Cervantes’ studies are as numerous as the cattle, and the results are so voluminous and extensive that they cannot be covered in a single monograph” (ibid.). Moreover, “all history is contemporary history,” and all literature is contemporary literature, and standing at the height of the times and with the cultures of the peoples at his back, Cervantes is undoubtedly inexhaustible. But this is, in any case, a commendable beginning to the study of Cervantes’ academic history.

The studies of the academic history of the works of classic authors is undoubtedly one of the most important, or basic, foundations of literary studies. Any study of the works of classic authors is almost inconceivable without a certain, if not potential, vision of academic history. “The result of postmodernist deconstruction, however, has been the replacement of relative absolutes by absolute relativities. As a result, much disdain relatively objective academic-historical studies in favor of empty theories anymore. In some people’s eyes, even the relatively objective view of truth has been dissipated” (Chen, *Study in Cervantes’ Academy History* 2). So says Professor Chen.

The *Study in Cervantes’ Academic History* consists of three parts, the first of which is a compendium of the academic history, with five chapters dating from the beginning of the century to the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century AD. The first of these chapters, on the seventeenth century, is a meticulous raking of the documents, for example, the details of Cervantes’ feud with the great writer Lope de Vega, which may not be well known in Spanish studies in Cervantes, as they are completely buried between the lines of both writers. In addition, he detects a trace of Don Quixote in Góngora’s extra-collections, which, despite the tone of the mainstream Spanish writers of the time, is considered to be a possible pseudo-parody of

Góngora.

The second chapter, “The Eighteenth Century,” was inaugurated by the English translator Peter Motteus, who positively evaluated and affirmed *Don Quixote*, but at the same time the French translator Lesage (Alain-René) precisely rejected Cervantes and *Don Quixote* from the opposite side. The latter not only translated Avellaneda's forgery, but also lashed out at Cervantes in the Translator's Preface:

This is a *Don Quixote* distinct from Cervantes. I will provide a brief explanation of the alleged disbelief. After Miguel de Cervantes had published the first part of *Don Quixote* in 1605, it was a big hit but nothing more. Hence an Aragon's Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda published the second book of *Don Quixote* in 1614. This work also obtained a modest success. The first translation at hand is none other than Avellaneda's *Don Quixote*. Cervantes, jealous that someone else had been the first to do so, picked up the seemingly abandoned sequel [...] and it must be noted that there are many similarities between the two sequels. However, given that Cervantes came after and Avellaneda came before, it is clear which is true, and which is false. (Armero 26)

What is significant is that Professor Chen, through his search for the truth, discovered that *Don Quixote* was included in the *Spanish Dictionary of the Royal Academy of Spanish Language* (1737) and in the *Encyclopedia* under Diderot (Denis) (1751-1765).

The third chapter, “The Nineteenth Century,” is the century in which *Don Quixote* and its author, Cervantes, were canon and set in stone. Although it is clear that the division of literature and literary criticism into eras, and especially centuries, remains a practice of necessity. In fact, whether it is seventeenth-century Baroque or eighteenth-century neoclassicism, or rationalism and the Enlightenment, or nineteenth-century Romanticism and realism, etc., most of these are definitions of later generations, and it is difficult to establish clear temporal boundaries, nor are they clear-cut or incompatible with each other. Moreover, the situation in each country was different, as were the levels of productivity and social development, and literary thought was altogether different. In the case of Romanticism, for example, the German “Rampage” is broadly considered to have begun in the 1870s, while French Romanticism did not really take off until the 1820s, although it is also claimed that *Julie or La Nouvelle Heloise* was the first, written by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the Enlightenment thinker. The French Romanticism did not really take off until the 1820s, although Rousseau's *Julie or La Nouvelle Heloise* has also been

called the forerunner of French Romanticism. Spain was even later.

Firstly, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, inspired by Rousseau's "return to nature" and combined with English sentimentalism, wrote *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and *Wilhelm Meister's Journeyman Years*. The concept of Romanticism, as opposed to Classicism, was first introduced by Goethe and Schiller (Johann Christoph Friedrich von).<sup>1</sup> As for realism or critical realism, although it is a counterpoint to Romanticism, it also inherits many elements of it, as is particularly evident in the French writers. Secondly, it is astonishing that the critical realist writers did not despise *Don Quixote* by abandoning Romanticism.

Let us begin with the fact that the German Romantics set the tone for the classicization of Cervantes and his *Don Quixote*. On this point Professor Chen gives a great deal of space and reaches its peak in the section on Heine. In the preface to the German edition of the fine printing of *Don Quixote*, the latter writes with great affection: "The first book I read after my childhood knowledge had been opened up and I could read quite well was *The Life and Deeds of Don Quixote, a Perceptive Gentleman of the County of La Mancha* by Cervantes [...]. In *Don Quixote* one cannot hear the opposition to the old religion, the opposition to the totalitarian monarchy. The voice against the old religion is unheard in *Don Quixote*, nor is the voice against the monarch's authoritarianism. Those critics who hear such voices are clearly mistaken. There is a school of thought that poetically idealize absolute obedience to the monarch; Cervantes belongs to that school. The monarch here is the Emperor of Spain, who was then so powerful that he shone brightly on the earth. Even a laughing-stock felt so honorable that he preferred to disregard his own freedom [...]. The political greatness of Spain at that time could instruct its men of letters to be broad-minded. In the mind of the Spanish poet, as in the realm of Charles V, the sun never sets [...]. This was the case in Elizabethan England, when Spain also had a burgeoning poetic school, and it can be compared to it. England had Shakespeare, and Spain had Cervantes [...]" (Henie 413-433). He concludes: "Cervantes, Shakespeare and Goethe became a three-headed reign, each at the top of the three categories of writing: narrative, drama and lyric [...]" (ibid.).

From then on, *Don Quixote* went out into the world with a "new image." In Lu Xu's words, Don Quixote's spirit can be summed up as "the courage to go ahead and do something based on ideals," whereas Hamlet "spent his life meditating and doubting, so that he could do nothing;" and, he says, "later on there were others" (158). He also says, "later on, as opposed to these Don Quixotes, who were

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Chinese Encyclopedia-Foreign Literature* Vol.1, Beijing: Chinese Encyclopedia Press, 1982, 586.



idealistic, they were called 'Marxist,' who saw reality and went ahead and did things" (ibid.).

In the fourth chapter, "The Twentieth Century," which spans from modernism to postmodernism and beyond, the study of Cervantes' scholarship presents a very diverse and varied picture. Many of the passages reflect the breadth of the author. But as a sinologist, I prefer his relevant comments on Chinese scholars, especially about Lu Xun. He begins by quoting Lu Xun: "Quixote's determination to fight injustice cannot be said to be wrong; it is not unappropriated to be insolent. The error is in the way he fights. Because of the haphazard thought, the wrong way of fighting is induced [...] and is 'not in vain, but harmful'" (Chen, *Study in Cervantes' Academy History* 397). It is then argued that "Lu Xun used Q to create an anti-Don Quixote with no idealism. Moreover, based on the image, the tail in the character 'Q' is seen as a braid. In fact, it seems to have a connection with Don Quixote. First of all, Q's 'method of spiritual triumph' is an almost exact copy of Don Quixote's 'method of spiritual triumph:' Don Quixote loses many battles, but always consoles himself. For example, after losing a battle against a windmill, he says to his squire Sancho that if it had not been for a magician who turned the giant into a windmill, the giant would have been no match for him. Secondly, the Q, which Lu Xun relies on to refer to 'A Q' is precisely the first letter of Quixote. Why would Lu Xun have to use a foreign letter to refer to the name of an authentic national if he did not mean to?" (ibid.)

The fifth chapter, "Aftermath," is certainly an epilogue, but it also leaves a number of threads or suspense.

The second part of *The Study in Cervantes' Academy History* is a study of studies, with seven chapters presenting the author's many fascinating contributions to the study of Cervantes. Among them are outstanding fundamental questions, such as some unanswered questions and contradictions about Cervantes' life, as well as a series of questions about *Don Quixote* and the process of its canonization, gradually amplified from point to point: "Cervantes' contradictions or prejudices," "Cervantes' irony or parody," "Cervantes' Fiction and Truth," "Classical Contingency and Necessity," "Negation of Negation Recognition of Recognition," and "*Don Quixote* and the Classical Reversal," and "*Don Quixote* and the Renaissance Movement." There are quite a few highlights worth exploring and remembering, but for the sake of space, I will only highlight one point: the reflection on the Western Renaissance movement, falsely based on Cervantes, and revealing the other side of the Renaissance movement: the liberalism and individualism behind humanism. The reflections in question are indeed thought-provoking.



The third part is a bibliography, which is not without detail; but in view of its length, it will not be reiterated here.

## II. Writing a General History

It is on the basis of a number of indispensable case studies (Cervantes and the Spanish “Golden Century,” García Márquez and Borges and the Latin American “literary boom,” etc.) that Professor Chen has produced a multi-volume *General History of Spanish and Spanish American Literature*. This is the culmination of his research on Spanish and Spanish American literature, zenith of his longstanding commitment to the study of Chinese and Western literature and culture.

Given the magnitude of the work, which is nearly two million Chinese characters, I can only go so far here. To be honest, what is most striking is no longer his treatment of classic writers of the past and present, such as Cervantes, García Márquez and Borges, and the genres they emerge from or derive from, but the distinctly Chinese or Oriental perspective.

First, in all the histories of Spanish and Spanish American literature to date, few scholars have extended to the Arabian Andalusian and ancient American periods. However, Professor Chen has worked on precisely these two sources. In the first volume of the *General History, Spanish Literature: The Middle Ages*, the Visigoth-Latin period and the Arabian Andalusian period, in particular, occupy more than half of the space. In the second chapter, “Arabic Literature,” the author begins by saying that there are still Western scholars who regard Arabs and Muslims as other, even heretical. As a result, the contribution of the Arabs to Europe has not been fully acknowledged in Western literature and history, and only a few Western literary historians mention it in relation to the Middle Ages. Oswald Spengler is one of them, writing in *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*, vol. 2: “Arab culture is a discovery [...] but since it has been so completely omitted in Western historical research, we have not even been able to find a proper name for it” (35). Jackson Spielvogel is a more objective and distinctive one. In his *Brief History of Western Civilization*, he speaks of the willingness of Arab Muslims to actively assimilate the culture of the conquered. He thus argues that “the Arabs were the true inheritors of the Greco-Roman culture that remained in the Roman Empire. They also readily absorbed Byzantine and Persian culture. In the 8<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> centuries, countless Greek, Syrian and Persian scientific and philosophical works were translated into Arabic” (212). In fact it was not only Arabic, but also Latin and Hebrew. While Western Europe was in cultural decline as a result of the Germanic sweep, Muslims created glory. This is evident not only from the flourishing of Baghdad, Damascus and Cairo

at the time, but also from the numerous cities founded by the Arabian Umayyad and post-Umayyad dynasties in south-eastern Iberia and their Islamic civilization. Among them, Cordoba, the capital of Andalusia, had nearly 100,000 inhabitants as early as the 9<sup>th</sup> century AD. It was second only to Constantinople and was one of the largest cities in the world at the time.

Secondly, in the 8<sup>th</sup> century AD, the Arabs, led by their princes and famous generals, were invincible and pushed right up to Constantinople and the Carolingian Dynasty. The empire's territorial expansion was accompanied by the task of saving and spreading classical civilization. Ancient Greek philosophy was practically forgotten and fell into desolation in the European Middle Ages; whereas the works of ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle were collected in large numbers in Islamic cities such as Damascus (capital of the Umayyad Dynasty) and later Baghdad (capital of the Abbasids), and were translated in large numbers into Arabic and Latin. In addition to the Greco-Roman source, mathematical and scientific writings had influences from India and China. The art of papermaking played a significant role in the spread of classical scholarship and classical literature in India. Paper-making originated in China, from where it was introduced by the Arabs in the seventh and eighth centuries AD.<sup>1</sup> The Arabs founded the first paper mill in the Middle East in Baghdad. Muslim booksellers flocked to the city and libraries sprang up. What the Umayyads brought to Europe was a continuation of this cultural diffusion project. Centennial Translation Movement is a testimony to this cultural dissemination project.

Once again, Professor Chen and his disciple Zong Xiaofei believe that the "Harakah al-Tarjamah" ("Centennial Translation Movement") began in the early 8<sup>th</sup> century AD. "In the middle of the 7<sup>th</sup> century, when Islam emerged, Arab culture began a centuries-long ascendancy, with rapid developments in language, religion, philosophy, literature, art, jurisprudence, science and technology. After the death of Muhammad, the four caliphs devoted themselves to the formation and expansion of the Arabian Empire. The iron horses went where much of the essence of classical human culture was to be found. By absorbing Byzantine, Persian, Babylonian, ancient Egyptian and Greco-Roman cultures, as well as Indian and Chinese cultures, they created a glorious Arab-Islamic civilization, leaving behind a vast and starry legacy of cultural achievements in the history of human civilization. These achievements range from direct translations of classical writers to new works that build on the shoulders of their predecessors" (Etiemble 78-104). The "Centennial

---

1 See René Etiemble, *L'Europe Chinoise*, translated by Gen Sheng, Beijing: Commercial Press, 2013, 78-104.

Translation Movement” was of the former type and took place simultaneously in the Arab empires of East and West.

Apparently, as early as the end of the 7<sup>th</sup> century AD, with the formation of the Arab empire, the Muslim intelligentsia began to collect and translate the cultural texts of the conquered peoples. In 711 AD, Musa bn Nusayr, the Arab governor of North Africa, sent the famous Arab general Tariq bn Ziyad to attack the Visigoth dynasty. The Arabs drove in and quickly took over most of the Iberian Peninsula and established a viceroyalty in Seville. A little later, Abd al-Rahman I, the only descendant of the Umayyad Dynasty at the time of its downfall, founded the Arab-Islamic Andalusia, which was independent of the Abbasids, with Cordoba as its center. This means that the rise of the Abbasids in the mid-eighth century did not mark the end of the Umayyad Dynasty. In fact, the princes or vassals of the latter ruled for centuries as Emir and Caliph, the post- Umayyad Dynasty. During this period, the Islamic scholars of Córdoba, led by Abdur-Rahman, began to translate and disseminate classical scholarship. The Abbasid dynasty, also in the eighth and tenth centuries, was responsible for a large and created translation campaign, sponsored and promoted by the caliphs, which gave rise not only to the famous “Baghdad School,” but also to the “Alexandrian School” and interacted with Córdoba and Cairo.<sup>1</sup>

In the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> centuries Córdoba reached its peak, and in 929 Abd al-Rahman III was crowned king, abolishing the Emirate and renaming it the Caliphate. At that time there were seventy libraries in Cordoba, each of them rich in collections, and the Caliph’s private library alone contained over 400,000 manuscripts. Muslims collected books from all over the world and translated them into Arabic and Latin.<sup>2</sup> These books laid the foundations for the later Renaissance movement and the extraordinary maritime discoveries. Prince Rahman of Umayyad also built the Great Mosque in Cordoba, which attracted large numbers of pilgrims and literary scholars. In just over two centuries, the Jewish population alone had tripled. By this time, the ethnic and religious composition of Andalusia was already relatively complex, with the majority of the population being Christians left over from the Visigoth Kingdom, followed by Muslims, then Jews, then Slavic slaves at the bottom of the social ladder and mercenaries of more complex origin. The Muslim authorities adopted a tolerant stance towards the infidels, however there

---

1 See Chen Zhongyi, *General History of Spanish and Spanish American Literature* Vol.1, Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2017, 89-90.

2 See Judith M. Bennett and Charles Warren Hollister, *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, translated by Yang Ning and Li Yun, Shanghai: Academy of Social Sciences, 2007, 92.

were still a number of Christians and Jews who converted to Islam because they were overwhelmed by the extra taxes.

The Muslims of Andalusia made great strides in the natural sciences and the literary arts while translating a considerable number of classical texts. Their achievements in astronomy, mathematics and physics were astonishing. These achievements not only incorporated the fruits of Western civilization, but also led to the construction of advanced observatories and the application of the Chinese compass to astronomical observation; the development of the Indian system of counting, and the creation of Arabic numerals and counting methods. In the words of the American scholar Eduardo Glante, “a real wave of translations between 1125 and 1200 translated important parts of Greek and Arabic science into Latin, and even more in the thirteenth century (the New Translation Movement up to the time of Alphonsus X). No event in the history of science has balanced the translation of a large number of Greek sciences into Arabic since the 9<sup>th</sup> and early 10<sup>th</sup> centuries” (17). Simultaneously, they were also successful in the field of medicine. Literature, moreover, took a completely different path from that of the Western Middle Ages: the early secular expressions and the later purism (such as Sufi mysticism) formed two poles, between which there was richness and color.

In short, the Arabic literature of Andalusia offers a different landscape from that of its Latin contemporaries; its richness and its forwardness (or modernity) seem to have been erased by a dozen centuries, and even today it can still be dazzling or empathetic. By contrast, the Visigoth period could be considered practically devoid of literature.

As for Spanish America, ancient Indian literature was greatly expounded. In the fourth volume of the General History, *Literature of Spanish America: The Classical Period*, Amerindian literature also occupies more than half of the pages.

In terms of time, the civilizations of the Americas are almost as old as those of Asia and Europe. Among them, the Maya are regarded as one of the oldest civilizations of mankind and have not been immersed in civilizations from other continents. Although some scholars believe that the Maya belonged to the Mongolian race, a yellow race that migrated to the Americas through the Bering Strait tens of thousands of years ago, and there have been legends in China that the “Yin people migrated to the east” and the “Fusang countries,” these are not the consensus of the archaeological community. Especially in recent years, with the development of genetic engineering, some ancient skeletons have been discovered in Central and South America (these skeletons are older than the “most ancient skeletons” found in North America, and their physique and DNA are closer to those

of the Javanese people in Southeast Asia), and some scholars believe that the earliest Native Americans may have drifted by sea from Oceania and Southeast Asia to Central and South America. Certain scholars have suggested that the earliest Native Americans may have drifted by sea from Oceania and Southeast Asia to Central and South America. Taken collectively, there is a growing tendency to believe that the aboriginal peoples of North and some Central America are descended from Siberian inhabitants who migrated to the Americas via the Bering Strait Ice Land Bridge for hunting, while other aboriginal peoples of Central and South America may be descended from Malays who migrated from the Pacific islands. Of course, there are also anthropologists and archaeologists who hold to a multi-ethnic symbiosis and believe that the American race could have arisen at the same time or almost at the same time as the Asian and European races. There are many different views and opinions.<sup>1</sup> However, Professor Chen does not confine himself to any view or discussion of the origins of the human race, he focuses on the civilizations of the Americas themselves, particularly their ancient literature and culture.

He argues that the Mayan civilization is one of the ancient civilizations of mankind, dating back to the Pre classical period, a thousand years B.C. or even earlier. Other early civilizations or cultures include the Olmeca, Tolteca, Chichimeca, Teotihuacán, Zapoteca, Totonaca, Mixteca, Azteca, Chavin and the Maya. Tiwanaku, Inca, and so on. However, not all civilizations or cultures in the Americas have bequeathed a literary legacy. Some, like the Maya, Olmeca, Tolteca, Misteca, Teotihuacan, Chavin and Tiwanaku, flourished long before the invasion of the Western colonists, leaving behind more mysteries than literary legends; the Azteca and Inca cultures, at their height, were killed by the Western colonists' bloodshed and the smallpox plague, and their literary heritage was destroyed. Even so, thanks to the archaeological discoveries of the last century and the tireless work of countless dedicated people, the literature of the Americas, from myths to legends, from poetry to drama, is now so vast that it cannot fail to capture the attention of the world.<sup>2</sup>

In this way, Professor Chen reviews chapter by chapter the Mayan, Azteca and Inca literatures. Many of these texts are being presented for the first time in China. For example, there are some narrative sketches and Nuo operas of the Maya, some lyrical poems and prose of the Azteca, some myths, legends and plays of the Inca, and so on.

---

1 See Robert Frank, *Los americanos*, Madrid: La Fabrica, 2008, 1-35.

2 See Chen Zhongyi, *General History of Spanish and Spanish American Literature* Vol.4, Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2021, 2.

In addition, the author synthesizes and discovers a large number of novels from the colonial period absent from the history of literature. Since the Spanish-Portuguese colonists forbade the novel to enter the American colonies to “poison the Indians,” it remained a secret undercurrent that gradually emerged from the end of the last century to the beginning of the present one, when the dust of history was gradually removed. At the same time, some of the unresolved issues of ancient American and colonial literature have been re-examined, like the trajectory of ancient Indian literature, the mechanism of colonial literature, and the sexual orientation of the “tenth muse,” Sister Juana, and so on.

### III. Capital and Literature

In addition to the above-mentioned studies of Spanish and Spanish-language literature, Professor Chen has never abandoned his studies of literature and art, with a particular focus on the relationship between capital and literature. In his works, he often cites Marx's *The Capital*, while empirically examining how literature conflicts with or colludes with capital.

In a series of literary criticisms on the Western Renaissance and beyond, capital frequently emerges as an important thread linking his thought on the relationship between the individual and the general, appearance and essence.

More than a decade ago, Professor Chen sharply revealed another face of the Western Renaissance movement. The greatness of the Renaissance movement is well known, he said, “but its other face or dimension has been little questioned and little commented on. That is the three beasts of humanity that Dante glimpsed in the dawn light” (“Other Dimension of the Renaissance” 13). Engels calls Dante “the last poet of the Middle Ages and at the same time the first poet of the new age” (ibid.). This is certainly not a problem. The problem is that both before and after Engels, the Renaissance has been praised almost uniformly with great praise and, in the words of Engels, “the greatest, progressive change that mankind has never experienced, is a change that required giants and produced giants—in thinking power, enthusiasm and character, giants in versatility and learning” (ibid.). Professor Chen pointed out that Engels' statement that these giants were “the figures who laid the foundations of modern bourgeois domination [...]” is constantly forgotten, even though they were not “subject to the bourgeoisie” (ibid.). He considers that similarly, Marx saw the Renaissance as a new play by the emerging bourgeoisie in the name of Greco-Roman. Naturally, these are not just the ideas of Marx and Engels; it's a way of summarizing the Renaissance movement as it has been explored and revealed by European scholarship over centuries. But his approach has somewhat transformed



the way in which Western humanist scholarship has defined the Renaissance movement. For he states those definitions were somehow inaccurate (*ibid.*).

Hu Shi has famously said he treats people with doubt where there is no doubt, and asks questions where there is no doubt. Before answering these two “non-questions,” it is useful to look at the Chinese literary scene today. Apart from the vaguely preserved virtues of the old ancestors or the shadows or slogans of Marxism and Mr. Democracy and Mr. Science, China has a real “triviality,” a huge annual production of more than 700 films and more than 12,000 television episodes, as well as more than 3,000 full-length novels, more than 15,000 anthologies of various kinds and more than one million Internet novels. But the impact of all these products combined is perhaps no more than that of the sketches and the performance art of a few people. Individualism, liberalism and materialism, on the other hand, entered and rapidly covered the Chinese landscape as a matter of course. In other words, the Chinese accomplished in thirty years what had taken the Western bourgeoisie (the Renaissance) more than three hundred years to do: to achieve greatness and at the same time to awaken the three beasts that had so terrified Dante—the leopard (carnal desire or lust), the lion (pride), and the wolf (greed). In the words of Professor Chen, the Western Renaissance, while giving birth to humanism, caused the other side of it, liberalism, individualism and materialism, invincible.<sup>1</sup> In the fourteenth century, Saccetti’s eccentric and ridiculous Heraldo, an old man who, at the age of seventy, sets off from Florence to a neighboring village to participate in a tournament on a whim, only to be teased by a few ill-intentioned men (they stuff a handful of iron orchids into the tail of his horse, causing that the horse suddenly galloped and jumped on its back, and did not stop until it returned to Florence). In the fifteenth century, Pulci and Boaldo also treated previous literary or literary figures in a jocular manner. The former added to the folklore of Orlando’s story, while the latter simply made a man of Orlando’s experience fall in love and become a clumsy, shy fool who was played by Angélica. In Ariosto’s and Rabelais’s writing, this kind of banter is transformed into “parody” and “grandstanding” or “carnival.” This more casual than strict satire, but also more infectious, is combined with the burgeoning comedy of the early Renaissance into a powerful cultural force that slowly deconstructs and melts away the relative rigidity of the Middle Ages. At almost the same time, the giant Cagandua was born, able to suck the milk of thousands of cows before he was born, so much so that he couldn’t wait to swallow one in his cradle. And this has always been considered a symptom of Rabelais’s humanism: a representation of the human spirit from another perspective (i.e. mocking the giant gods with giants, or

---

1 Idem.

scandalizing them with giants). In the comedies of Manrique and others, this has developed into a “spoof.” Thus Joseph becomes a smiling old man, who even says humorous things like:

Oh, unfortunate old man!  
 Fate is so dark.  
 To be Mary's husband.  
 She has trampled on his honor.  
 I see that she is pregnant  
 But I do not know when.  
 I heard that the Holy Spirit had done it  
 and I know nothing about it. (Chen, “Other Dimension of the Renaissance” 13)

Professor Chen underlines that it was based on humanism, that the religious world gave birth to the doctrine of election, an attempt to divorce the Holy Spirit from the Trinity, which was suppressed by the Vatican. However, the roaring orgy of the Renaissance laid the intellectual foundations for the triumph of the bourgeoisie over the feudal dynasties. Erasmus identified this. With malicious glee, he saw in “the Ode to a Fool” the instruments of human reproduction as the divine source of all things, of life. Thus, it is as if we hear a tramp-like harrumph in the face of the fall of Olympus. “If Dante marks the end of an age of gods and the dawn of an age of men, Cervantes likewise marks the end of one age and the beginning of another. On the one hand, the end of an age of idealism and the beginning of an age of rationalism; on the other hand, it is the end of an age of heroism and the beginning of an age of villainy, or the end of idealism and the beginning of materialism. This is not, of course, an either/or rule, and the complexities are too well-known to require further elaboration. But on the whole, this is the inevitable result of the development of private ownership or capitalism” (Chen, “Other Dimension of the Renaissance” 13).

Professor Chen emphasizes, “There is nothing inherently wrong with jokes and comedic performances in literature and the arts, but what is wrong is the uncritical and unrestrained pursuit of them and their praise regardless of the occasion, regardless of elegance or vulgarity. Moreover, reflecting on the Renaissance does not mean denying it, but rather using its method of relying on the past to see the dimension of Chinese literature and art today. Moreover, there are scholars who have long ago corrected the errors of the past, and I have offered my views on a range of issues stemming from the development of capitalism, such as modernity,

modernization and alienation, to which I have merely added. By the way, the true cultural consciousness and university style are to advance and retreat in the middle, to follow the beauty of the world; to take the right and the wrong in both secondary and western studies, and to benefit firstly the civilizational progress and the long-term stability of our nation, and secondly the broader academic spirit, objective truth, world morality, etc., even though they are often complementary and indistinguishable from each other”(Chen, “Other Dimension of the Renaissance” 13). The contemporary scholar Schmitt, reflecting on modernity, said that from the beginning it was a “secular age.” Everything was in order except what Erasmus called “the sole thing that mattered,” and even humor, banter and jocularity were institutionalized. With the solemnity dispensed with, the sublime banished, the reverence gone, the desire liberated, is it really “entertainment to death” that awaits mankind?

### Works Cited

- Armero, Gonzalo. *Cuatrocientos años de Don Quijote por el mundo*. Madrid: TF Editores, 2005.
- Bennett, Judith M. and Charles Warren Hollister. *Medieval Europe: A Short History*, translated by Yang Ning and Li Yun. Shanghai: Academy of Social Sciences, 2007.
- Chen Zhongyi. *General History of Spanish and Spanish American Literature* Vol.1. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2017.
- . *General History of Spanish and Spanish American Literature* Vol.4. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2021.
- . “Other Dimension of the Renaissance.” *Soochow Academic Research* 1 (2011): 5-17.
- . *Study in Cervantes' Academy History*. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2011.
- Chinese Encyclopedia-Foreign Literature* Vol.1. Beijing: Chinese Encyclopedia Press, 1982.
- Etiemble, René. *L'Europe Chinoise*, translated by Gen Sheng. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2013.
- Frank, Robert. *Los americanos*. Madrid: La Fabrica, 2008.
- Glante, Eduardo. *Physics in Mediege*, translated by Hao Liuxiang. Shanghai: Fudan UP, 2000.
- Henie, Heinrich. “Preface to *Don Quixote*.” *Henie's Anthology-Criticism*, translated by Qian Zhongshu. Beijing: Renmin Literature Press, 2002.
- Lu Xun. *Lu Xun's Complete Works* Vol.7. Beijing: Renmin Literature Press, 1981.
- Spengler, Oswald. *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* Vol.2, translated by Wu Qiong. Shanghai: Sanlian Press, 2006.
- Spielvogel, Jackson. *A Brief History of Western Civilization* Vol.2, translated by Dong Zhongyu etc.. Beijing: Peking UP, 2006.

# Echoing Ethical Literary Studies: *So This Is What I Heard* as An Odyssey of Chinese Magical Realism

Wei Chenlin

**Abstract:** *So This Is What I Heard* (Rushi Wowen) features Chen Zhongyi's fruitful exploration of indigenous magical realism in China. In resonance with the tempo of the ever-changing world civilizations, Chen masterfully integrates various creative techniques such as suspense, magical realism, and absurdity. With a discerning eye, the author establishes and navigates the traffic between "literary fictionality" and "social reality," while reflecting upon the shortcomings of indigenous cultures, criticizing the detrimental impacts of feudal superstition that mislead the masses, and addressing the current state and issues of the national education system. Besides, Chen delivers his insightful reflection on subjects like virtual space, artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, cloning technology, etc. By balancing literariness, artistry, and readability, Chen's writing not only embodies the author's cultural concern and artistic intuition but also demonstrates his scholarly conscience and cultural consciousness. To this extent, this work ambitiously undertakes the responsibility of reviving Chinese culture and showcases incomparable ethical values.

**Keywords:** ethical literary criticism; *So This Is What I Heard*; Chen Zhongyi; cultural concern

**Author:** Wei Chenlin is Associate Professor at School of Humanities and Social Science, Xi'an Jiaotong University (Xi'an 710049, China). Her academic research focuses on Comparative Literature, Literary Criticism, Ming and Qing Literature, and Theatre Studies (Email: weichenlin18@163.com).

**标题：**文学伦理学的杰出探索与成功实践：从《如是我闻》看陈众议的学术视野与文化关怀

**内容摘要：**《如是我闻》是陈众议对构建中国“本土魔幻现实主义”风格的有益探索。作者在把握世界文明律动的基础上，融合了悬疑、魔幻、荒诞等多种创作手法，以审视之眼往返于“文学虚构”与“社会真实”之间，客观、善意地思考本土文化的不足，抨击封建迷信蛊惑人心的积弊，关注国家教育体系的现状和问题，对虚拟空间、人工智能、基因工程等进行反思；其作品完美结合了文学性、艺术性和可读性，率真而不失睿智，魔幻却难掩真实，不仅体现出作家的文化关怀和艺术直觉，而且彰显着学者的良知和自

觉；具有无可替代的文学伦理学价值。

**关键词：**文学伦理学批评；如是我闻；陈众议；文化关怀

**作者简介：**魏琛琳，西安交通大学人文与社会科学学院副教授，主要研究方向为比较文学、文学批评、明清文学和戏剧研究。

A member of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and former president of the Chinese Association for Foreign Literature, Chen Zhongyi has extensively studied Latin-American literature and provided systematic discussions on the origins, development, and contextual background of Latin-American literature, as well as authored numerous remarkable commentaries on the works of Gabriel García Márquez and Jorge Luis Borges. His publications include *The Master of Magical Realism* (《魔幻现实主义大师》), *Genres of Contemporary Latin-American Novels* (《拉美当代小说流派》), *A History of Mexican Literature in the 20th Century* (《20世纪墨西哥文学史》), *A Critical Biography of Gabriel García Márquez* (《加西亚·马尔克斯评传》), *Magical Realism* (《魔幻现实主义》), *Jorge Luis Borges* (《博尔赫斯》), *Studies on Spanish Literature: The Golden Age* (《西班牙文学——黄金世纪研究》), and *The Lance of Don Quixote* (《堂吉珂德的长矛》). Within the realm of Spanish-language literature, Chen Zhongyi has established his academic “base.” With a scholarly perspective and a methodological approach that encompasses comparative literature and cross-cultural academic vision, he sensitively and inclusively apprehends, comprehends, and elucidates the unique characteristics and profound connotations of his subjects. These virtuous qualities enable Chen’s work to exhibit open visions, insightful perspectives, and masterful discourse.

However, Chen’s excellence extends beyond the characteristics mentioned above: his literary accomplishments surpass mere academic research as he has also excelled in the fields of translation, creative writing, and literary criticism, attaining notable achievements in each domain. In 2022, he published *So This Is What I Heard* (*Rushi Wowen* 《如是我闻》), a book that encompasses various creative techniques such as suspense, magical realism, and absurdity. By skillfully weaving his extensive research on foreign literature alongside his subtle observations of local cultures into his writing, Chen adeptly extracts elements of fantasy from the realm of reality and employs them to construct intricate layers within his fictionalized reality. This work well renders the author’s passion, imagination, attention to secular reality, resistances against the invasion of capitalism, pursuit of rationality, and yearning for the spiritual world. In this sense, *So This Is What I Heard* not only manifests a

distinct sense of contemporary awareness and courage for intervening reality, but also demonstrates Chen's endeavor in confronting, contemplating, and critiquing issues related to the globalizing era, the elevation of local cultural values, and the development of national literature. In this sense, the novel serves as a testament to his broad-mindedness and deep humanistic concern, displaying Chen's academic stance, scholarly perspective, compassionate care, and cultural self-consciousness, which makes him both an erudite scholar and a talented contemporary writer.

### **A Synergistic and Creative Practice in Harmony with Academic Research: The Fruitful Futility<sup>1</sup> of *So This Is What I Heard***

Coming from a background in Comparative and Spanish-language Literature, Chen Zhongyi stands as a scholar of remarkable cross-cultural awareness and possesses an expansive academic perspective. Whether it be his discussion about the "Golden Age" of Spanish classical literature in the 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries or his exploration of contemporary Spanish and Latin-American literature, both were conducted within the context of Western literary traditions and the framework of world literature. That is why he always chooses those universally applicable themes and focuses that spontaneously offer enlightening insights into the development of literature and culture in the present era, all of which were built upon historical narratives. By resonating with his well-rounded scholarship, Chen's novel develops an enriching plot with exquisite storytelling techniques, brimming with vivid imagination that grasps the essence of magical realism. While drawing inspiration from the magical realism of Latin-American literature, Chen's work also embraces traditional elements, displaying a distinct awareness of contemporary concerns and a deep care for indigenous cultures.

Chen has unearthed the remarkable unity between plot and theme in Spanish "Golden Age" literature, primarily within the realm of narrative works. Through a juxtaposition with the celebrated "Shakespeareanization" (莎士比亚化), a perfect fusion of plot and content revered by Marx and Engels, Chen has derived the "Golden Law" of "Plot + Theme = X" as an interpretive framework for world literature.<sup>2</sup> In his thought-provoking novel, *So This Is What I Heard*, Chen skillfully employs thematic

1 Here, fruitful futility (wuyongzhiyong 无用之用) refers to the usefulness of the useless, which extract from *The Book of Chuang Tzu*, "What seemingly useless is truly of great use."

2 Chen has provided multiple insightful ideas on "Golden Law," see Chen Zhongyi, "Literary Equation of 'Plot + Theme = X,'" *Wen Jing* 6 (2005). Available at: <http://nlc.vip.qikan.cn/text/Article.aspx?titleid=wenj20050606>; Chen Zhongyi, *The Lance of Don Quixote*, Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2008, 168-169; Chen Zhongyi, "The Golden Law of Literature," *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition)* 4 (2008): 13-18.



design and plot arrangement to evoke the readers' perception of his sensitivity and subtlety, art's insights and its unconsciousness, thus verifying the proposition that "writers are the engineers of the human soul."

Confronting the complex "prosperity" under the backdrop of globalization, Chen engages in profound reflections on the preservation and reconstruction of values. He employs satire and criticism to expose various societal ills: the rampant proliferation of cults and superstitions, leading individuals to lose themselves and rationality fades away (such as the obsessive pursuit of immortality, rejuvenation, and misbelief in time travel); the replacement of natural human needs by capital-driven trends and fads (such as information technology, short video platforms, and consumer culture); the profit-driven trend of deliberate modernity and intentional creativity (such as plastic surgery, anti-aging treatments, excessive educational tutoring, and cell regeneration); even the possibility of genetic engineering taking over the natural process of human reproduction. That being said, traditional cognition, values, and aesthetic norms are all subjected to destruction in this unsettling landscape. Under such realistic circumstances, Chen creates a protagonist who has returned from studying abroad and working as a professor. Like a modern-day Oedipus, he constantly looks for the Master and pursues the truth, always seeking a way out during his quest. The plot and themes of this novel carry the author's deep concern for the hardships of society and exude an epic grandeur. Through immersive reading, the readers witness how the protagonist undergoes a process of doubt, resistance, entanglement, and struggles in a fantastical world. In this sense, the work resembles more like a record or a diary of the protagonist, for it utilizes fragmented storytelling to critique the vagueness of superstition and the absurdity of reality. Simultaneously, Chen's novel invites readers to co-generate the underlying textual meanings. As readers immerse themselves in the magical and vivid passages, they may also experience a quasi-magical sense of bitterness and heaviness. In doing so, the work introduces a new, interactive experience that channels three dimensions-the author, protagonist, and readers, thus presenting a unique and unreplicable textual world.

As an eminent academic researcher, Chen once summarized the laws of world literature as operating in five tendencies: from top to down, external to internal, strong to weak, broad to narrow, and large to small. This statement has appeared multiple times in his scholarly works.<sup>1</sup> The concept of "top to down" refers to

---

1 The relevant discourse can be found in the following articles: Chen Zhongyi, "Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics," *Soochow Academic* 1 (2010): 17-24; Chen Zhongyi, "Studies on Academic History at the Background of Literary Globalization," *Contemporary Writers Review* 1 (2012): 44-57.

the change of literary focus from the sacred divine to the secular human-being, from superior to ordinary as humans continue to develop over time and gradually replace the so-called divine nature with human nature. The notion of “external to internal” signifies the shift in narrative paradigms from external descriptions to the exploration of inner thoughts, as seen in the prevalence of literary works written in the style of stream of consciousness. The idea of “from strong to weak” denotes the weakening or “dwarfing” of literary characters from the great to the trivial (from gods to giants, heroes, ordinary individuals, and even to the lowly/clownish). Concurrently, literature has gradually abandoned its traditional role of moral instruction, which became particularly evident during the modernist and postmodernist periods of the 20th century. Nowadays, the prevailing of transnational capitalism intensifies this trend, transforming grand narratives into self-revealing monologues. The progression “from broad to narrow” implies that literature increasingly focuses on the individual, and the characters’ sphere of activity shifts from a relatively expansive world to a relatively confined space. The transition “from large to small” signifies that, as humanism is established and evolves, world literature gradually relinquishes the grand collective pursuit, no longer shouldering the moral responsibility of a certain world, nation, or collective. Instead, it is dedicated to depicting the individual self, amplifying the micro-self. However, in *So This Is What I Heard*, we can observe a tenacious “resistance” and a departure from the established patterns of world literature, evident in the author’s attention to tradition, embrace of the grand collective value, and focus on both internal and external dimensions. One could describe it as a kind of macro-narrative that defies macro-narratives, a pursuit that preserves traditions while embracing future.

As Chen mentioned, to be considered as a classic, a work must possess a kind of “rebellious (betraying/detaching) spirit” at its core.<sup>1</sup> In this regard, it becomes easier for us to comprehend the motivation behind his creative endeavors. In his essay “Under Realism<sup>2</sup> and the Betrayal of the Classics” (下现实主义与经典背叛), he distinguishes between the concepts of the “classic” (经典) and “classicality” (经典性), asserting that “classicality” is a spirit that can not only adapt to the changing

1 See Chen Zhongyi, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics,” *Contemporary Writers Review* 6 (2010): 202.

2 Here, the notion of “under realism” refers to Chen’s personal interpretation of a particular kind of realist writing. Chen believes that realism can be extended upwards humanism (referred to as humanistic realism) and can also delve into socialist realism, revolutionary realism, surrealism, neo-realism, magical realism, and so on. He states that “the under realism, in short, refers to how realism has moved from top to bottom to its current state.” See Chen Zhongyi, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics,” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2010): 17-24.

times but also provide an inexhaustible wealth of inspiration and cultural resources for readership from different eras.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, classicality is a kind of “rebellious spirit,” one that challenges and transcends prevailing trends and popular values. Henceforth, contemporary writers and intellectuals are called upon to unleash their agency and critical spirit, moving “against” the mainstream, detaching themselves from narrow perspectives of reality, and even engaging in “anti-reality.” Similar to literary giants like Miguel de Cervantes, Cao Xueqin, and Gabriel Garcia Márquez, one should not only confront reality but also strive to ameliorate it.<sup>2</sup>

Hence, Chen’s work is filled with surreal scenes and rich imagination, adopting a clear contrary stance against the downward trends of contemporary society and the human spirit. From deconstructing ghost stories during the historical period of the Up to the Mountains and Down to the Countryside Movement to exposing the carnal scenes of the Nudist Club (天体会), depicting the illusory nature of the protagonist’s friend called Stone’s “incessant efforts over the years to build a kingdom of wealth, only to end up as a mere illusion” (*So This Is What I Heard* 61), to the exclamation of “looking around, shattered dreams are strewn everywhere, as if the whole world has shed rationality and regressed to the Middle Ages” (*So This Is What I Heard* 46). Furthermore, there are satirical depictions of popstars’ poisonous social influences, the vanity and blind conformity of modern individuals, complex cloning technology, cell regeneration, and confusion about monitored smartphones and surveillance on individuals, impacts of smartphones and tablets in the era of self-media on literature and reading, and also, Xia Qin’s disfiguration and devastated health due to plastic surgeries sentence her to a hopeless end [...] In summary, Chen uses fragmentary descriptions to capture the spiritual confusion of the masses and the moral decline of society, reflecting the capitalistic flaws, value disorder, and absurd chaos of consumer society. All these scenarios mentioned above demonstrate apparent qualities of magical realism, together achieving one shared goal to highlight the jaw-dropping reality. Therein lies explicitly Chen’s contrary stance towards the secular and prevailing trends, behind the endeavors of which are his intellectual scholarship and cultural pursuits.

In his essay “Review of Foreign Literary Studies over the past 70 Years,” Chen points out that the world is entering an unprecedented era of transnational carnival.<sup>3</sup>

1 See Chen Zhongyi, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics,” *Contemporary Writers Review* 6 (2010): 202.

2 See Chen Zhongyi, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics,” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2010): 17-24.

3 See Chen Zhongyi, “Review of Foreign Literary Studies over the past 70 Years,” *Soochow Academic* 5 (2019): 13-14.

He writes, “The clamor of an era that comes after all the literary movements in history so far ( 后主义 ), as marked by the rapid development of information technology and Internet, has turned itself into a self-indulgent and self-comforting carnivalesque” (14). Besides, Chen also notes that “the tendency toward nihilism has profoundly impacted the world” (13). Similarly, in another essay titled “Studies on Academic History at the Background of Literary Globalization,” he explicitly states, “With the global expansion of transnational capitalism, traditional values have been attacked and deconstructed. Not only are the notions of nationalism and statehood in their traditional sense losing significance, but also the preservation and reconstruction of values have become urgent tasks for developing countries. Furthermore, the ecological crisis of human civilization has become evident” (48). Against this backdrop, he poses a soul-searching question: “In the era of globalization, in the era of ‘de-elitism’ and mass consumption, in the era when humans are transitioning from natural reproduction to genetic engineering and AI experiments, and from natural needs to manufactured desires, such challenges place heavy responsibilities upon the shoulders of literature and all humanists: Should we go with the flow, or should we go against the historical current by cherishing and emphasizing the tradition rather than the shallow concepts of current trending?” (14) By penetrating reality and refracting social problems, the novel *So This Is What I Heard* has provided satisfactory answers to readers that can transcend their real-life experience. In a time when reality compromises with the unreal, art yields to capitalism, and the mass becomes addicted to supernatural and feudal superstitions, a world saturated with absurdity, deception, and irrationality, the scholar-writer Chen Zhongyi undertakes an ambitious attempt to restore order through his unique writing style and narrative structure inspired by magical realism. Such creative effort and remarkable contrary stance are invaluable in the age of “globalization.” They not only showcase Chen’s depth and breadth of knowledge but also highlight his academic merits and aesthetic standards.

### **The Uniqueness of Narrative: A Circus of Versatile and Diverse Narrative Techniques**

Two quotes stand out on the title page of *So This Is What I Heard*: one is Solomon’s “you need to not only see but also see through” and another is “But that view involves both a right and a wrong; and this view involves also a right and a wrong” ( 彼亦一是非, 此亦一是非 ) from *Zhuangzi-Inner Chapters-The Adjustment of Controversies* (《庄子·内篇·齐物论》). In face of the surrounding reality, our negligence often blinds or mutes us from discovering the truth, resulting in a heartless and emotionless state. Moreover, the notion of “each other” (*bi ci* 彼此) should be perceived as a

relative concept, and same for the notion of “a right and a wrong” (*shi fei* 是非)-this explains why different people react differently when confronting the same situation. However, as a renowned scholar specialized in foreign literature, Chen not only notices but also sees through details often ignored by others, and more importantly, renders his discoveries with such valuable genuineness and sensitivity that aestheticize his landscapes, turning them into a marvelous literary art. In this regard, *So This Is What I Heard* not only undertakes his unmeasurable endeavor and efforts but also his life memory and experience<sup>1</sup>, through which Chen delivers his various observations and contemplation on Chinese contemporary history and societal reality. Replete with benevolence and empathy, Chen’s insightful writing is also embedded with allegories and warnings that, from theme to plot, from views to techniques, essentially open up a more inclusive space for intellectual pondering.

“So This is what I heard” is the opening sentence of various Buddhist scriptures, which is first found from *Buddhabhūmyupadeśa*. This means that I heard Buddha say so. Taking this quote to be its title, Chen’s novel can be read as a collection of histories operated at various levels-individual, temporal, spatial and social, etc. Deep at its core, Chen’s novel resembles more of a kind of recording or documentation during the process of which readers are also invited to participate in the seeing, hearing, and feeling process as well. By decoding the shared cultural codes together, readers share a unique bond with the author, which constitutes an immersive and interactive experience unique to this novel. Besides the eye-catching power of novelistic narrative, Chen’s writing also incorporates and intersects narratives situated in different time and locations (for instance, ancient-present, Chinese-foreign, rural-urban, faith-science, Xuanji bar-asylum [...]) as well as their dimensions (realistic, virtual, imaginary, dreamy, informational), etc. In this case, readers are endowed with the power to go beyond mere watching and reading in a traditional sense but to further experience what the author “sees” and “has seen.” That is, to feel and contemplate like him. Consequently, this breaks free the temporal restriction of traditional narratives, making the characters, narrator, and readers are all shadowed by a sense of nervousness, suspense, suspicion and fear. During the writing process, the author shows neither the condescending attitude of an educated professor nor the Lu Xun-like castigation and criticism. Rather, with

1 During an interview Chen revealed that “*So This Is What I Heard* is, after all, an anti-superstition novel. My writing motivation primarily derived from a sense of unsettling anger. Ten years ago, my wife was deceived and began to believe in Great Immortals and Masters, which eventually caused her to leave home—up to today, I still don’t know her whereabouts. Back in those days, people used internet and text messages that were difficult to detect to contact her, thus taking advantage of the unregulated virtual space.” See Shu Jinyu, “Chen Zhongyi: A Return to Rationality,” *Mixed accent* 12 (2022): 36.

his sympathetic empathy, Chen remains loyal to depict the protagonist's unfiltered memory, attendant feeling, and personal experience that enable his readers to see through the desperate dilemma faced by the lost public at a time of moral degeneration and superstitious cult.

Therefore, this paper does not consider the novel *So This Is What I Heard* as absurd. Quite the contrary, absurdity is life per se. By extracting fragmentary moments from quotidian life, the author is able to create, refine, concretize, and crystalize his literary arts. He contextualizes the storyline within the protagonist's daily life, as the novel begins with the professor's mother urging him to return to his hometown in order to visit his grandma's grave. Besides, other major characters are ordinary people in protagonist's daily life like his relatives, friends, the frequently mentioned yet mysterious Master (who never physically appears throughout the story) and her female disciples. The communication and interaction among these characters are often filled with reserved humor. Speaking of form and structure, Chen inserts many jokes, episodes, and funny examples—for instance, "In the past one says our hearts are distanced by our bellies, whereas now bellies become satellites! Everyone lives in a two- or three-dimensional world, each face layered by two, three, or N pieces of skin [...]" (174) -such kinds of innovation of the traditional narrative form and novelistic structure prevail in his writing. In fact, Chen is more concerned about the declining social trends and chaos in the era of globalization. While such attention obviously falls into the realm of "humanistic literature," with a specific focus on caring human beings and reflecting upon our mundane world, Chen chooses to write about more trivial subjects and ordinary individuals—that is, he starts from daily life and intimate friends around him to implicate a bigger picture registered in trivial moments. Thus, this unique writing style can be coined as a "macro-narrative that defies macro-narratives."

In terms of narrative mode, the author skillfully channels the past and present, imaginary and real, blending and overlapping reality and dream to push the story to a gray area between real life and fantasy. This demonstrates that the author's "national imagination" that is both classical and pioneering. Pushkin once said, "True imagination requires the cognition of genius" (qtd. in Chen, "Also Sprach Vargas Liosa"). Famous educator Dr. Rudoff Stanler divided imagination into two kinds: memorial and creative. Chen's novel manifests these ideas: on the one hand, it is the author's representation of imaginative memory during the historical period of the Up to the Mountains and Down to the Countryside movement, as he recalls, "when I was with Stone and Stick, we three were always together and played lots of pranks. Don't you laugh! It's all true! [...] I learned how to transplant rice seedlings



seriously, while letting countless stories of hero flow in my mind, and gradually, I became unafraid of squirming leeches” (*So This Is What I Heard* 12-13). Others are the so-called “imaginative creation,” such as describing the Master as “an endless cloud of smoke, magically hanging over our heads, yet we lack the wisdom of the fishermen in *The Arabian Nights*. We don’t know how to begin to send the cloud back to Solomon’s forbidden bottle” (*So This Is What I Heard* 166). Those imaginative creations endow the story with melodrama and magical realistic power.

Another point worth mentioning is Chen’s usage of metaphor, which differentiates him from many other skilled writers-whose stories begin with either directly or indirectly mentioning metaphors based on which the plot gradually develops, such as *The Third Bank of the River* that is replete with images and strong fictionality; Amaranta, who spent all her time weaving her own shroud in *One Hundred Years of Solitude*; or, the child with a pig’s tail, who all possess obvious magical features, while Chen’s metaphor is hidden in the narrative process and the internal of daily social life. To name some typical examples: Xiao Lu, “like morning dew and soap bubble, it is not only difficult to track her trace but also to locate where she is” (who later in the story becomes Dew that can evaporate at any time) (*So This Is What I Heard* 88); besides, there is a bar metaphorically called “Secrets’ Hide-and-seek” (*xuan ji* 璇玑), a character named Lu Fugui who is described as a “chameleon,” etc. All these metaphors construct an outlet from the impenetrable “real” world to the outside world, through which lights pouring in can illuminate readers’ heavy hearts. While being aware of Chen’s work’s fictionality, the readers are still amazed and surprised by its unexpected turns that continue to challenge us to think and move forward.

It can be said that Chen’s novel features its immense inclusiveness—from theme to plot, narrative concepts to writing techniques—found mostly obvious in the epilogue.

The main plot of the epilogue is as follows: originally, Xia Qin is likely to be the protagonist’s comrade to uncover the Master, but “unexpectedly, the plot turns around and she gets sick and later disappears.” Lao Bai, who is hospitalized in an asylum, lives under Lao Yu’s nose and is unlikely to offer any help. As the protagonist sighs, “I am running out of my ideas or strategies and am at a loss for further solutions; either the potential witnesses are dead or too powerless to give any help” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 324). He realized that although everything was so clear, he had no judicial evidence at hand. Instead, he could only watch the Master get away with legal punishments. Later, he turned to Morning Dew and hoped to expose the master with her help: “Given the current situation, I have no

way out except to rely on her to give it a try” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 326). “It is true that I can no longer tell the truth from falsehood, like a drowning man, I rely on whatever I get, whether it is a straw or not” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 327). Gradually, he distances from the regular path and cannot distinguish right or wrong. In reality, his credit card is overdrawn and he cannot even purchase a ticket or any food, and has no choice but to live like a cowardly turtle. However, the further away he is from society, the closer he becomes to the Morning Dew. The closer he is to the Morning Dew, the closer he gets to the Master and the exposure of ultimate truths.

Finally, the protagonist thought he had, after waiting for so long, a chance to expose truths through his investigation: as the drunken Morning Dew became tipsy and almost unconscious, “she went to the kitchen to get a sharp table knife and cut her arm as if she didn’t feel any pain. The blood came out, but it was so quickly absorbed that it felt like magic; The cut marks quickly healed and became invisible.” Completely shocked by what he saw, the protagonist “recorded it on his mobile phone, which may be used as evidence in a future court” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 350). After a while, he begins to kiss, touch, and try to possess Morning Dew [...] After describing such a fantastical experience, the protagonist, however, finds himself in a hospital room, as if he has had nothing but a dream: “When I wake up, I can’t tell what time it is. Lying in bed, I see there are doctors and police surrounding me, asking me confusing questions” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 351-352). As he manages to get up from bed, he fails: “I tried to remember what happened ‘last night,’ yet could only recall the vague imagery of Morning Dew. I didn’t remember anything else [...] I saw her vanishing away like fog, and so did Cai Nv and Yan Zi, while the Master—she was snickering sneeringly.” Unable to move, he finds himself surrounded by the police and realizes that in their hearts he is “at least, a suspect, if not a criminal.” “They shouldn’t waste their time on me [...] When I can talk, I will explain all the causes and effects to them. Until then I had been, at best, only half of myself: a neurotic patient in the eyes of the psychoanalyst Dr. Horney” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 354). What is ironic about this ending is that while the protagonist believes he finally attains the truth by possessing Morning Dew sexually and spiritually—since she metaphorically symbolizes the crisis and manic revelation of truths—little does he know that all of this feels like happening in a vague dream from which he later wakes up in surprise. By weaving a series of dreams into a thematic thread of investigation, Chen skillfully develops a narrative that blurs the boundaries between fiction and reality, fabrication and truth, which highlights his unique writing technique.

### **The Functions of Moral Instruction: The Ethical Dimension and Choices in *So This Is What I Heard***

Marx once pointed out in his analysis of British society that British realist writers “The present splendid brotherhood of fiction-writers in England, whose graphic and eloquent pages have issued to the world more political and social truths than have been uttered by all the professional politicians, publicists and moralists put together” (13: 664). Engels also said that he had learned more from Balzac than from “all the professed historians, economists, and statisticians of the period together” (48: 168). That being said, life, emotions and characters depicted by an excellent writer’s pen are often different from the general abstract description. Instead, they are more concrete and realistic, and thus appear to be more moving and vivid to the readers, not to mention their gifted, natural ways of rendering and delivering moral instructions to the greater public.

The mention above inspires this paper to contextualize *So This Is What I Heard* within the methodology of literary ethics. Ethical Literary Criticism is an original literary criticism theory first proposed by the internationally eminent scholar Nie Zhenzhao, which serves as a critical method to comprehend the nature and function of literature from the perspective of ethics. “Literary ethical criticism believes that literature originates from the needs of human ethical expression, regards literature as the product of morality, adheres to the moral responsibility of literary criticism, and emphasizes the educational function of literature. Hence, this theory possesses a clear value stance” (“Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 71). As a matter of fact, in today’s world where human beings overwhelmed by capital and technology head step by step (through bioengineering and genetic coding) towards consumption freedom and living eternity, ethical issues have become the biggest issue that human beings currently face and will continue to tackle in the future. Therefore, in the novel, Chen focuses on an “era in which money and wealth seem to become the sole standard of or way to determine values” (*So This Is What I Heard* 52). He focuses on exploring the truth behind magical society such as superstition and mystery, and pays attention to socially chaotic phenomena (such as instrumentalization, entertainment, de-aestheticization and detraditionalization), public cognition, value orientation and spiritual pursuit. From this perspective, Chen’s novel can be perceived as an outstanding exploration and successful practice that expands and enriches the dimensions of literary ethics.

To be specific, Nie points out that literature is one of the most important forms of ethical expression of human beings, arising out of the need for human

education. In short, “literature arises out of the need for ethical instruction” (“Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 71). “Ethical Literary Criticism arose in order to interpret texts, to understand them properly, and to draw lessons from them” (“Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 77). Ethical Literary Criticism constructs the theory of “ethical selection” on the basis of Darwin’s theory of natural selection. Moreover, it constructs its own discourse system through many core terms such as ethical choice<sup>1</sup>, ethical identity, ethical environment, ethical context, bestial factor, human factor, free will, rational will, ethical taboo and moral teachings. Hence, ethical literary criticism has gradually evolved from mere trends of literary thoughts to theories and methods, and has been effectively used in the analysis and study of literary texts.

Taking the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, “The whole process of ethical selection is composed of countless self-ethical choice activities, which are not only intensively described in literary works, but also constitute the important contents of literary texts. Choosing human beings as the subject, literary works write, narrate and lyric scenarios of characters making ethical choices. They describe selected activities in characters’ life process one by one and make remarks on discussing the truth of being a human. Taking the life choices described in literature as a mirror, the lessons and examples of gains and losses can guide and educate the readers” (Nie, “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 77). In fact, it is because of the appearance of *So This Is What I Heard* that readers can acquire the special access to one virtual ethical scene after another, observing how the protagonist, his mother, friends, and other people tackle extremely complex moments of making various ethical choices, with more in-depth ethical thinking and profound moral enlightenment generated within.

“In essence, ethical choice is the choice of how to behave in a particular environment or context, as well as the construction and confirmation of human identity. Ethical choice activities are often determined by people’s identities. People with different identities often make different choices, and different choices also construct new identities” (Nie, “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 77). This best explains why, when the entire society suffers from the predicament of spiritual disorientation difficult to walk out, the Master turned to the superstitious cult, the “mother” (and the kind she represents) chose superstition, Morning Dew et al. decide to blindly worship the Master,

---

1 Ethical Selection versus Ethical Choice: the former refers to the process of making ethical choices, whereas the latter refers to the particular actions that constitute the process.

Stone and Stick choose jokes and self-indulgence. However, as a well an educated professor, the heroic protagonist “I” chose to believe in science, “[I] believe in truth, kindness and beauty as well as fairness and justice” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 334), and constantly asks ethical questions and seeks truths. Following the developing process of different ethical choices made by characters, both the author and readers can feel their moral growth.

In addition, the moral education function of *So This Is What I Heard* is also reflected in Chen’s seemingly casual embedment of his own attitudes and reflections. For example, he writes, “Plastic surgery and genetic engineering are using technology to overturn ethics and cognition and make the impossible possible” (131). Or, in the protagonist’s voice, he claims: “I have visited a number of biologists and life scientists, and the answer is always ambiguous. In other words, the technology is fine, but the ethics aren’t. There is a tacit understanding among the world’s leading bioengineering institutions to try to prevent unethical human cloning from crossing the line into practice” (310). Facing friends and relatives deep in the mire of superstition, the author borrows his fictionalized hero’s mouth to note “the notion that ‘it is better to believe that it exists than it does not’ makes this world so bad. Isn’t the false belief that eating human brains could cure epilepsy and dementia while consuming steamed bun (mantou, 馒头) made of human blood can heal asthma and tuberculosis caused by people’s superstition in witchcraft? !” (186) “Since the advent of TikTok, we have become less and less accustomed to using words to express ourselves. Perhaps we will slowly return to the era of illiteracy!” (331) Not only that, the author also comments on the inserted stories: “Actually, my story is not funny, but it at least offers some enlightening meanings and good advice” (280). Many times in the protagonist’s voice, the author sighs: “I really want to purify the social atmosphere to do a small part of the force” (315).

Moreover, the author also deconstructs many social chaos in the novel. For instance, when discussing the “magic medicine,” the protagonist notes, “As I look at it carefully, I realize that it is not any magic medicine but merely a powder with a little reed ash and fish bone meal to help people digest better” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 46). Examples of deconstructing superstition can be found in the text as well: “[...] The ancients called it an out-of-body experience, while psychology calls it corneal gyri disorder” (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 131). Or, “Something to be especially mindful and respected [...] for instance, it is best to cover the mirrors in the house during a funeral, to take a dog for a walk when moving into a new house, to take a stick when walking at night, and not to hang wind chimes in the bedroom. These are common sense, and have nothing to do with mystical power,

because the deceased loved ones are frequently reminisced by the living people, who may—due to overwhelming sadness—find hallucinations on mirrors; Undeniably, the new house is a strange place, whether its facilities are old or new they may be intruded by unclean things like snakes and insects; Carrying a stick in the dark can not only strengthen one's courage, but also provide protection; Hanging wind chimes in the bedroom can easily impact one's sleeping quality, whereas keeping the window open is more harmful to one's health. After all, the so-called ghost is only self-frightening" (Chen, *So This Is What I Heard* 190). By reading Chen's novel with care and appreciation, readers may obtain moral enlightenment and self-reflection on what is a correct ethical choice.

It should be noted that the moral education function of Chen's novel is essentially realized through Nie's coined notion of "brain text."<sup>1</sup> The "brain text," according to Ethical Literary Criticism, "uses the human brain as a vehicle. Through the thinking process of perception, cognition and understanding, the brain is able to store the results of thinking in the form of memory, thus forming the brain text. People's perception and cognition of objective things in the world will be stored in the form of memory in the brain. Furthermore, the brain generates text in the process of understanding things through perception and cognition." Professor Nie points out that before the emergence of written and electronic texts, non-physical forms of consciousness could only be preserved in "brain texts." There are many places in the novel where the author's consciousness flows, for all his narratives are constructed by his introspection of memories. This characteristic, in some degree, verifies the final formation of literary text is nothing but the transformation and expression of the protagonist's brain text.

What is more so noteworthy is that "brain text" plays an irreplaceable role that written text and electronic text do not have—in order for written or digital texts to be able to offer didactic functions, readers need to read the text and convert their textual perception into a new "brain text" for preservation. "To some extent, brain text is the established program that determines people's thoughts and behaviors. It is used not only to communicate and disseminate information, but also to determine people's consciousness, thinking, judgments, choices, actions, and sexuality. Therefore, literature does have the function of education, but it can only be used when it is converted into a brain text" (Nie, "Value Choice and the Theoretical

---

1 Literary texts are the critiqued subjects of literary ethical studies. According to different mediums, literary texts can be categorized into three basic forms: the brain text based on human brains, the written text based on textual writing, and the electronic text based on technology (also called as numerical / digital text). Meanwhile, given these categories, literary ethical studies construct its own textual theories based on the brain text.



Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 81). In short, brain text determines people’s thoughts, concepts, emotions and morals, and decides how people make ethical choices. Both the formation of the literary text of *So This Is What I Heard* and the realization of its ethical value depend on the important role played by “brain text.” “As readers’ brains interpret, digest and receive the preserved texts, literary works influence them in natural and unconscious ways, just like the spring rain nourishing the seeds” (Nie, “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism” 81).

In the end, the protagonist once again misses out the Master, the truth, and the vagueness of spiritual sustenance. In an elusive strange atmosphere replete with quotidian absurdity and magic, a sense of falling into the dark abysmal of depression and despair arises spontaneously, yet nothing can stop the protagonist and readers from desiring and pursuing the light of hope.

Chen’s novel reminds me subtly of many monumental works of world literature that best captures the author’s intellectual and literary virtuosity. It evokes images of Kafka’s “K,” who stands outside the castle but can never enter; the country doctor, “naked in the earthly chariot, driving the unearthly horse,” traversing the moors with little hope of returning home; Beckett’s two vagabonds waiting for Godot; Woolf’s lighthouse, seemingly distant yet close enough to eventually reach[...] In Chen’s novel, the protagonist seems to go mad, that “He distantly observes artificial intelligence and genetic engineering collaborating to create a new Homo sapiens, an omnipotent divine being. These beings swiftly conquer Heaven in its broadest sense, as well as Mount Olympus or Penglai Pavilion in a narrower sense. They possess the ability to read human thoughts and manipulate cyclones and ocean currents through brainwaves [...]” (*So This Is What I Heard* 356) At this time, the protagonist hears ancient ballads in a dreamy trance. However, should the man who resists and is driven to the brink of madness be deemed truly insane? The answer is clearly *no*. While the current situation is less promising, the protagonist’s existence per se signifies a glimmer of hope in a pathological society. Amidst various influences, he perseveres in questioning and seeking, relentlessly fighting against despair and pursuing truth. His relentless efforts to emerge from the dark abyss offer readers a glimpse of the feeble yet enduring lights derived from Chinese tradition.

Therefore, *So This Is What I Heard* is enveloped in a somber yet resilient emotional aura—a persistent quest, an unwavering pursuit that persists even in the face of impossible odds. Like a mantis’ arm avoiding an oncoming carriage, this courageous attempt nonetheless showcases the protagonist’s audacity to embrace despair, which is a rightful ethical choice. From this perspective, Chen and his

work bear an admirable resemblance to a “the sole but brave hero.” Conversely, his willpower, resilience, creativity, breakthrough thinking, scholarly acumen, and humanistic concern find complete liberation within the literary and ethical discourse that pushes this crisis and suffering to an extreme, where spiritual confusion, dominant beliefs, and capitalist dominance prevail.

### Conclusion

In the 1980s, with the intellectual wave of Latin-American magical realism swarming into China, Chinese writers, represented by Jia Pingwa, Han Shaogong, and Mo Yan, drew inspiration from the creative model of the Latin-American literature landscape by combining “local cultural resources” with “modernistic techniques” to produce a series of literary works that possess distinctive national characteristics, signifying the seeds of magical realism began to take root in China. Subsequently, how to take advantage of traditional culture resources to establish a Chinese “indigenous magical realism” style and break away from the one-way pursuit of Western literary trends became one of the prominent concerns of contemporary Chinese writers. *So This Is What I Heard* (*Rushi Wowen*), published in 2022 by renowned scholar Chen Zhongyi, who is best known for his expertise in foreign literature—especially of the Spanish-language world, features another fruitful exploration of indigenous magical realism in China. With erudition and creativity, Chen’s book faces up to the flaws and imperfection in reality, intervenes in life crises, and undertakes both temporal and societal responsibilities. Even the most critical readers cannot anticipate the infinite wonders that Chen’s writing is about to bring forth. In resonance with the tempo of the ever-changing world civilizations, Chen masterfully integrates various creative techniques such as suspense, magical realism, and absurdity. With a discerning eye, the author establishes and navigates the traffic between “literary fictionality” and “social reality.” After reflecting upon the shortcomings of indigenous cultures, he restores and cultivates the cultural uniqueness from which his stories emerge, thus calling for a return to rationality and self-examination to reveal truths behind his magical creation. All of these sufficiently demonstrate that in addition to his well-accomplished scholarship in the field of foreign literature, Chen also earns his name as a first-class writer capable of combining both classical and avant-garde elements, integrating humanistic spirit and social responsibility, and possessing enormous literary talent as well as creative potential. Furthermore, situated in an era when losing faith becomes a common tendency, *So This Is What I Heard* plays a unique role in saving souls and inspiring individuals to find their way out of spiritual dilemma.

According to Herbert Marcuse, true art is the art of rejection and protest—of existing social flaws and imperfections already there.<sup>1</sup> In other words, art is transcendence: art is called “art” or claims its value of existence because it provides another world of possibility as well as another dimension—namely the dimension of poetics. The former is the kind of “defamiliarized” spiritual world that seeks or finds meaning in mediocrity, while the latter demonstrates a kind of profound spiritual pursuit of anti-vulgarity and anti-power in humanistic care and ultimate thinking.

In this sense, *So This Is What I Heard* can be regarded as a piece of true art. By producing a work that stands firmly in the contemporary world while embracing a global perspective, yet remains rooted in the past, confronts the present, and cares for the future, Chen exhibits a distinct attitude of rebellious towards trends and societal norms. He focuses on the prevailing social ills and cultural crises of the present, engaging in discussions on the eternal themes of “spiritual confusion” and “self-redemption,” and grappling with the timeless contradiction between “materialism and spirituality.” His storytelling transcends reality, surpasses historical accounts, and delves deeper than philosophy, presenting a narrative that renders macrocosm through microcosm, appealing to and captivating readers. Furthermore, the ethical dimension of his work will not fade or erode with the passage of time—it serves as a warning, reminding us that making the right ethical choices contributes to the elevation and transcendence of our spiritual realm beyond the material plane. This is not only crucial for the great rejuvenation of the Chinese nation, but also holds significant meaning in safeguarding the balance of world civilizations and resisting the irrational expansion and diffusion of capitalism.

Chen has referred to literature as the “the usefulness of uselessness” and employed the metaphor of “mending a broken bowl” to illustrate this idea. He vividly depicts humanity’s fractured society and the complexities of human nature as a broken bowl with eighteen cracks. With great effort, he drills and hammers idealistic nails into it, using his blood, sweat, and tears as sand and adhesive to futilely bridge the irreparable gaps. During this process, he cannot help but empathetically examine, connect, and reconcile various ideological concepts, from the microcosm to the macrocosm, seeking to understand, balance, and unite them into a perfect harmony.<sup>2</sup> In the novel, the protagonist’s endeavors are likened to those idealistic nails, and author Chen is the one that meticulously repairs the bowl. Following Chen’s ground-breaking and distinctive writing style, readers

1 See Marcuse, Herbert, *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*, London and New York: Routledge, 2002, 66.

2 See Chen Zhongyi, “On Mo Yan,” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2013): 12.

experience the daily lives and ethical choices of the characters in the story. They find enlightenment in their words and actions, and more importantly, they perceive persistence through the protagonist's nostalgia and nobility through his unwavering determination. In this sense, *So This Is What I Heard* not only represents a successful exploration of the author's literary creation, but also serves as an excellent example of practicing literary ethical studies, showcasing the academic vision and cultural concern of contemporary scholar-writers.

## Works Cited

- 陈众议：“巴尔加斯·略萨如是说”，《中华读书报》2011年7月27日，第13版。
- [Chen Zhongyi. “Also Sprach Vargas Llosa.” *China Reading Weekly* 27 July 2011: 13.]
- ：《加西亚·马尔克斯评传》。杭州：浙江文艺出版社，1999年。
- [— *A Critical Biography of Gabriel Garcia Márquez*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Literature & Art Publishing House, 1999.]
- ：《拉美当代小说流派》。北京：社会科学文献出版社，1995年。
- [— *Genres of Contemporary Latin-American Novels*. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 1995.]
- ：“文学的‘黄金定律’”，《渤海大学学报（哲学社会科学版）》4（2008）：13-18。
- [— “The Golden Law of Literature.” *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition)* 4 (2008): 13-18.]
- ：《20世纪墨西哥文学史》。青岛：青岛出版社，1998年。
- [— *A History of Mexican Literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century*. Qingdao: Qingdao Publishing House, 1998.]
- ：《博尔赫斯》。北京：华夏出版社，2001年。
- [— *Jorge Luis Borges*. Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2001.]
- ：《堂吉诃德的长矛》。北京：人民文学出版社，2008年。
- [— *The Lance of Don Quixote*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2008.]
- ：“情节+主题=X的文学方程式”，《文景》6（2005）。参阅网站：  
<http://nlc.vip.qikan.cn/text/Article.aspx?titleid=wenj20050606>。
- [— “Literary Equation of ‘Plot + Theme = X’.” *Wen Jing* 6 (2005). Available at:  
<http://nlc.vip.qikan.cn/text/Article.aspx?titleid=wenj20050606>.]
- ：《魔幻现实主义》。沈阳：辽宁大学出版社，2001年。
- [— *Magical Realism*. Shenyang: Liaoning University Publishing House, 2001.]
- ：《魔幻现实主义大师》。郑州：黄河文艺出版社，1988年。
- [— *The Master of Magical Realism*. Zhengzhou: The Yellow River Literature & Art Publishing House, 1988.]
- ：“评莫言”，《东吴学术》1（2013）：5-12。
- [— “On Mo Yan.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2013): 5-12.]
- ：“外国文学研究七十年述评”，《东吴学术》5（2019）：5-15+2+161。

- [—, “Review of Foreign Literary Studies over the past 70 Years.” *Soochow Academic* 5 (2019): 5-15+2+161.]
- : 《如是我闻》。北京: 作家出版社, 2022 年。
- [—, *So This Is What I Heard*. Beijing: The Writers Publishing House, 2022.]
- : “文学‘全球化’背景下的学术史研究”, 《当代作家评论》1 (2012): 44-57。
- [—, “Studies on Academic History at the Background of Literary Globalization.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 1 (2012): 44-57.]
- : 《西班牙文学: 黄金世纪研究》。南京: 译林出版社, 2007 年。
- [—, *Studies on Spanish Literature: The Golden Age*. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2007.]
- : “下现实主义与经典背反”, 《当代作家评论》6 (2010): 201-203。
- [—, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 6 (2010): 201-203.]
- : “下现实主义与经典背反”, 《东吴学术》1 (2010): 17-24。
- [—, “Under Realism and the Betrayal of the Classics.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2010): 17-24.]
- Marcuse, Herbert. *One-dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society*. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. *Marx & Engels Collected Works*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2010.
- 聂珍钊: “论脑文本与语言生成”, 《华中师范大学学报(人文社会科学版)》6 (2019): 115-121。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “On Brain Text and Language Generating.” *Journal of Central China Normal University (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 6 (2019): 115-121.]
- : “文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构”, 《中国社会科学》10 (2020): 71-92+205-206。
- [—, “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020): 71-92+205-206.]
- 舒晋瑜: “陈众议: 回归理性”, 《南腔北调》12 (2022): 36-43。
- [Shu Jinyu. “Chen Zhongyi: A Return to Rationality.” *Mixed accent* 12 (2022): 36-43.]

# 取精用弘，鉴往知来：陈众议文学研究的辩证之维

## Wisdom Extracted, Insights Acquired: The Dialectical Dimensions of Chen Zhongyi's Literary Studies

涂险峰 (Tu Xianfeng)

**内容摘要：**陈众议先生作为西班牙语语言文学领域的中国专家，兼具学者、翻译家和作家等多重身份，在文学的跨文化、跨学科研究领域著述丰硕、成就卓然。其数十年间的学术探索，不仅视野开阔、涉猎广博，而且具有在矛盾事物之间保持辩证思维的特质。其辩证思维在历史与现实、感性和理性、守正与创新、民族性与世界性等关系维度中得以展开。他对西班牙及拉美文学、中国文学和世界各国文学的深入研究，关于文学“黄金定律”、文学演化“常数”与“变数”等规律和趋势的理论总结，所倡导和推进的学术史研究工程，对文学经典、传统、母语及“二元论”的维护，以及对跨国资本主义驱动下的西方后现代主义、解构主义思潮及“世界主义”话语的反思批判等，均为这种辩证思维的体现。

**关键词：**陈众议；辩证思维；文学研究

**作者简介：**涂险峰，武汉大学文学院教授，研究领域为比较文学与世界文学及文学的跨学科研究。

**Title:** Wisdom Extracted, Insights Acquired: The Dialectical Dimensions of Chen Zhongyi's Literary Studies

**Abstract:** Prof. Chen Zhongyi, a Chinese expert in the field of Spanish language and literature, who plays multiple roles as a scholar, translator, and writer, has made remarkable achievements in cross-cultural and interdisciplinary literary studies. Over decades, his academic explorations have not only demonstrated a broad vision and extensive knowledge encompassing literature from different eras and cultures, but also showcased a methodology of dialectical thinking amidst contradictory phenomena, which operates in various dimensions, such as the relationship between history and reality, sensibility and rationality, tradition and innovation, as well as national and global perspectives. His influential studies in Spanish and Latin American literature, Chinese literature, and world literatures, his theorization of the “golden rule” of literature, the constancy and variability in literary evolution, his advocacy and promotion of the projects on academic history studies in literature, his

appreciation of literary classics, traditions, native language and “dualism”, as well as his critique and reflections on Western postmodernism, deconstructionism and the discourse of “globalism” influenced by transnational capitalism, are embodiments of Chen Zhongyi’s commitment to dialectical thinking.

**Keywords:** Chen Zhongyi; dialectical thinking; literary studies

**Author:** Tu Xianfeng is Professor at School of Chinese Language and Literature, Wuhan University (Wuhan 430072, China). His research interests include comparative literature and world literature, and interdisciplinary studies of literature (Email: heathtu@126.com).

在中国当代外国文学研究者中，陈众议以身份多元、涉猎广博、独具识见、富有批判精神而引人瞩目。他身兼研究者、翻译家和作家数任，在西班牙及拉美文学研究领域著述丰硕，成就卓然，撰有《拉美当代小说流派》《20世纪墨西哥文学史》《加西亚·马尔克斯评传》《魔幻现实主义》《博尔赫斯》《西班牙文学黄金世纪研究》《塞万提斯学术史研究》等专著，翻译博尔赫斯（Jorge Luis Borges）、卡彭铁尔（Alejo Carpentier）、富恩特斯（Carlos Fuentes）等拉美作家的大量作品，并创作《玻璃之死》《风醉月迷》等长篇小说及中短篇小说。作为西班牙语文学研究领域学殖深厚的专业学者，他不仅广泛涉猎世界诸国文学，而且谙熟中国文学及人文典籍，在论及各国文学时不断贯穿中外比较及跨学科研究意识。他既深入渺远历史，精研西班牙巴洛克文学或古印第安文学遗产，又与莫言、阎连科等当代作家展开积极对话，还领衔组织学术史、学科史和文学原理学等学术工程。其数十年的学术探索，不仅展示出开阔视野和深厚学养，而且体现出在看似相距遥远甚至彼此对立的两极之间纵横捭阖的学术张力。

在一次访谈中，当对话者指出陈众议的研究“张力”时，他自谦地称之为“矛盾”，似乎暗示没能很好地解决这些问题。<sup>1</sup>但从辩证思维看，矛盾事物之间不仅只有冲突，而且充满内在关联，充满思辨张力，充满相互转化之潜能。回溯其学术历程，不难发现陈众议对矛盾关系始终具有敏锐直觉。例如，他从博尔赫斯那里概括出的便是这样一对对“矛盾”概念：“偶然与必然、个别与普遍、存在与虚无，乃至生与死、始与终、有与无等一系列没有答案的形而上学的终极思考”（赵山奎 陈众议 61）；而在谈及《玻璃之死》的命名时，他强调其目的“是为了突出情节与理论、人物与叙述，甚至灵与肉、生与死、情与性、传统与现代、继承与创新等诸如此类的关系”（赵山奎 陈众议 65）。这种富有辩证意味的思想方式，贯穿其研究生涯，由初见端倪到波澜壮阔，由无意识的流露，到自觉而执着的追求。

1 参见 赵山奎、陈众议：“守护我们美好的传统”，《当代作家评论》1（2012）：58。



于是,伴随其学术事业的展开,在遥不可及的尘封历史和呼吸与共的当下现实之间,在纤细入微的艺术感悟与大气磅礴的规律把握之间,在守护传统、回归本源与反思批判、建构创新之间,在民族立场、家园情怀与世界视野、天下格局之间,陈众议以其充满辩证精神的学术思维上下求索、纵横探寻,呈现出不同凡响的张力景观。

### 一、历史意识与现实关怀

陈众议文学研究的一个突出特点,是无远弗届、无近不察的历史意识。他擅长从复杂历史背景出发阐释文学现象,揭示深藏的历史维度。在论及《堂吉珂德》的反骑士小说时,他剖析背后错综纷纭的政治角逐与宗教纠葛:一方面,反骑士小说迎合了天主教会对新教的排斥;另一方面,西班牙卡洛斯王朝建立的统一帝国,将基于小邦独立的骑士文化当作离心文化加以排斥。<sup>1</sup>小说公开宣称要把骑士小说扫除干净,其实“特兰托教务会议之后,骑士小说成了过街老鼠,而反骑士文学则成了‘主旋律’”(“永远的堂吉珂德”24)。这一还原历史语境的研究,改变了《堂吉珂德》独自挑战流行骑士小说的刻板印象,揭示出更多的历史复杂性和个人多面性。塞万提斯试图靠近主流、跻身宫廷诗人而不得,一生坎坷,创作小说而不被承认。他以戏拟骑士小说奠定《堂吉珂德》基调,这并不违背天主教西班牙官方政治宗教倾向,同时,塞万提斯的文学抱负、坎坷遭遇和现实批判精神又赋予其更多微妙性。陈众议指出,塞万提斯在讽刺骑士小说时,又借助骑士小说的自由度借题发挥,同时实现其讽刺骑士文化和社会现实的多重意图。<sup>2</sup>

在研究17世纪西班牙巴洛克文学时,陈众议结合其波诡云谲的政治、历史、宗教、文化背景,从价值观和审美观的多元取代一元、人文主义的背反和怀疑主义的滋生三方面,深度解析巴洛克文学的成因。<sup>3</sup>其中任何一个成因,又是各种政治、宗教、文化力量相互较量的历史结果。一方面,西班牙帝国盛极而衰,却继续高擎反宗教改革大旗;另一方面,文艺复兴的复古浪潮出现反动,作家开始寻求新的创作形式,加上16世纪神秘主义历史传统,使巴洛克文学风行一时。<sup>4</sup>作为西班牙文学资深学者和翻译家,陈众议谙熟文本细节,但没有局限于形式主义研究,而是从历史语境出发,结合历史文献及作品内涵进行探索。他的其他专题研究,如对于“圣灵”阐释史<sup>5</sup>、美洲殖

1 参见陈众议:“永远的堂吉珂德”,《中国图书评论》4(2005):23。

2 参见陈众议:“永远的堂吉珂德”,《中国图书评论》4(2005):24。

3 参见陈众议:“‘变形珍珠’——巴洛克与17世纪西班牙文学”,《外国文学评论》4(2005):75。

4 参见陈众议:“‘变形珍珠’——巴洛克与17世纪西班牙文学”,《外国文学评论》4(2005):77-78。

5 参见陈众议:“信仰与想象——关于圣灵的几种阐释”,《东吴学术》6(2014):5-15。

民地时期文学“秘篆的研究”<sup>1</sup>等，也都是基于扎实历史文献、贯穿深厚历史意识的学术范例。此外，他还在不计其数的文章中多次强调文学研究中历史意识的重要性。

陈众议近年倡导和推进的学术史研究，是其历史意识的集中体现。他认为“学术史研究既是对一般博士论文的基本要求，也是一种行之有效的文学研究方法，更是一种切实可行的文化积累工程，同时还可以杜绝有关领域的低水平重复（……）如能温故知新，有所创建，则读者幸甚，学界幸甚”（“外国文学”104）。而他主持、组织编纂的学术史系列，则是将这一思路拓展为系统学术工程的重要体现。

另一方面，对现实的关怀在其研究中有全方位表现。在拉美文学领域，他对博尔赫斯象牙塔中的哲学玄想不无保留，而更肯定马尔克斯、略萨等对现实的书写。<sup>2</sup>其现实关怀还表现在对当代中国文学创作的关注和批评，其数量之多，关心之切，为外国文学学者之罕见。我们从他对莫言、阎连科、贾平凹、格非、张炜等作家的批评文字中可见一斑。<sup>3</sup>他在肯定当代文学不凡成就的同时，也批评其中“大我（集体意识）的逐渐隐退和小我（个人主观意识）的日益张扬”认为“当代文学的最大问题首先是缺乏足够的悲悯和关怀，小对他者，大对民族、人民”（陈众议 阎连科 28-29）。此外，在为数众多的著述中，陈众议表达了对数码时代网络快餐文化、现代技术和跨国资本控制时代的文明危机，以及民族语言及传统文化危机的忧思。

作为富有辩证张力的两极，他的历史意识与其现实关怀不仅密不可分，而且互相支撑，相得益彰。他认为“‘一切历史都是当代史’，一切文学也都是当代文学”（“塞万提斯学术史研究”106）。这一论断蕴含着双重意义：一方面，我们要将历史放在当代框架之中加以考量，看到所有的历史研究都受到当代思维和需求的影响；另一方面，我们要将当代置于历史脉络之中加以考察，看到每一个当代观念都有其历史的阶段性、相对性和局限性，从而超越我们置身其中的现实模式之局限，做到鉴往知来。

陈众议对于西方后现代主义解构思潮、历史虚无主义的批判，既是出于对当下现实中种种淡化意识形态、主张价值虚无的理论背后隐藏的资本霸权的忧虑，也是从历史意识出发对现实境遇的反思使然。他积极倡导学术史研究，原因之一就是认为它能够克服后现代主义思潮以绝对的相对性取代相对

1 参见 陈众议：“秘篆新启：美洲殖民地时期的三大文学奇观”，《海南大学学报（人文社会科学版）》3（2021）：1-11。

2 参见 陈众议：“来自巴尔加斯·略萨的启示”，《当代作家评论》1（2011）：134。

3 参见 陈众议：“评莫言”，《东吴学术》1（2013）：5-12；陈众议：“理解荒诞”，《扬子江文学评论》4（2019）：5-8；陈众议：“贾平凹的通感——以《老生》为个案”，《东吴学术》3（2016）：6-10；陈众议：“评《人面桃花》或格非的矛盾叙事”，《东吴学术》5（2012）：9-31；陈众议：“评张炜的《独药师》《艾约堡秘史》及其风格”，《上海交通大学学报（哲学社会科学版）》4（2020）：48-53。

的绝对性的弊端。<sup>1</sup>只有梳理学术史,看到不同历史阶段的不同思维范式,才能有效地摆脱当代流行理论的思维窠臼。陈众议不遗余力引领和推进的文学史、学术史、学科史等系统工程,正是其历史意识与现实关怀辩证统一的体现。

## 二、艺术感悟与规律探寻

身为作家型学者和学者型作家,陈众议对感性和理性之间的辩证关系体会颇深。捕捉微妙感觉与探寻宏观规律之间的张力,在他这里达到某种别开生面的平衡。一方面,他具有敏锐的感性直觉,另一方面,他力图将感性体验与对本质的把握结合起来。他对直观感觉、诗性体验在文学中的功能意义进行过持续思考,常将艺术感觉、童心和陌生化理论结合起来探讨。在他看来,被俄国形式主义奉为圭臬的陌生化,就是通过艺术手段让读者返回“童心”。他在解析博尔赫斯、《百年孤独》、堂吉珂德乃至《红楼梦》时,均将童心和“第一感觉”视为文学的精髓。

博尔赫斯作品兼具哲学思辨和奇幻妙想,是观念与直觉的独特结合。尽管陈众议认为“从观念出发审视博尔赫斯,远比从别的角度或象征物如书、镜、迷宫等审视博尔赫斯要畅快、直接”(“心灵的罗盘”44),但他仍对其中老虎、镜子与迷宫三大奇妙意象及童心的作用进行探讨,由此发现童年印象和第一感觉何等重要。艺术想象恢复和重构了几时感觉,童年记忆中“老虎的条纹变成了日月更迭、昼夜交替的时间”;“对镜子的恐惧乃是他儿时的感受,尽管随着年岁的增长这种感受被逐步赋予了形而上的哲学意蕴”(“童心剖诗”85-86)。陈众议引述施克洛夫斯基的陌生化理论说:艺术“就是为使人恢复对生活的感觉(……)使石头显示出石头的质感”。他认为,所谓陌生化指的就是我们对事物的第一感觉,而这种感觉的最佳来源便是童心。作家可以通过艺术想象恢复童年般的敏感,正如“曹雪芹曾经借助于刘姥姥的‘第一感觉’写出了钟的质感”(“童心剖诗”86)。

在《百年孤独》研究中,陈众议也将感觉、童心和陌生化彼此关联。小说经典开端的奇异之处,除了独特的叙事时间结构,便是主人公的生死攸关与童年初识冰块时的震撼体验之间的神秘关系。陈众议根据马尔克斯回忆分析童年感觉记忆如何成为整部小说的构思起点。<sup>2</sup>魔幻现实主义之所以神奇,在于拉美世界特定的观念视野、文化氛围和感受世界的方式,需要借助陌生化手段写出拉美世界的不同感受。“通过马孔多人的感觉知觉,作品变习见为新知,化腐朽为神奇:外界早已习以为常的事物,无一不成了‘世界奇观’”(“‘百年孤独’”80)。热带孩童奥雷连诺第一次触摸冰块时竟感

1 参见陈众议“外国文学学术史研究——‘经典作家作品系列’总序”,《东吴学术》2(2011): 103。

2 参见陈众议:“‘百年孤独’及其艺术形态”,《外国文学评论》1(1988): 79。

到滚烫无比，这一体验如此震撼，以至生死关头仍会想起。除冰块外，马孔多人对于外界日常事物如磁铁、照相机、自动钢琴、火车等均有奇异反应。正如博尔赫斯的独特感觉和幻想连接着玄奥哲学，马尔克斯笔下的点滴异样感觉，都通向对拉美文明形态和现实政治的整体反思。《百年孤独》中关于拉美文明的孤独与封闭等主题，往往通过神奇天真的感觉来呈现。奥雷连诺上校无数次反对独裁的起义，蜕变为翻云覆雨的政权更替游戏。他“身经百战，到头来不知道为谁而战，为什么而战。自由党和保守党原是一路货色，唯一的区别是‘自由党人举行早祷，保守党人举行晚祷’”（“‘百年孤独’” 80）。这些循环往复的无意义政治行动，最终以上校不断重复铸造和熔化小金鱼为象征。<sup>1</sup>

陈众议在回顾本人文学创作时，表达了对文学和文字感觉的重视。他将其早期文学创作视为“练练手”，“当然也有保持文学敏感度、文字（母语）敏感度的目的”（赵山奎 陈众议 63）。但另一方面，对感觉的玩味品鉴总与某种整体把握意图难分难解。颇能说明问题的是他对阎连科作品的解析。他效仿前辈学者以只字概括作家风格，如用“挤”“唱”“做”“说”概括鲁迅、郭沫若、朱自清和巴金：“鲁迅挤出了‘深’（深刻），郭沫若唱出‘广’（广博），朱自清做出了‘雅’（雅致），巴金说出了‘真’（真实）”（“理解荒诞” 5）。他也尝试以“荤”“素”“悟”“醒”概括莫言、王安忆、贾平凹、张炜。<sup>2</sup>在描述阎连科时，他先用“悯”字揭示其悲天悯人、拥抱苦难，又用“硬”、“盈”、“倔”、“绝”描绘其干脆硬朗的文风，内涵的充盈和深广，内心的端方中正，以及挚爱驱使下的锐利与决绝<sup>3</sup>。这种概括，兼有他本人所说的“变得抽象一些、哲学一些”（“理解荒诞” 5）和诉诸直觉感官的特性，或者说更像某种本质直观：既基于第一感觉，又试图以一驭多，精准把握对象本质。

事实上，无论多么强调童心和第一感觉，陈众议始终没有将其与对规律的把握割裂开来。他明确表示对碎片化思维的激烈批判。他通过古今中外文学现象的解析，不断提炼和把握文学发展的历史规律。他提出关于“情节+主题”（情节由高走低，主题由低走高）X轴线模式，以及西方17世纪文学如何形成情节和主题完美结合范式的“黄金定律”。<sup>4</sup>在文艺复兴研究中，他发现另一维度的趋势：历时三百多年完成的历史使命，唤醒的却是《神曲》中令人毛骨悚然的三只猛兽：肉欲、傲慢与贪婪。<sup>5</sup>他还从西方文学整体态势中，揭示出自上而下、由外而内、由强到弱、由宽到窄、由大到小五种历史轨

1 参见陈众议：“‘百年孤独’及其艺术形态”，《外国文学评论》1（1988）：80。

2 参见陈众议：“理解荒诞”，《扬子江文学评论》4（2019）：5。

3 参见陈众议：“理解荒诞”，《扬子江文学评论》4（2019）：5-8。

4 参见陈众议：“文学的黄金定律”，《渤海大学学报（哲学社会科学版）》4（2008）：13-14。

5 参见陈众议：“文艺复兴的另一个维度”，《东吴学术》1（2011）：7。



迹：文学的形而上形态被形而下倾向所取代；文学的叙述范式从外部转向内心；文学人物由崇高伟大而“弱化”“矮化”到平凡渺小；文学人物活动空间由相对宏阔走向相对狭隘；书写对象由大我变成小我。<sup>1</sup>当然，即使是这些宏观规律，仍保留着某些感性特质，无论是“黄金定律”还是五种趋势的表述皆不例外。这种从整体上把握文学规律的追求，与基于童心、第一感觉等的艺术体悟之间，构成富有辩证意味、别具特色的张力关系。

### 三、守护传统与反思创新

陈众议对西方盛行理论思潮进行批驳，同时捍卫传统观念：在解构主义思潮面前，他为二元论辩护；在质疑经典的话语面前，他重新肯定经典的价值；在淡化情节、凸显观念与形式的现代、后现代主义面前，他重新强调情节的重要性。

就二元论而言，他认为二元思维“未来仍将是人类思维的主要方法。真假、善恶、美丑、你我、男女、东方和西方等等实际存在，并将继续存在”（“外国文学”105）。文学方面，“关心小我与大我、外力与内因、形式与内容、反映与想象、情节与观念，以至物质与精神、肉体与灵魂、西方与东方”（“外国文学”105）等二元问题仍是我们的着力点。他在肯定二元论时还重点强调了辩证思维：“二元论绝不是排中律，而是在辩证法的基础上融会二元关系及二元之间所蕴藏的丰富内涵和无限可能性”（“外国文学”105）。

关于经典，他认为经典作家都是无法穷尽的，用略萨的话说“伟大的经典具有‘自我翻新’的本领”（“外国文学”105）。他用两个特征来界定经典：“一是它们必须体现时代社会（及民族）的最高认知和一般价值（包括人类永恒的主题、永恒的矛盾）；二是其方法的魅力及审美的高度不会随着岁月的更迭而褪色或销蚀”（“外国文学”105）。他赞同桑塔亚那的观点：“经典不在于一时一地喜欢者的多寡，而在于喜欢者的喜欢程度。如果在此基础上再加上一个历史的维度，那么这话也就更加全面了”（“外国文学”105）。

在情节问题上，与他总结的“黄金定律”一致，他始终将情节看做文学不可或缺的要害。他肯定西班牙语当代文学向情节回归的趋势，指出其深层原因“是文学最具规律的律动”（“拥抱情节”33）。他认同亚里士多德视情节为文学首要问题的看法，尤其推崇马恩关于情节与内容完美结合的莎士比亚化主张。<sup>2</sup>在研究古今中外文学时，他多次表达了对情节的重视和肯定。

总之，在林林总总的激进思潮面前，陈众议表现出捍卫传统的保守姿态。他甚至专门谈及保守主义的意义：“保守本身并无贬义，况且我所要保

1 参见陈众议：“经典背反及其他”，《外国文学研究》2（2010）：72-73。

2 参见陈众议：“拥抱情节——当今西语小说概览”，《当代作家评论》5（2009）：33。

全要守护的是美好的民族传统。有人也许会问，民族传统是独立生成、一成不变的吗？当然不是，但主动拿来、有意借鉴和盲目照搬、被迫接受是完全不同的”（赵山奎 陈众议 63）他痛感“不仅我们的美好传统，同时还有世界文明的许多美好传统都在被颠覆、被抛弃、被取代”（赵山奎 陈众议 63），认为“保守已经不仅仅是民族立场的问题，而且是在国家消亡之前人类抵抗资本逻辑和技术理性的不二法门（……）守护美好的传统需要创造性思维，否则它们很快会像梵文或古埃及文或古希腊文或玛雅文那样死去”（赵山奎 陈众议 64）。

此处有几点值得注意：一、保守并非拒绝改变，而是反抗不经反思地盲目跟从或被迫接受改变，是高扬主体性的主动选择；二、守护民族传统与借鉴开放并不矛盾，需要守护的也包括世界其他优秀传统；三、保守并不仅仅是民族立场问题，而是抵抗资本逻辑和技术理性的法门；四、守护传统并不排斥创新，而恰恰需要创造性思维。

陈众议在更为宏阔的视野中对于世界文学的变与不变、守成与创新进行了富有辩证意味的探讨。他一方面概括出构成文学发展“变数”的五大趋势（向下、向内、向弱、向窄、向小），又提炼出审美特征、社会责任、创作方法与人物塑造、情节与修辞等文学“常数”。<sup>1</sup>他的“守常”，是对“既有之变”的批判，是向着“未来之变”开放的主体建构行为。他在解析重变数、轻常数的历史原因后，建设性地提出了“重塑原理”之路，并提出两个重要命题：学科史赋予文学研究以来龙去脉；学术史以知其然及所以然为指归。<sup>2</sup>正是这种鉴往知来、不仅知其然还要知其所以然的思维，使得陈众议在反思和超越的层次上获得思想的定力。

陈众议的保守主义价值取向，是经过批判反思之后的否定之否定。后现代主义以绝对的相对性取代相对的绝对性，然而，将相对性推向极致，这本身又构成某种偏执和绝对，需要通过反思批判来超越。陈众议从马克思主义角度出发，看到抹煞一切差别的解构思潮背后无所不在的资本霸权，看到消解意识形态的理论话语本身的意识形态性，看到将相对性推向极致的理论本身的绝对性和时代局限。

总体而言，陈众议充满辩证意味的理论概括和主张，看似向传统回归，其实是经历反思之后对守护传统的成熟认知，是具有高度主体性、建构性和创新意识的选择，是与批判精神紧密相伴的固本培元与推陈出新。

#### 四、民族立场与世界眼光

在中国当代外国文学研究领域，陈众议或许是最关注中国文学者之一。

1 参见 陈众议：“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：84-90。

2 参见 陈众议：“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：91-97。

在各种论述中，他对中国经典话语和诗文信手拈来，在分析外国文学现象时，常与中国文学比较而提出发人深省之论。这些表现，固然与他自幼对中国文学和国学经典的大量阅读和热爱息息相关，但更是其文化立场使然。随着他对世界文学的广泛涉猎和深入研究，对本民族文化的挚爱和理解，反而有增无减，愈益深厚。

民族立场和世界视野的辩证统一，是陈众议学术张力的重要体现。个中内涵，可借博尔赫斯改编的小说《双梦记》（“The Story of Two Dreams”，1935）略加阐释。主人公是位开罗人，梦见好运在伊斯法罕，便前往寻找，历经磨难而不得，甚至被疑为强盗而入狱。当他向狱长讲述缘由时，狱长哈哈大笑告诉他：自己曾梦见财宝埋在某个庭院的无花果树下，但从不相信。开罗人获释回家，根据狱长描述的梦中场景，在自家庭院树下找到了宝藏。<sup>1</sup>此故事有两层含义：一，开罗人走出家门云游四方，最终发现真正的宝藏就在故园，不在他乡；二，要在自家园中发现宝藏，必须走出家门，在与外部世界的交流之中反观自身，方能达成。笔者以为，此故事对于跨文化研究颇具启迪意义：走向世界是为了充分发掘和弘扬本民族文化的特色和价值，而要更好地理解和弘扬本民族文化，则必须走向外部世界，具备比较视野和世界眼光。

陈众议对这种辩证关系具有深刻理解，且多次撰文论述。他研究的拉美文学为理解民族性与世界性的关系提供了天然范例。“20世纪拉丁美洲文学的任何一次骚动几乎都伴有‘全球化’与‘本土化’的讨论”（“全球化？本土化？”5）；他从20年代宇宙主义和土著主义之争探讨拉美作家在全球化语境下的不同文化选择。<sup>2</sup>拉美文学在处理民族性和世界性方面对中国文学颇有借鉴意义。陈众议主张中国学者应确立坚定的民族意识，面对强势资本驱动的强势价值观和强势话语权蔓延以及英文霸权，应该维护母语，守护精神家园。<sup>3</sup>他一面强调中文承载的想象力胜于拼音文字，一面反驳关于中文不利于抽象思维的谬见，并借助西方学者缪勒和希尔斯、诗人波德莱尔和庞德等对中文的盛赞为中文之美提供佐证。<sup>4</sup>他还将守护母语及民族传统文化的意义上升到气节道义等伦理高度：“不仅是出于文化生态多样性的需要，更是重情重义的君子之道、人文之道”（“再论中文危机”27）；中国文学及人文经典“是中华民族的梦想与记忆、价值观与审美观等多重精神因素的集合，关涉民族的精神根脉”（“再论中文危机”25）。

1 参见陈众议：“心灵的罗盘——纪念博尔赫斯百年诞辰”，《外国文学评论》4（1999）：41。

2 参见陈众议：“全球化？本土化？——20世纪拉美文学的二重选择”，《外国文学研究》1（2003）：5-10；陈众议：“民族性与世界性——崛起前的争鸣”，《外国文学》2（1997）：10-12。

3 参见陈众议、潘佳宁：“全球化与文学研究的民族意识——陈众议教授访谈录”，《当代作家评论》4（2014）：203-205。

4 参见陈众议：“再论中文危机及其他”，《东吴学术》2（2014）：26-27。



基于对民族性与世界性辩证关系的深刻理解，陈众议坚持民族立场与世界视野的高度统一。他对颠覆传统、全盘西化和抱残守缺、复古排外都不认同。在他这里，坚持民族立场、守护自身传统与对外开放不仅不矛盾，反而相辅相成。只有在世界文化参照系中，才能更深刻理解、更有力弘扬自身文化。所以，坚持民族立场反而要加深、加强对世界文化的认知。

因此，有几点需要强调：首先，对于世界文化，不仅知其然，还要知其所以然。陈众议说：“我们对现代西方文学及文化只是知其然，离知其所以然还存在着很大的距离。比如说为什么村上春树在日本和全世界那么有市场？为什么阿特伍德进入中国这么多年后，我们才开始知道门罗？”（陈众议 潘佳宁 205）其次，不能仅了解单一外来资源，借鉴视野要更加开阔、多元。陈众议认为：“对于现当代中国文学，西方文学的影响是一条纵线，而俄苏文学和拉美文学则各像一条横线（……）相形之下，俄苏文学富有悲悯色彩（契合着我们的独立解放思想），而拉美文学更具包容精神（契合着我们的改革开放精神）”（陈众议 阎连科 30）。第三，借鉴世界文化来增进和弘扬本民族文化，正是外国文学研究者的独特使命和专业优势。“从事外国语言研究的学人，首先应该为我们的母体文化增加新的抗体和新的能量。这是使命”；“我们是学习研究外国语言文学的（……）因此我们的视野应该更加宽阔，因为我们可以对比，可以参照，从而知己知彼”（陈众议 潘佳宁 206-207）。最后，维护传统文化的方式并非一味赞美，而应蕴含智慧和反思批判精神。“我们有责任用自己的智慧和努力回报我们的文化。反思和批评也是为了让中华民族变得更好”（陈众议 潘佳宁 207）。

从民族性与世界性的辩证关系出发，他对那些似是而非的简化论观点进行了批判。例如他反驳“越是民族的就越是世界的”这一命题时说：“即使民族（比如中华民族）的概念是基本清晰的，世界的概念却是模糊的、不确定的（……）在很大程度上，现在的所谓世界实际上只是西方”；在跨国资本主义时代，“真正的多元早已不复存在”（“民族的就是世界的吗”8）。

同样富有辩证意味的是，在坚持世界眼光、天下情怀时，陈众议也对空泛的“世界主义”进行剖析批判。他从思想史角度梳理“世界主义”源流，描述它自柏拉图以降，历经基督教、德国古典哲学、法国启蒙哲学和圣西门的空想社会主义，直至马克思科学社会主义理论的漫长历程，认为马克思主义的国际主义与一般意义上的“各美其美，美人之美，美美与共，天下大同”（“再论中文危机”22）并不相同。他反对当今“世界主义”将跨国资本主导的全球化与马克思主义的国际主义混为一谈的观点，认为即使是古代的“世界”、“天下”等概念，也与当前所谓“世界主义”思潮并无多大瓜葛。<sup>1</sup>

陈众议的世界视野、天下情怀与民族立场以及对跨国资本全球化和空泛

1 参见陈众议：“再论中文危机及其他”，《东吴学术》2（2014）：21-23。

“世界主义”的批判，在马克思主义的国际主义视野里达到辩证统一。他指出，跨国资本主义时代世界文坛大踏步走向趋同，即所谓“国际化”写作。歌德心目中的“世界文学”（各民族文学的并存、互译、互文等）正在成为实际的空想，超越“民族偏见”的“世界文学”正在成为“国际化”共识。悖论在于：跨国资本导致所谓“国际化写作”或无差别的“世界文学”，是以民族文学的消失为代价，从而悖谬地使得歌德意义上基于各民族“并存、互译、互文”的“世界文学”也不复存在。<sup>1</sup>然而也正是在这个意义上，坚持民族文学立场，反对跨国资本全球化带来的所谓“世界主义”，与更高意义上的世界视野和天下情怀，达成了辩证统一。正如陈众议所说：“这就是摆在每一个人文学者面前的两难选择！其中的悖论颇使我联想到马克思：明知不可为而为之（一方面承认资本主义这个必然王国，另一方面则坚定不移地批判之、否定之）！在跨国资本主义横行的时代胸怀大我、心向自由王国、大同世界（而非技术王国、孔方世界）。〔……〕‘中国梦’必得是‘人类梦’，盖因时代拒绝独善其身。人类需要新的共识〔……〕”（“控制时代”14）。

在渺远历史与当下现实之间，在微观感觉与宏观规律之间，在守护传统与反思创新之间，在民族立场和天下情怀之间，陈众议数十年的学术探索一直保持着辩证思维的张力。取精用弘，鉴往知来，他在古今中外浩瀚无垠的学术空间中，从现象出发探寻规律，从历史出发反思现实，带着艺术家的敏锐直觉、研究者的精益求精、仁者的悲悯情怀、思想者的批判精神，总结过往，干预当下，构筑未来，为中国当代人文学术不断开辟新的境界。

## Works Cited

- 陈众议：“外国文学学术史研究——‘经典作家作品系列’总序”，《东吴学术》2（2011）：102-105。
- [Chen Zhongyi. “The Academic History Study of Foreign Literature: an Introduction to the ‘Classic Writers’ Works Series.” *Soochow Academic* 2 (2011): 102-105.]
- ：“童心剖诗——论博尔赫斯的老虎、镜子与迷宫”，《文艺研究》4（2002）：83-91。
- [—.“Analyzing Poetry with Childlike Wonder: On Borges’ Tigers, Mirrors, and Labyrinths.” *Literature & Art Studies* 4 (2002): 83-91.]
- ：“文艺复兴的另一个维度”，《东吴学术》1（2011）：5-17。
- [—.“Another Dimension of the Renaissance.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2011): 5-17.]
- ：“控制时代的来临与中国的艰难选择”，《世界文学》5（2013）：8-14。
- [—.“The Arrival of the Age of Control and China’s Difficult Choices.” *World Literature* 5 (2013): 8-14.]
- ：“经典背反及其他”，《外国文学研究》2（2010）：71-79。
- [—.“Classics, Contradictions and Others.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 2 (2010): 71-79.]
- ：“心灵的罗盘——纪念博尔赫斯百年诞辰”，《外国文学评论》4（1999）：40-45。

1 参见陈众议：“控制时代的来临与中国的艰难选择”，《世界文学》5（2013）：11。

- [—, “The Compass of the Soul: Commemorating Borges’ Centenary.” *Foreign Literature Review* 4 (1999): 40-45.]
- : “拥抱情节——当今西语小说概览”, 《当代作家评论》5 (2009): 26-34。
- [—, “Embracing Plot: An Overview of Contemporary Spanish-Language Novels.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 5 (2009): 26-34.]
- : “永远的堂吉诃德”, 《中国图书评论》4 (2005): 23-26。
- [—, “The Eternal Don Quixote.” *China Book Review* 4 (2005): 23-26.]
- : “信仰与想象——关于圣灵的几种阐释”, 《东吴学术》6 (2014): 5-15。
- [—, “Faith and Imagination: Various Interpretations of the Holy Spirit.” *Soochow Academic* 6 (2014): 5-15.]
- : “全球化? 本土化? ——20 世纪拉美文学的二重选择”, 《外国文学研究》1 (2003): 5-10。
- [—, “Globalization or Localization: The Choice of Latin-American Literature.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2003): 5-10.]
- : “文学的‘黄金定律’”, 《渤海大学学报 (哲学社会科学版)》4 (2008): 13-18。
- [—, “The ‘Golden Rule’ of Literature.” *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition)* 4 (2008): 13-18.]
- : “来自巴尔加斯·略萨的启示”, 《当代作家评论》1 (2011): 130-137。
- [—, “Inspirations from Vargas Llosa.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 1 (2011): 130-137.]
- : “‘变形珍珠’——巴洛克与 17 世纪西班牙文学”, 《外国文学评论》4 (2005): 74-82。
- [—, “‘Irregular Pearls’: Baroque and 17<sup>th</sup> Century Spanish Literature.” *Foreign Literature Review* 4 (2005): 74-82.]
- : “民族的就是世界的吗?”, 《当代作家评论》3 (2012): 5-15。
- [—, “Is Nationality the Same as Universality?” *Contemporary Writers Review* 3 (2012): 5-15.]
- : “贾平凹的通感——以《老生》为个案”, 《东吴学术》3 (2016): 6-10。
- [—, “The Synaesthesia of Jia Pingwa: A Case Study of *Lao Sheng*.” *Soochow Academic* 3 (2016): 6-10.]
- : “民族性与世界性——崛起前的争鸣”, 《外国文学》2 (1997): 10-12。
- [—, “Nationality and Universality: Debates before the Rise.” *Foreign Literature* 2 (1997): 10-12.]
- : “秘篆新启: 美洲殖民地时期的三大文学奇观”, 《海南大学学报 (人文社会科学版)》3 (2021): 1-11。
- [—, “A New Enlightenment of Sacred Texts: The Three Literary Wonders in the Period of Colonial America.” *Journal of Hainan University (Humanities & Social Sciences Edition)* 3 (2021): 1-11.]
- : “评莫言”, 《东吴学术》1 (2013): 5-12。
- [—, “On Mo Yan.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2013): 5-12.]
- : “评张炜的《独药师》《艾约堡秘史》及其风格”, 《上海交通大学学报 (哲学社会科学版)》4 (2020): 48-53。
- [—, “On Zhang Wei’s *The Secret Pharmacist* and *The Secret History of Aiyue Castle* and His Writing

- Style.” *Journal of Shanghai Jiaotong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 4 (2020): 48-53.]
- : “‘百年孤独’及其艺术形态”, 《外国文学评论》1 (1988): 75-81。
- [— “One Hundred Years of Solitude and Its Artistic Forms.” *Foreign Literature Review* 1 (1988): 75-81.]
- : “评《人面桃花》或格非的矛盾叙事”, 《东吴学术》5 (2012): 9-31。
- [— “Reviewing *Peach Blossom Paradise* or the Contradictory Narration of Ge Fei.” *Soochow Academic* 5 (2012): 9-31.]
- : “再论中文危机及其他”, 《东吴学术》2 (2014): 21-27。
- [— “Revisiting the Crisis in Chinese and Others.” *Soochow Academic* 2 (2014): 21-27.]
- : “塞万提斯学术史研究”, 《东吴学术》2 (2011): 106-117。
- [— “A Study of Cervantes Academic History.” *Soochow Academic* 2 (2011): 106-117.]
- : “理解荒诞”, 《扬子江文学评论》4 (2019): 5-8。
- [— “Understanding the Absurd.” *Yangtze Jiang Literary Review* 4 (2019): 5-8.]
- : “文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”, 《中国社会科学》4 (2023): 83-98。
- [— “Variables and Constants in Literature: ‘Extrinsic Research’ and ‘Intrinsic Research’.” *Social Sciences in China* 4 (2023): 83-98.]
- 陈众议、潘佳宁: “全球化与文学研究的民族意识——陈众议教授访谈录”, 《当代作家评论》4 (2014): 203-207。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Pan Jianing. “Globalization and Ethnic Consciousness in Literary Studies: An Interview with Professor Chen Zhongyi.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 4 (2014): 203-207.]
- 陈众议、阎连科: “文学资源两人谈”, 《渤海大学学报(哲学社会科学版)》4 (2008): 19-30。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Yan Lianke. “Literary Resources: A Dialogue between Two Individuals.” *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition)* 1 (2012): 19-30.]
- 赵山奎、陈众议: “守护我们美好的传统”, 《当代作家评论》1 (2012): 58-66。
- [Zhao Shankui and Chen Zhongyi. “Defending Our Beautiful Traditions.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 1 (2012): 58-66.]

# 文学原理学研究与中国当代文学理论重构：从陈众议 《文学原理学批评及其他》谈起

## Research on Literary Principles and Refactoring of the Contemporary Chinese Literary Theory: Proceeding from *Criticism of Literary Principles and Others* by Chen Zhongyi

张同胜（Zhang Tongsheng） 姜媛媛（Jiang Yuanyuan）

**内容摘要：**跨国资本主义的全球化与文化多元化产生了极端相对主义；我国政府倡导学科体系、学术体系、话语体系建设，在此背景下陈众议倡导“直面问题，重塑原理”的文学原理学研究，得到学界的纷纷响应。它在当代的主要价值有三：一是理论价值，它针对着国际化和文化多元化问题而提出，可以进一步解决后时代文学创作和文学批评中存在着的诸多学理性问题，体现了鲜明的唯物史观品格；二是方法论价值，它提出要反思文学原理，考镜学术史源流，阐述文学原理学理论，对具体文学作品进行文学批评，皆对当前的文学创作实践具有启迪和指导的作用；三是现实价值，即其运用马克思主义的立场、观点和方法明辨是非，坚持正确的文艺批评标准，反对极端个人主义及其书写，通过文学批评指引文学创作和研究的方向。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究以重建中国当代文学理论，继承和发展马克思主义文艺观，将在推进我国“三大体系”建设中发挥重要作用。

**关键词：**陈众议；文学原理；话语体系；中国当代文学理论

**作者简介：**张同胜，兰州大学文学院教授，主要从事比较文学与文化研究；姜媛媛，兰州大学文学院博士生，主要从事中外文学与文化关系研究。本文系国家社科基金西部项目“中国古代文学阐释机制研究”【项目批号：20XZW003】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** Research on Literary Principles and Refactoring of the Contemporary Chinese Literary Theory: Proceeding from *Criticism of Literary Principles and Others* by Chen Zhongyi

**Abstract:** The globalization of transnational capitalism and cultural pluralism have brought forth extreme relativism. China's advocacy of the system construction

among disciplines, academia and Chinese discourse inspired the initiative by Professor Chen Zhongyi to embark upon the research of literary principles by way of “facing problems directly to reshape literary principles,” which has received a broad response in the academic circles. Its contemporary values manifest in three aspects: first, its theoretical value aims at the problems resulted from the present glocalization and cultural diversification, hopefully to further solve numerous scientific problems existing in literary creation and literary criticism in the post-era, thus displaying a distinctive character of historical materialism. The second is its value in methodology, which proposes to reflect on the principles of literature, examine the origins of academic history, elaborate the principles of literature theory, and carry on literary criticism to specific literary works, all of which can enlighten and guide the current practice of literary creation. The third is its practical significance. It uses the standpoint, perspectives and methods of Marxism to distinguish right from wrong, adheres to the correct standards of literary criticism, opposes out-and-out egoist writing, and guides the correct direction of literary creation and research through literary criticism. Chen Zhongyi commences the motion to further investigate literary principles for the refactoring of contemporary Chinese literary theory, inherits and develops Marxist view of literature and art, which will surely play a crucial part in promoting the construction of the “three major systems” in China.

**Keywords:** Chen Zhongyi; literary principles; discourse system; the contemporary Chinese literary theory

**Authors:** **Zhang Tongsheng** is Professor at the School of Chinese Literature, Lanzhou University (Lanzhou 730000, China). His area of academic research includes Comparative literature and culture, and literary theory (Email: hopemark@126.com). **Jiang Yuanyuan** is PhD candidate at the School of Chinese Literature, Lanzhou University (Lanzhou 730000, China). Her research focuses on relations between Chinese and foreign literature and culture (Email: 403375382@qq.com).

目前，国家倡导学科体系、学术体系和话语体系建设，中国特色、中国风格、中国气派的当代文学理论重构何以可能？陈众议指出，当前唯文本论、反本质主义、虚无主义甚嚣尘上，契合新时代的美学体系亟需建构，文学原理也待回归正途。<sup>1</sup>他说：“构建符合世界文学发展规律并具有中国立

1 参见 陈众议：“话语之弧：中西资源探赜之一”，《浙江社会科学》10（2021）：122-128。



场、中国审美特质的文学理论体系不仅迫切需要，而且完全可能”（“民族的就是世界的吗？”7）。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究以重构中国当代文学理论，在当前具有重要的学术价值和现实意义，值得我们进一步深究。当我们探论一位学者或者一个理论的学术价值的时候，我们从问题域看这个理论针对什么问题产生以及产生后能解决什么问题；从功能看其在文学理论体系中的地位以及其方法论的学术意义；从应用看其实际解决问题的功效。本文拟从陈众议倡导的文学原理学研究的问题域、文学原理学研究的方法论、文学原理学研究的现实意义等方面论述其重构当代文学理论的重要价值。

## 一、文学原理学研究的理论价值

### （一）文学原理学研究

文学原理是文学原理学研究展开的前提，它一般分为本体论、创作论、批评论，它探讨文学创作和文学研究的一般规律。陈众议认为：“归根结底，一切文学原理终究是为了研究、总结和引导文学批评，梳理、概括和揭示文学创作的基本规律（认知、鉴赏和评判文学经典亦在其中）”（《文学原理学批评及其他》9）<sup>1</sup>。正因为陈众议从文学创作和文学批评的角度研究文学的一般规律，因此他倡导的文学原理学研究，其内部结构就是由文学思想、创作论和批评论构成。

文学原理学的根本任务在于探寻文学的内涵和基本规律，回答文学是什么，以及文学何为、文学何如等根本性问题。古今中外，迄今对文学原理的研究可谓蔚为大观。然而，如今我们进入了新时代，国内外形势发生了新变化，出现了新问题。针对21世纪的新变化新问题，陈众议倡导文学原理学研究以建构中国式文学理论。

### （二）文学原理学研究的问题域

一种新理论的提出，总是针对着一个具体的时代性问题。文学原理，既然是对文学最基本规律的把握，那么，文学原理学则从文学本质上研究文学创作和文学批评中的一般性重大问题。它的突出特征是，高屋建瓴地把握文学现象和文学问题的实质。从这个维度来看，我们需要弄清楚陈众议倡导文学原理学研究针对的是什么问题，又要解决什么问题，也就是它的问题域是什么。陈众议认为：“作为学者，尤其是人文学者，有一个基本的方法是永远不要丢弃的：无论做什么，都要对国际、国内大势做一个基本的判断”（陈众议 潘佳宁 3）。陈众议作为一名敢于担当的专家学者，其最大的独特性就在于他对宏大政治问题的敏感以及看问题的透彻和深邃。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究的国内外形势及其具体语境是怎样的呢？

首先，国际、国内大势。第一，国际化。陈众议认为，国际化，“本

1 本文有关《文学原理学批评及其他》的引文均来自陈众议，《文学原理学批评及其他》（北京：中国社会科学出版社，2022年）。以下引文仅标注页码，不再一一说明。



质上即跨国资本主义化”（10），形式上则是“跨国公司或跨国资本化”（112）。如果对马克思主义没有真正掌握，没有对马克思主义的立场、观点、方法化为己用，是不可能如此深刻地直抵事物的实质的。陈众议进一步指出：“我们所面临的最大的国际矛盾是民族利益、民族情感同跨国资本及其主要支配者所奉行的资本逻辑之间的矛盾”（55）。从学理来看，陈众议认为国际化即“极端相对主义”（109）。极端相对主义已经渗透进了当前中国的文学创作和文学批评，形成国际化写作，文学创作机制和创作理念皆有质的改变，后现代主义创作及其文学批评成为主潮。

多元化。陈众议认为，所谓“多元化”，本质是“跨国资本主义的一元化”（50）。多元化文化，应跨国资本而生，为跨国资本而存。文化一元化在后时代体现为后现代主义，即去中心、去本质、去民族化、去政治化，是对中心主义、本质主义、民族意识等的解构。众人所见，一般是解构所带来的平等、自由和民主。然而，陈众议却认为：“一切淡化意识形态或去政治化倾向（尽管本身也是一种意识形态和政治）同庸俗社会学一样有害”（56）。淡化意识形态的学理支撑是什么呢？陈众议认为，是后现代概念、后现代思想所导致的极端相对主义。<sup>1</sup>那么，我们应该如何应对上述国际化、文化多元化的现实问题呢？陈众议提出来的应对策略是，回到学术史研究，因为学术史的时空里写着何以然和所以然。<sup>2</sup>

其次，我们当下具体的人文环境，主要存在着五个问题：一是“引进照搬较多，自主创新较少”；二是“关注西学较多，重视东学较少”；三是“微观研究较多，宏观把握较少”；四是“就事论事较多，规律探讨较少”；五是“生搬硬套较多，分析批判较少”（110-111）。这五个问题，便是文学原理学研究面对的国内大势，也是我们重构中国当代文学理论具体的问题域。

陈众议在当前国内外形势下倡导文学原理学研究，从主体性来看，是因为文艺创作市场化，“文学批评家成为‘纯粹’的工匠”（144），知识分子对国际化麻木不仁，而“我们的文学及文学批评正一点点丧失立场和本分”（13）。我们的立场，本来是辩证唯物主义和历史唯物主义。我们的本分，本来是旗帜鲜明地运用批判的武器。然而，现在很多作家、文艺批评家已经将它们丢弃了。后果就是牛鬼蛇神纷纷出笼，是非不分，美丑混淆；更有甚者，为虎作伥，指鹿为马。鉴于此，重构中国式文学理论势不容缓。文学原理学研究反思文学原理，主要探讨当前文学原理缺乏标准、一系列矛盾统一关系作为悖论所构成的障碍、似是而非的命题等。它们是国际化、文化多元化中的主流，造成了乌烟瘴气的混乱局面，因此，陈众议认为有必要重塑原理，进行文学原理学研究，以此重构以马克思主义为指导的当代文学理论。

1 参见陈众议：《文学原理学批评及其他》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2022年，第85页。

2 参见陈众议：“学术史研究及其方法论辨正”，《外国文学动态研究》3（2020）：6-11。

### （三）重构中国当代文学原理学

为什么要重塑原理？因为，“文学原理面临着前所未有的混沌局面，作为界定、阐释、评判或鉴赏标准的文学观念也纷乱繁杂，以至于本可以中外并举、彼此兼容的理论和方法每每相互排斥、彼此龃龉，这就迫使我们在对强制和反强制的辨析与规约中努力弥补阙如，以裨重新出发”（陈众议，“直面问题”18）。在当代中国特色文学原理学的建构过程中，陈众议认为，中国传统文化中的中庸思想和包容精神没有在其中得到体现。文学评论的八股化和标准化（实则是西化或技术理性化）迄今为止尚未被清算。去意识形态、去审美理性、绝对的相对主义、虚无主义、碎片化等诸如此类的问题，亟需或呼吁重塑文学原理。

重塑原理的立足点是什么？陈众议认为：“辩证地、平衡地守护常数、洞察变数，入乎其内、出乎其外是重构文学原理的基本立足点”（“文学的变数与常数”83）。“文学的常数究竟有哪些呢？这个问题虽然很难断然回答，但审美特征、社会责任，以及某些创作方法如人物塑造、情节处理和修辞方法等，无疑都是文学赖以生生不息并润物无声地感化读者、潜移默化地改变世道人心的基本元素”（86）。何谓文学的变数？文学的变数，是文学原理学的要务和难点。陈众议关于世界文学的演变有一重大发现，即其五大趋势：向下、向内、向弱、向窄、向小，便是变数中的重要内容之一。<sup>1</sup>

如何重塑原理？重塑原理需要建构文学原理的话语体系，而文学原理的话语体系必须建立在学术史和学科史的基础之上。<sup>2</sup>这是因为，学科史可赋予文学研究以源流正变的考察，而学术史则在问题生产的具体语境中展现何如与为何的逻辑关系。学术史自19世纪末德国俾斯麦时代以来，就成为人文学的研究方法。学术史中的研究之研究，不仅是一种行之有效的方法，而且是进一步深入研究的基础。如此一来，重塑原理就不会成为无源之水。

文学原理学研究的路径之一，就是“借历史唯物主义和辩证法对一些重要的文学思想进行历时性梳理和共时性观照”（17）。追根溯源，考镜源流，在发生学或谱系学的视域中探求其根本原因和基本规律；共时性观照，取其精华，去其糟粕，一切从实际出发，实事求是，发展马克思主义，以此重构当代文学原理学。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究的理论价值，主要有三：一是它针对当代全球化和文化多元化中的种种文学问题，倡导从文学原理的维度对文学现象和问题进行马克思主义的学术研究和文学批评；二是它运用或重塑文学原理中的基本术语、概念和思想进行理论上的反思和辨析，能够推进我国学科体系、学术体系和话语体系的建设；三是它归纳和总结了文学创作、文学研究、文学批评中的一般性规律，而这些规律可以用来指导我们的文学文化实践。

1 参见陈众议：《文学原理学批评及其他》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2022年，第84-86页。

2 参见陈众议：“直面问题，重塑原理”，《中国文学批评》1（2022）：22-24。

## 二、文学原理学研究的方法论价值

文学艺术为谁写？写什么？如何写？这些基本问题，是马克思主义文艺理论体系中的极其重要的问题。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究，继承和发展马克思主义的文艺观，预设了将马克思主义文艺观发展到一个新阶段的可能性，具有鲜明的时代特征。

### （一）为谁写？

每一位作家都是为他的时代而写。巴尔扎克说过：“教育他的时代，这是每一个作家应该向自己提出的任务”（82）。他创作的《人间喜剧》，赢得了马克思、恩格斯高度的赞扬。恩格斯在《致玛·哈克奈斯》中说，巴尔扎克“汇集了法国社会的全部历史，我从这里，甚至在经济的细节方面（如革命以后动产和不动产的重新分配），我学到的东西也要比从当时所有职业历史学家、经济学院和统计学家那里学到的全部东西还要多”（462）。

苏俄时期，列宁指出，文艺应该“为千千万万劳动人民，为这些国家的精华、国家的力量、国家的未来服务”（666）。在20世纪40年代，毛泽东号召作家为人民大众写作。毛泽东“在延安文艺座谈会上的讲话”认为：“为什么人的问题，是一个根本的问题，原则的问题”；他进而追问：“什么是我们的问题的中心呢？我认为，我们的问题基本上是一个为群众的问题和一个如何为群众的问题”（853）。因此，文艺工作者应该与人民群众打成一片，必须彻底解决个人和群众的关系，文艺为以工农兵为主体的人民大众服务。

新中国成立以来的“十七年”，出现了一系列“红色经典”，它们为党为新中国为人民而写。文艺“为工农兵服务”“为政治服务”。1957年2月，毛泽东在“关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题”中指出：“人民这个概念在不同的国家和各个国家的不同的历史时期，有着不同的内容”（《毛泽东文集》205）。

新时期以来，解放思想，改革开放。文艺“为人民服务，为社会主义服务”。文学花园里生机勃勃，郁郁葱葱，鲜花杂草，一起生长。当前的文学创作，深受跨国资本主义及其思潮的影响，良莠不齐。马克思指出：“资本主义生产就同某些精神生产部门如艺术和诗歌相敌对”（《马克思恩格斯全集》296）。跨国资本在后工业时代的文学艺术领域，形成的是一种观念先行、消解情节、鼓吹“奶嘴战略”的后现代主义解构式写作。

“文学作品所表述的核心因素是斯芬克斯因子”（“Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection” 398）<sup>1</sup>，从而为谁写的问题，实质上是作家的一种伦理选择。陈众议对作家作品的文学批评不仅有一说一有二说二，而且有意识地倡导风清气正的艺术创作生态。文学原理学研究关于“为谁写”的问题，针对

1 本文外文引文均出自笔者译。

的正是新时代跨国资本主义及其一元化文化，这是我们当下的新问题，从而体现了陈众议倡导文学原理学研究以正本清源的必要性、重要性和迫切性。

## （二）写什么？

1938年4月28日，毛泽东“在鲁迅艺术学院的讲话”中号召“文学作品要有内容，要适合时代的要求，大众的要求”（《毛泽东文艺论集》16-17）。陈众议主张：“既然美离不开社会责任，那么作为创作主体的作家在遴选素材、确立主题、营造氛围、塑造人物等方面必然要有所甄别，有所取舍。换言之，写什么和怎么写是每一个作家必须首先回答的问题”（“文学的变数与常数”89）。

陈众议对国内外大势有理性的认知，对当代的中国文坛也有一个宏观的透视和把握。从“40后”之前到“90后”的作家，他都有一个总括的观照，简要地概括出不同时代作家创作的主要特点：“70前”作家仍然在创作“中国的传统文学或严肃文学”，“70后”是“实践了题材和文体的演变、小我和大我的PK”的一代，“80后”笔下“已少有禁区可言，自我表演成为主导”，“90后”是网络文化催生的一代，“他们以不乏稚气的自由涂鸦”（64-65）。从当下文坛上的写作类型，也能看出作家们在写什么。陈众议发现，“新武侠、新玄幻、新奇幻、新志怪、新言情、新历史、新校园、新职场、新恐怖、新青春、新推理、新闻谍小说等新新类型层出不穷”（64），他认为，中国文坛所展现的上述繁杂，“既可以理解为繁荣，也可以理解为混乱”（65）。

陈众议倡导文学原理学研究，对世界文学的五大变迁趋势作了归纳，具体地说，就是从神文到人文，从崇高到庸常；从外部转向内心；从神祇到英雄，到凡人；从宇宙到国族，到个人；从大我到小我。<sup>1</sup>因此，当下的文学书写对象也就是日常、内心、凡人、个人、小我等。然而，写真善美还是假恶丑，这是每一位作家必须直面的问题。陈众议对文学作品中假恶丑的批评，就是对跨国资本化意识形态的批判。

不破不立。依照陈众议倡导的文学原理学研究，文学创作应该写“传统意义上的故土乡情、家国道义”“传统意义上的民族意识”“乡村文明”（188）。陈众议当然也意识到了随着现代社会的发展，麦克卢汉所谓的“地球村”已经成为事实。然而，他仍然坚持呼吁乡土乡情之书写，他说“我始终认为中国需要伟大的作家对我们的农村做史诗般的描摹、概括和美学探究”（168）。

笔者认为，陈众议提倡写乡土乡情，既是对中国文学创作美好的愿景的表达，更是对中国文学创作价值的坚持。乡村史诗的书写，在全球化的时代何以可能？陈众议也承认，“跨国资本主义是人类社会发展的必然一环”（55）。中国现在身处全球化潮流之中。当前中国社会不再是纯然的农业社会，而是农业社会、工业社会、后工业社会并置。马克思认为：“不是人

1 参见陈众议：《文学原理学批评及其他》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2022年，第84-86页。



们的意识决定人们的存在，相反，是人们的社会存在决定人们的意识。”

（《马克思恩格斯选集》2）。因此，国际化、文化多元化的社会存在，决定了人们的思想意识不会单纯是农耕文明的价值观，而只能是后现代主义、现代主义、前现代主义并存。但是，正如陈众议发现的“经典背反”规律所指出的，“对下现实主义的背反不仅必要，而且紧迫。这也是由文学，尤其是文学经典的理想主义性质所决定的”（72）；文学经典之所以是经典，就在于它对时流的反动和对传统理想的持守。“中华民族及其民族认同感更多建立在乡土乡情之上”（52），因此陈众议呼吁作家们书写乡村文明、农业文化、精神家园等民族传统。

### （三）如何写？

文学原理学研究得出的一般性规律，既是文学批评的定海神针，也是文学创作活动的指南。陈众议关于“情节与主题”“民族性与世界性”“经典背反及其他”等文学原理的论述，以及他关于莫言、贾平凹、张炜、帕慕克（Ferit Orhan Pamuk）、博尔赫斯（Jorge Luis Borges）等作家作品个案的文学批评，无不展示了他对文学作品“如何写”的理论性思考。

陈众议论析“情节与主题”，针对着当前文学创作现实中的一个问题，即“情节在现当代严肃文学中的阙如已是不争的事实”（35）。何谓情节？情节就是有内在因果逻辑关系的故事，是“有血有肉的故事”（37）。陈众议提倡当代作家按照这个“文学方程式”进行创作：情节+主题=X。这个X的两条曲线，“可以视作‘黄金世纪’文学的一个黄金定律”（“文学的‘黄金定律’”13）。这一概括简明扼要，具有文学创作的指导价值。

从重塑文学原理切入的文学批评，是为了艺术家们能够更好地进行文学艺术创作。陈众议对帝王将相、才子佳人、英雄情爱等影视大片毫不留情地批评，正是为了中国电影能够解决“情节的生硬”“主题的悖谬”等问题而提出的对策。文学艺术作品的创作应该是“莎士比亚化”，即“情节生动性和内容丰富性完美融合”（38）；而不是“席勒式”写作，即政治理念的图解、口号的空洞宣传、应然性文字。或者说，“情节+主题=X”是陈众议针对着“主题先行和情节危机趋势已经普遍存在于20世纪和当下的严肃文学”（43）对症下药所开的药方。它已然成为文学创作切实可行的规律或法则，对文学艺术创作大有裨益。

陈众议以“评莫言”为例，既指出了莫言小说魔幻现实主义色彩的域外文化影响，又说明了莫言对民族传统文化的持守；同时，尤其难能可贵的是，他也批评了莫言小说存在着的五根软肋：缺乏节制、审丑倾向、过于直接、蝌蚪现象、原始生命力崇拜。<sup>1</sup>陈众议关于莫言小说的文学批评，是一种典型的文学原理学研究，它切入的角度是文学创作的基本规律，它对文学作品特征的归纳客观公允，它对莫言小说存在着的问题的分析切中肯綮。

1 参见陈众议：《文学原理学批评及其他》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2022年，第161-163页。

文学的创作方法，主要有现实主义、浪漫主义、社会主义现实主义与浪漫主义相结合、现代主义、象征主义、后现代主义、多元化创作等。不管文学终结结论陈述的是否是事实，文学业已实现了文化转向，从而文学创作也转向了影视文学、网络文学、超链接文学、多媒体立体文学等新文体文学形态。文学创作，虽然是法无定法，但是，有一条则既是陈众议的夫子自道，又是文学原理学研究的科学认知，那就是“原创性始终是经典、是严肃文学的不二法门”（65）。从文学原理学研究来看，伟大的文学经典，展现的一般是原创性精神。重复或模仿，那不是创作。

以上所述，是陈众议在文学原理研究中关于文学创作所总结归纳的一般性法则，具有方法论的价值和意义。他关于“为谁写”“写什么”“如何写”的时代性思考，从重构中国当代文学理论的维度作了初步的批判性回答。而其科学结论，将为当下的文学创作提供理论和方法上的重要参考。

### 三、文学原理学研究的现实价值

文学原理学研究除却以上所论述的理论价值和方法论价值，如果从文学批评这个角度来看，它还具有批判假恶丑、弘扬真善美的现实意义。文学批评的作用，主要有三：一是“引导读者阅读”；二是“启迪作家创作”；三是“促进理论建设”<sup>1</sup>。文学批评是一种理性思考，是一种审视方式，是一种思想对话，它探究文学作品到底要说什么。而文学原理学研究，由于它的哲学底蕴、政治站位、唯物史观对文学批评还有更高的要求 and 自觉。

#### （一）文学批评的立场

文学批评的首要问题，就是立场问题。立场决定方向。“立场问题，归根结底是世界观问题，但同时也牵涉到小我与大我、个别与全局、短期与长远等一系列关键问题”（111）。文学批评的首要问题，是文学作品所显示的政治立场是否正确？毛泽东认为：“文艺批评有两个标准，一个是政治标准，一个是艺术标准”（《毛泽东选集》868）。这两个标准，应该是辩证的统一。

文学原理学研究应用到文学批评，其前提是要有一个正确的政治立场。陈众议在“我国外国文学研究的几个问题”中严厉地批评严歌苓作品中的政治立场，诸如《小姨多鹤》《归来》《金陵十三钗》等无一不是对中华民族的“指摘与不屑”，然而中国的受众竟然“麻木不仁”，外国文学研究界也“麻木不仁”（146）。之所以麻木不仁，最主要的原因就是因为文学批评的立场不正确。严歌苓的文学作品存在着意识形态问题，这不是唯一的个案。

陈众议认为，我国当代的文学批评主要存在着三种不良的倾向：“一是追捧，二是谩骂，三是照搬和套用西方理论”，或者说“媚评、酷评、西化”（109）三种不良学风，这些问题的根源从学理来看，可以溯源到极端相

1 参见 欧阳友权编：《文学理论》，北京：北京大学出版社，2006 年，第 325-328 页。

对主义，即后现代主义或文化全球化。文学批评的不良学风出自文学批评者的政治立场错误。陈众议说：“从方法论的角度看，立场是基础，是灵魂”（109）。

自改革开放以来，我国意识形态领域的管控较为宽松，于是有一些别有用心之辈变相地否定社会主义和中国共产党的领导。然而，令人难以置信的却是，一些文学评论家竟然对此视若无睹，置若罔闻。不仅如此，还有论者不辨是非地为之胡吹乱捧，为低俗、庸俗、媚俗、恶俗欢欣鼓舞。当前从思想政治理论的高度，指出并批判文学作品中的侮华、反华、丑化中华民族等反动言论的清醒者并不多，而陈众议则是为数不多者的旗手。从马克思主义立场出发对文学作品进行的批评、指导或引领，显示了文学原理学研究的现实价值和实践意义。

## （二）文学批评的指导思想

马克思主义关于文学批评，一贯的是坚持思想意识的正确性。马克思对抽象性的批评、恩格斯的倾向性论述等无不体现了文学批评政治正确的重要性。早在1905年，列宁就指出，“写作事业应当成为整个无产阶级事业的一部分”，而让“无党性的写作者滚开”（663）。传统、经典、民族性、悲剧等文学原理的术语，在不同的历史时期其所指有特定的内涵外延。陈众议对具体作家作品的文学批评，无不展现了政治正确之于文学批评的重要性。

陈众议在其文学原理学研究里的守正，还体现在他倡导“逆时代潮流而动”“明知不可为而为之”（12）的创作精神。这与他对待文学经典的科学认知有关系，因为他发现古今中外的文学经典，似乎总是一种与时代精神悖反的社会存在，即他所命名的“经典背反”（61）。

文学批评应该赞美什么？应该批评什么？文学评论的时代性价值何在？这些问题都事关文学创作的方向。文学批评要判断文学作品在思想上是否具有进步的倾向性，是否具有积极健康的情感性，是否具有引人向上的审美性，对文学作品要进行实事求是的评价。文学原理学研究在政治站位上是旗帜鲜明的，即以马克思主义的历史唯物主义与辩证法为指导。陈众议认为：“重构文学原理必须回归马克思主义的基本立场、观点和方法”（“文学的变数与常数”98）。

“对发展中国家而言，全球化时代的最大国际矛盾无疑是并在可以预见的的一个时期内仍将是跨国资本同有关国家民族利益的矛盾。这是当代文学及文化阐释的重要基础”（陈众议，“《阿拉伯文学通史》评议”55-56）。陈众议的这段话，为我们当前进行文学批评指明了正确的方向，那就是文学研究的重要基础，是清醒地意识到跨国资本主义与民族利益之间的矛盾。任何一个具有社会良知的知识人，一定力戒成为跨国资本的帮凶，避免为资本主义的罪恶文过饰非，不能容忍损害国家根本利益的虚假言论。文学批评的指导思想，务必是马克思主义基本原理以及习近平新时代中国特色社会主义思想



想。

### （三）文学原理学研究的批评术语

文学原理学研究，其根基在于文学原理的核心概念。这些核心概念包括文学、经典、传统、情节、主题、真实、悲剧、民族性、世界性、认同等术语。陈众议“直面问题，重塑原理”提出，面对全球化，为了“三大体系”建设，需要“重塑原理”，而重塑原理须从对文学原理的基本概念、术语入手：“从方法论的角度看，时至今日，任何概念必须置于历时性和共时性、唯物主义和辩证法坐标上方能厘清”（25）。

#### 1. 文学

文学原理学研究首先关注的是，什么是文学？因为它是文学原理最基本也是最根本的问题之一。陈众议认为：“文学是创作和批评构成的双桅船”（87），文学指的是“关乎自我的询问与回答”（113）。陈众议关于何谓文学的理解，其维度为哲学。在西方，有一个“你是谁”的主体性质询传统。因此，文学的上引界定，其实是肤廓的，它可以回答文史哲的众多问题，从而也就不能把握文学之为文学的独特性。什么是文学的本质？陈众议赞同老舍《文学概论讲义》里的看法，即认为文学的特质是“感情、美和想象”（72）。这也是一家之言。

何谓文学？从文学的概念史来看，文学指的是所有的书写（writing）；某一族群的文献资料；个人的创作篇什；自1800年斯达尔夫人（Madame de Staël）发表《从文学与社会制度的关系论文学》以来，文学专指包括小说（novel）、诗歌、散文和戏剧在内的现代文体。作为常识，一般认为，文学是语言的艺术。童庆炳认为，文学是审美意识形态。<sup>1</sup>德里克·阿特里奇（Derek Attridge）主张“文学本身是一初始事件，它打开了情感和意义新的多种可能性”（59）。

“文学观念是在文学的历史化过程中被认同、接受和发展的，因此文学观念的形成过程，实际上是一个伦理过程。从文学发展的历史看，文字文本被确认为文学文本的过程，在本质上是一个文字文本伦理化的过程”（《文学伦理学批评导论》21），也就是说，“文学概念的演变，决定于生成它的文化和语境”（“A Basic Theory” 189），即其伦理环境。

随着文化产业的发展，文学实现了文化转向。西方一些理论家，如希利斯·米勒（Hillis Miller）认为：“文学研究的时代已经过去，但是，它会继续存在”（138）。国内一片哗然，他们将其理解为“文学死亡”或“文学终结”，于是质疑之声不绝于耳。其实，终结不是死亡，而是转型。文化转向后的文学，不复是斯达尔夫人所谓的文学，这是不争的事实。文学，自从这个概念产生以来，其内涵外延就一直随着语境在变。每个时代有每个时代的文学，文学的所指是时代语境中的所指，不是过去或未来生态中的所指。

1 参见童庆炳编：《文学理论教程》，北京：高等教育出版社，2004年，第57页。

文学的起源是什么？有多种说法，如神授说、模仿说、契约说、游戏说、巫术说、心灵表现说、劳动说、伦理说，等等。伦理说是聂珍钊创立的文学伦理学批评中的主要观点之一，即认为文学起源于“人类伦理表达的需求”（Nie, “Ethical Literary Criticism” 389）。陈众议认为，文学的重要功能，包括“摹拟和表现、载道与消遣、传承与鼎新、审美与审丑、表达与宣泄等”（91）。文学原理的教材，一般将文学功能分为现实作用、审美作用和心理愉悦作用。其实，后现代主义语境中的文学及其功能，亟需对它进行重新界定，从而也证明了陈众议倡导文学原理学研究的确是时代的客观性要求。

## 2. 经典

关于文学原理，陈众议认为，本质上是“经典的原理”（13）。职是之故，文学原理学研究非常注重对文学经典的研究。经典与经典性是两个概念：“文学经典终究是民族精神的载体，是民族认同感和向心力的重要基础，也是国民教育的重要内容”（“经典重估是时代的需要” 102），而经典性指的是一种“对时流、对大众价值的背反精神”（61）。

马尔库塞认为，真正的艺术是拒绝的艺术、反抗的艺术。<sup>1</sup>此说极是。它体现了对时流价值的背反精神、批判精神。陈众议正是从马克思主义的这一思想出发来探讨经典性与经典的。陈众议认为，“经典是变化的”（61）。聂珍钊认为，“经典化过程就是重构过程”（《文学伦理学批评导论》140）。文学经典的价值，就在其伦理教诲之价值。

关于文学经典，陈众议继而追问经典是“随变的还是普世的？民族的还是世界的？时代的还是恒久的？”（71-72）他认为：“只有国家强盛，才可能掌握话语权，也才能使民族的变成世界的”（86）。笔者以为，包括文学经典在内的所有经典，都是权力话语或统治阶级进行伦理规训的工具，是主流意识形态为权力合法性作的辩护，是一种权力话语的建构。经典总是时代性的，这种时代性源自主流意识形态的轮换坐庄。它是民族的，被翻译后成为世界文学；如果不能被理解就只能是民族的。成为世界文学的不一定是民族文学中的经典，如《好逑传》。经典与其说是民族的或是世界的，不如说它是阶级的。重写文学史何以可能？统治阶级的意识形态作为文学史编纂的指导思想，管控着文学史如何撰写以及那些文学作品成为文学经典。主流意识形态一旦发生变化，重写文学史就成为必然。

## 3. 传统

陈众议坚守中华优秀传统文化，他认为“价值观是最大的软实力”“文学是价值观的重要载体”（51-52），民族语言是最大的传统。中文“是中华民族传统道德伦理和价值观、审美观的主要载体”（97），守护本民族语言的纯正性，目的是为了能够更好地继承和弘扬民族传统。“我们的母语”中文，

1 参见 马尔库塞：《单向度的人》，上海：上海译文出版社，2008年，第483-490页。

是“民族赖以生存的根基”（48）。

陈众议的传统观是马克思主义的传统观，他从不认为“巫不巫雠不雠、求仙拜佛做道场、装鬼弄神测八字”是民族传统，他也从不认为“无厘头式的帝王将相和哼哼唧唧的才子佳人”（12）是文化遗产，他坚决反对封建迷信、谶纬之术。他对传统中的牛鬼蛇神有着清醒的认知，从而能够对它们进行毫不客气的批判。陈众议说：“我们要坚持的恰恰是民族传统、共同富裕和远大的社会主义理想”（99）。

陈众议认为，中华民族的传统就是“乡土乡情”（52-53）。从农耕文化的角度来看，这诚然是不错的。然而，传统是从来就有的吗？传统是一成不变的吗？传统是不是后世发明、建构的？随着社会的发展和技术的进步，社会生态和生活环境由于新媒介新技术的更新而发生了重大的变化，物质的现实基础已然发生了根本性的改变，农业文明、农业文化根基之上的“乡土乡情”书写在工业社会甚至是后工业社会何以可能？

文学批评的力量，在于挖掘出文学作品的潜在价值，在于对其间真善美的宣扬、对假恶丑的鞭挞，在于从艺术本质归纳艺术规律。是其所是地进行文学评论并不容易做得到，尤其是在中国这个人情文化的社会生态之中。然而，陈众议却能够对当代中外文学著名作家进行了有温情、有深度、富有建设性的批评，不是隔靴搔痒，而是抓到痒处。

陈众议倡导文学原理学研究以重构中国当代文学理论，源自其对现实世界的文学关怀、文学原理的哲学思考以及从理论上解决文学根本问题的渴望。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究，具有理论批判的深邃性，文学创作的启迪性和文学批评的实践性。陈众议倡导文学原理学研究，直面现实问题，重塑文学原理，是对跨国资本主义和文化全球化在思想上的时代性回应，是回答当代重大理论问题的“预流”，是对我国建构当代文学科学理论的引领。

## Works Cited

Attridge, Derek. *The Singularity of Literature*. London: Routledge, 2004.

巴尔扎克：《巴尔扎克论文学》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，1986年。

[Balzac. *Barzac on Literature*. Beijing: China Social Science Press, 1986.]

陈众议：“经典重估是时代的需要——中国外国文学学会第十四届双年会开幕词”，《外国文学动态研究》4（2017）：102-105。

[Chen Zhongyi. “Classics Revaluation is the Need for the Times: the Opening Speech of the 14<sup>th</sup> Biennale of the Foreign Literature Association of China.” *Dynamic Research on Foreign Literature* 4 (2017): 102-105. ]

——：“《阿拉伯文学通史》评乱”，《外国文学动态》4（2012）：55-56。

[—.“Comment on *Arabian Literature History*.” *Foreign Literature Dynamics* 4 (2012): 55-56. ]

- : 《文学原理学批评及其他》。北京: 中国社会科学出版社, 2022 年。
- [—, *Criticism of Literary Principles and Others*. Beijing: China Social Science Press, 2022.]
- : “直面问题, 重塑原理”, 《中国文学批评》1 (2022): 18-25。
- [—, “Facing the Problem and Reshaping the Principle.” *Chinese Literature Critic* 1 (2022): 18-25.]
- : “文学的‘黄金定律’”, 《渤海大学学报》4 (2008) 13-18。
- [—, “The Golden Law of Literature.” *Journal of Bohai University* 4 (2008): 13-18.]
- : “民族的就是世界的吗? ——《文学原理学批判》导言”, 《当代文学评论》3 (2021): 5-15。
- [—, “Is the National the International? An Introduction to the *Criticism of Literary Principles*.” *Contemporary Literature Review* 3 (2021): 5-15.]
- : “文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”, 《中国社会科学》4 (2023): 83-98+206。
- [—, “Variables and Constants in Literature: ‘Extrinsic Research’ and ‘Intrinsic Research’.” *Chinese Social Sciences* 4 (2023): 83-98+206.]
- 陈众议、潘佳宁: “全球化与文学研究的民族意识——陈众议教授访谈录”, 《当代作家评论》4 (2014): 203-207。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Pan Jia'ning. “Globalization and National Consciousness in Literary Research: An Interview with Professor Chen Zhongyi.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 4 (2014): 203-207.]
- 老舍: 《文学概论讲义》。北京: 北京出版社, 2016 年。
- [Lao She. *Introduction to Literary Theory*. Beijing: Beijing Publishing House, 2016.]
- 列宁: “党的组织和党的出版物”, 《列宁选集》第 1 卷, 中共中央马克思恩格斯列宁斯大林著作编译局编译。北京: 人民出版社, 2012 年, 第 662-667 页。
- [Lenin. “On the Organizations and Publications of the Party.” *Selected Works of Lenin* Vol.1, edited and translated by the Bureau for the Compilation and Translation of Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2012. 662-667.]
- 恩格斯: “恩格斯致玛·哈克奈斯”, 《马克思恩格斯选集》第 4 卷, 中共中央马克思恩格斯列宁斯大林著作编译局编译。北京: 人民出版社, 1972 年, 第 462-463 页。
- [Engels. “To Margaret Harkness.” *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* Vol.4, edited and translated by the Bureau for the Compilation and Translation of Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1972. 462-463.]
- 毛泽东: “关于正确处理人民内部矛盾的问题”, 《毛泽东文集》第 7 卷, 中共中央文献研究室编。北京: 人民出版社, 1999 年, 第 204-244 页。
- [Mao Tse-Tung. “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions among the People.” *Collected Works of Mao Tse-Tung* Vol.7, edited by the Literature Research Office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1999. 204-244.]

——：“在延安文艺座谈会上的讲话”，《毛泽东选集》第3卷。北京：人民出版社，1991年。

[—.“Talks at the Yan'an Conference on Literature and Art.” *Selected Works of Mao Tse-Tung* Vol.3. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1991.]

马克思：“《政治经济学批判》序言”，《马克思恩格斯选集》第2卷，中共中央马克思恩格斯列宁斯大林著作编译局编译。北京：人民出版社，2012年，第2-3页。

[Marx. “Preface to *Critique of Political Economy*.” *Selected Works of Marx and Engels* Vol.2, edited and translated by the Bureau for the Compilation and Translation of Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2012. 2-3.]

马克思：“剩余价值理论”，《马克思恩格斯全集》第26卷第1册，中共中央马克思恩格斯列宁斯大林著作编译局编译。北京：人民出版社，1972年，第11-373页。

[—.“Theory of Surplus Value.” *Complete Works of Marx and Engels* Book I. Vol.26, edited and translated by the Bureau for the Compilation and Translation of Works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin under the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1972. 11-373.]

希利斯·米勒：“全球化时代文学研究还会继续存在吗？”，国荣译，《文学评论》1（2001）：131-139.

[Miller, Hillis. “Will Literary Studies Continue in the Era of Globalization?” Translated by Guo Rong. *Literary Review* 1 (2001): 131-139.]

Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.

—.“Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 383-398.

聂珍钊：《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.]

# 变数常数、文化关怀与童心辨析——中外文学与文化研究的进路探赜

## Variables and Constants, Cultural Care and Childishness Discernment: An Exploration on the Progress of Chinese and Foreign Literary and Cultural Studies

姚 睿 (Yao Rui)

**内容摘要:** 经历了80年代的拉美“文学爆炸”，中国的外国文学与文化研究界在与世界文论的持续对话中逐渐形成了文化自觉意识。作为知名的拉美文学研究专家、翻译家与作家，学者陈众议的研究带有广博的跨文化视野、深厚的学养与社会责任意识。他发展出“绝对的相对性”批评、“变数与常数”、“陌生化”与童心辨析等原创理论视角。陈众议立足于文明互鉴、本土文化与回归经典的价值立场，通过批判全球化时代的跨国资本与世界文学，为中国的中外文学与文化研究的学科体系、学术体系与话语体系开拓出一条辩证发展的理论进路。

**关键词:** 比较文学；文化研究；陈众议；童心；话语建构

**作者简介:** 姚睿，广州大学新闻与传播学院教授、粤港澳大湾区影视创作研究院院长，主要研究领域为影视、文学与文化研究。

**Title:** Variables and Constants, Cultural Care and Childishness Discernment: An Exploration on the Progress of Chinese and Foreign Literary and Cultural Studies

**Abstract:** After the “literary boom” in Latin America in the 1980s, the Chinese academia of foreign literature and cultural studies has gradually formed a cultural self-awareness through ongoing dialogues with the theories of world literature. In this context, Chen Zhongyi, a distinguished scholar, interpreter and writer recognized for his contributions to Latin American literature, embodies a scholarly approach characterized by his comprehensive transcultural perspectives, profound academic accomplishments, and evident dedication with a sense of social responsibility. He has developed original theoretical viewpoints and introduced terms like “absolute relativity”, “Variables and Constants in Literature” and “defamiliarization” criticism, and the notion of childishness thinking. Through



a perceptive critique of transnational capital and its implications for globalized world literature, Chen Zhongyi has established a dialectical theoretical path for the disciplinary, academic and discourse systems in the realm of Chinese and foreign literature and cultural studies guided by values of mutual understanding among civilizations, the foundation of Chinese indigenous culture, and a return to classical ideals.

**Keywords:** comparative literature; cultural studies; Chen Zhongyi; childishness; discourse systems

**Author:** Yao Rui is Professor in School of Journalism and Communication at Guangzhou University (Guangzhou 510006, China), and dean of Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Film and Television Creation Research Institute at Guangzhou University. His academic research focuses on Film, Television, Literature and Cultural Studies (Email: yrkino@outlook.com).

陈众议先生是当代最重要的比较文学研究者与文艺理论家之一。作为身兼研究者、翻译家与创作者三位一体的“三栖”文艺理论家，陈众议先生凭借横贯西语文学与中国文学的跨文化视野，在拉美文学研究、中国文学与文化进路的探赜上取得了突出成就。作为作家型学者，他的学术研究扎实而充满创见；作为学者型的作家，他的创作充满恣肆的想象力与激情；作为拉美文学译介与研究的先行者，他甚至影响了当代中国文坛创作的走向。作家阎连科将其誉为创作内部的内行与创作外部的专家。<sup>1</sup>难能可贵的是，陈众议先生始终保持着人文学者的社会责任意识与清醒自觉的批评立场，将他的学术立场与主张贯穿到文学、电影等各类艺术形式的批评实践之中，推动了中国的学科体系、学术体系与话语体系建设。本文将陈众议先生及其研究置于比较文学理论的发展语境下，对其核心学术观点进行总结，试图挖掘出陈众议先生对文学批评与文化研究领域的独特贡献。

### 一、文学理论的变数与常数思辨

文学与文学理论的演进并非一朝一夕，而是以“加法”的方式对前人之思展开批判、扬弃与继承的过程。这种演进为文学艺术作品的评判推演出一套有效的术语体系与评判标准。作为中国社会科学院外国文学研究所的前任所长、西班牙皇家科学院的外籍通讯院士与国家哲学与社会科学“万人计划”领军人才，陈众议先生主持了“外国文学学术史研究”等多项重大项目，出版了十余部著述并发表了百余篇论文。他基于马克思主义文学理论与辩证唯物主义的视角，将“文学的变数与常数”作为核心的学术批评理念，

1 参见陈众议、阎连科：“文学资源两人谈”，《渤海大学学报》4（2018）：19-30。



充分运用于文学研究与批评实践。

在文学的发展中,变数与常数难分难解,互相缠绕。陈众议先生将神话、传说、戏剧、小说与传记喻为文学的童年、少年、青年、中年与老年,并在此基础上将文学的变数概述为向下、向内、向弱、向窄、向小,将文学的常数归纳为审美特征、社会责任、创作方法与人物塑造、情节与修辞,为文学的演变规律建立起参照系与研究框架。<sup>1</sup>1、向下,“是指文学的形而上形态逐渐被形而下倾向所取代”(陈众议,“下现实主义与经典背反”17)。陈众议先生认为,文学自中世纪起便一路“向下”,人们开始拥抱人文主义,发现“人之美”,大部分以普通人与身体作为表征与隐喻的作品接踵而至。文学不再主要描写读者高不可及的王公贵胄和英雄豪杰,而将笔触指向普通人与底层人物。经此,文学经由浪漫主义转向批判现实主义,“向下”的状态愈发显著。<sup>2</sup>2、向内,即文学的表现内容从外部转向内心。陈众议先生引用西班牙作家何塞·奥尔特加·伊·加塞特(José Ortega Y Gasset)的相关论述,认为故事已经掘尽,小说再不可能以情节取胜。“去情节”是现代小说发展的必由之路。在充满危机的20世纪,意识流的内心独白、幻觉、梦呓甚至癫狂恰是表现灵魂孤独的有效形式。文学力求指涉灵魂深处的意识,关注跳跃的、梦幻的、忧郁的、陌生的与新奇的心灵片段,通过向内的形式拓新无限接近世界的真相。<sup>3</sup>3、向弱,主要指文学作品的人物呈现出由崇高到渺小,从英雄豪杰到凡夫俗子的“弱化”过程。陈众议先生特别指出,虽然向弱契合了现代主义对抗资本主义文化生产的初衷,但容易滑入自说自话、无病呻吟与审丑美学的境地。20世纪90年代以来,资本、技术与知识合应打破了精英阶层对知识与话语的垄断,文化走向大众化,也进而滑向了对市场的迎合与对观众的献媚。对此,陈众议先生高屋建瓴地剖析了文学生产向弱的历史动力机制及其在当代的局限性。<sup>4</sup>4、向窄包含两层含义,一是指作家视野的窄化,二是指文学作品中人物活动空间的窄化。前者由国家、民族、阶级等宏大叙事转向相对狭隘的自我叙事,后者由辽阔无边的世界发展到方寸之间的厅房。20世纪80年代,人文社科领域发生了重要的“空间转向”,空间逐渐摆脱了对时间的依附,成为文学与文化研究的关键概念。陈众议先生对文学空间向窄倾向的囊括与论述,在“空间转向”的理论基础上丰富了文学研究的空间话语。5、向小,即作家们纷纷放弃了过往“宏大叙事”高扬的“大我”,转而关注个体与“小我”。改革开放之后,后现代主义解构风潮的推波助澜造成了虚无主义盛行。资本增殖的内生主张

1 参见陈众议:“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”,《中国社会科学》4(2023):83-98。

2 参见陈众议:“下现实主义与经典背反”,《东吴学术》1(2010):17-24。

3 参见陈众议:《游心集:陈众议自选集》,郑州:河南大学出版社,2011年,第210-212页。

4 参见陈众议:“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”,《中国社会科学》4(2023):83-98。

批量生产着大众偶像。在这个意义上，陈众议先生痛心疾首地总结道：“屈原以降，无数先烈为我们留下了充满家国情怀的慷慨诗文。同样，大量演义记录了无数仁人志士为国为民赴汤蹈火、在所不辞的铿锵身影。及至20世纪五六十年代，尚有一系列红色经典继承和发扬大我精神。岂知倏忽之间，乌泱泱的‘私小说’和网络‘纯虚拟’占据了文坛的大半壁江山”（陈众议，“文学的变数与常数” 85-86）。作为陈众议先生对世界文学流变的基本概括，“向下、向内、向弱、向窄、向小”这五大倾向相互关联，不分你我，呈现出全球化时代文学发展的复杂化趋势。

在“变数”的基础上，陈众议先生进一步提出了审美特征、社会责任、创作方法与人物塑造、情节与修辞这四大“常数”。<sup>1</sup>其中：1、审美特征是文学的基本特征。陈众议先生通过对《论语》《诗学》等元文本的提炼，与对荷马、亚里士多德、康德、马克思等先贤的审美唯心论与唯物论的辨析提出审美是文学的基本常数与重要属性。2、社会责任体现出文艺作品的典型性与普遍性等特征，肯定了文艺在现实中的社会责任价值——美离不开社会责任。3、创作方法与人物塑造是作家创作的内容与形式之间的辩证法。如何使作品中的世界与人物运转起来将最终导致每个作家与作品的不同命运。“艺术的灵感来源于技巧”并非空谈，而是落实在从巴尔扎克、托尔斯泰到曹雪芹等文学巨匠具体的写作实践之中的。4、情节与修辞不应在现代主义与后现代主义的潮流中被否定与扬弃。相反，应当在眼花缭乱的流派与理论话语下，建立起内容与文体的独立性、丰富性与生动性，从而扭转各种思潮下的“轻情节”与现实主义以降的“轻修辞”倾向。

陈众议先生于杂乱无章、鱼龙混杂的世界文学之域去伪存真，精准地把握住了五个变数与四个常数，勾勒出其中变化、交织与演绎的轮廓，实现了马克思主义立场、观点和方法的辩证统一。在五个变数与四个常数的论述基础上，陈众议先生提出了“学科史赋予文学研究以来龙去脉”以及“学术史以知其然及所以然为指归”的观点<sup>2</sup>，重新审视学科史与学术史在文学理论发展中的决定性作用，论述了文学理论、文学史与文学批评对文学作品本身的重塑与再造功能。这种高瞻远瞩的跨学科研究视野，对中国特色文学理论的学科体系、学术体系与话语体系的建设无疑是一次大有裨益的开拓。

## 二、全球化、消费主义与世界文学批判

在全球化浪潮高歌猛进、消费主义与大众文化大行其道之时，陈众议先生以一名知识分子的责任感与使命感，对全球化时代文学的“去民族意识化”现象以及文艺市场“没有中心，不分你我”、“泛娱乐化”、“资本逻

1 参见陈众议：“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：83-98。

2 参见陈众议：“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：83-98。

辑与技术理性合谋”等时代危机进行了分析与批判,揭露了跨国资本主义的文化政治对文学、艺术与价值的绑架、裹挟与掣肘。在他看来,文化全球化的实质是一种“伪多元”;“世界文学”言之过早;我们应当重视母语,重拾经典;文艺界应树立文化自觉。<sup>1</sup>

尼采在《权力意志》中将虚无主义描述为“一种总体估价的没落(即道德的总体估价)新的阐释力量付诸阙如”(246)。全球化时代文化艺术的去中心化态势及其高扬的无限多元、相对主义表象与虚无主义精心掩盖了其消费主义本质。对传统二元论的解构顺应了跨国资本主义的扩展,加剧了现代人精神的颓废。陈众议先生提出:资本乐见于一个“不分你我,没有中心”的局面,它消解传统意义上的民族性或民族主义。<sup>2</sup>这一反诘可谓一针见血。陈众议先生沿着尼采、马尔库塞与费斯克等人的思想路径,将后现代的“价值阙如”转喻为“绝对的相对性取代了相对的绝对性”(《向书而在》107)并对其进行批判,揭示出文化多元化内在的跨国资本主义一元化本质。

作为“改革开放”后的首批公派留学生,陈众议先生亲历了80年代的拉美“文学爆炸”与后现代主义“无主流、无中心与无标准”的来临。对此,陈众议先生针对后现代主义提出的“用绝对的相对性取代了相对的绝对性”的论断,与袁可嘉先生对现代主义的表述“片面的深刻性和深刻的片面性”形成呼应与互文。<sup>3</sup>将两者结合,可以发掘出现代主义与后现代主义的差异、关联及其内生危机。“后现代主义指向一切意义和宏大叙事的解构为所谓娱乐至上的大众消费文化的蔓延提供了理论基础”(陈众议,《说不尽的经典》137)。当下,围绕跨国公司生产、销售的无孔不入的外来文化产品构成了葛兰西意义上的文化霸权——发达的资本主义国家打着“差异化”、“去中心化”和“多元化”的旗号,以灵活、隐秘的姿态,对第三世界国家进行文化侵略与意识形态渗透,使后者自愿接受前者建立的经济与文化秩序。由此,代表跨国资本的电影、广告、音乐、图书等文化产品才得以大行其道。“绝对的相对性”论断深刻揭示出后现代主义理念背后的资本与消费主义逻辑。<sup>4</sup>

陈众议先生不仅将他的批判实践置于全球化时代的文学场域,更是将其贯彻到电影、电视等传媒艺术场域。在“大众文化与跨国资本——以好莱坞为个案”一文中,陈众议先生揭示了好莱坞电影潜藏的意识形态裹挟功能,认为它“在提供感官刺激和精神愉悦(消遣)的同时,神不知、鬼不觉地将美国的价值观、审美观和认知方式灌输给了世界观众,同时巧妙地借‘国际

1 参见陈众议、潘佳宁:“全球化与文学研究的民族意识——陈众议教授访谈录”,《当代作家评论》4(2014):203-207;陈众议:“经典重估”,《江南大学学报》6(2016):68-71;陈众议:“我们为什么需要文学”,《世界文学》1(2018):212-232。

2 参见陈众议:《游心集:陈众议自选集》,郑州:河南大学出版社,2011年,第375页。

3 参见焦佩:“外国文学与文学发展规律——访中国社会科学院学部委员、外国文学研究所所长陈众议”,《马克思主义文化研究》1(2020):3-14。

4 参见陈众议:《说不尽的经典》,北京:作家出版社,2020年,第137页。

明星’的衣食住行将美国产品推销到了世界各地”（陈众议 叶隽等 12）。好莱坞电影何以风靡全球？陈众议先生认为成功的秘诀在于好莱坞电影基于大众消费的取向，一是伪多元，二是通俗化。<sup>1</sup>好莱坞大片所呈现出的“国际化”、“普世价值”与“多元化”本质上是美国化的价值呈现。《拯救大兵瑞恩》《美国队长》《阿甘正传》等国家主义内核的电影无不渗透着美国的意识形态，通过伪多元和通俗化等叙事方式将政治宏大叙事转化为个人与家庭的情感叙事，诱导观众接受电影所倡导的生活方式与价值观念。陈众议先生对好莱坞电影的论断显示出他在跨学科领域研究的触类旁通与鞭辟入里。

“民族”与“世界”并非决然对立，但也不能混为一谈。在叩问全球化与文化虚无主义的基础上，陈众议先生表达了质问和忧虑：“世界是谁？”并断言“资本之外，一切皆无”（“消费主义与‘世界文学’” 118）。资本在全球化时代具有主导其他意识形态的决定性地位。全球化定义的“世界公民”掩盖了各国在经济、政治、文化上不平等的事实。在跨国资本主义的掣肘下，“世界”等价于西方强势资本主义国家构成的利益共同体。它不仅在资本上，更是在话语权上彻底屏蔽了第三世界国家的声音。正因此，对世界文学进行批判、反思与追问并以此审视中国文学的发展道路成为了以陈众议先生为代表的外国文学研究者义不容辞的任务。18世纪，歌德曾构想“世界文学”的到来。陈众议先生将歌德的“世界文学”构想与孔子的大同理想与“礼崩乐坏”的感悟连接，肯定了其理想主义的愿景。<sup>2</sup>同时，陈众议先生把“世界文学”的构想放置在全球化与消费主义浪潮的现实背景下进行剖析，认为当前欧美主导了世界文学话语体系，“世界文学”几乎可以和“欧美文学”画上等号。基于此，陈众议先生表达了他的质疑：“在他们这个‘世界文学谱系’中，作为中国最伟大文学杰作之一的《红楼梦》尚非经典，更遑论巴基斯坦文学、津巴布韦文学或巴巴多斯文学！”（“消费主义与‘世界文学’” 122）。“世界文学”以“文化大同”之名制霸文学经典与体系的话语权，导致了第三世界文学的沉默与消亡。现实如此残酷，谈何“世界文学”？如果真的存在“世界文学”，它应该是世界各国文学的博采众长，是“各美其美，美美与共”的天下大同，应当建立在相互吸引、相互尊重与相互借鉴的基础上。“独特的染色体保证了各民族在共通或相似的物质文明进程中保持着不断变化却又不可淹没的个性。唯其如此，世界文学和文化生态才丰富多彩，也才需要东西南北的相互交流和借鉴，至少迄今为止当作如是观”（陈众议，“经典重估” 69）。于此，陈众议先生在批判世界文学的基础上提出重视中国文学经典与体用结合的学术思想。重视中国文学

1 参见 陈众议、叶隽等：《外国商业电影及其影响研究》，北京：中国社会科学出版社，2014年，第12页。

2 参见 高照成：“外国文学研究·世界文学·国家意识——学部委员陈众议研究员专访”，《复旦外国语言文学论丛》2（2022）：23-28。



经典并不意味着闭关自守，止步不前。文学需要活水，需要融会贯通与取长补短。这一切的前提是坚守民族文学的自主性。

陈众议先生呼吁，应该重视我们的母语，回归文学经典。“语言文学作为人文基础，其肌理决定了它作为民族认同的基础和文化基因或精神染色体的功用而存在并不断发展，因此，语言文学不仅是审美对象，还是民族文化及其核心价值观的重要载体”（陈众议，“文学学科话语原理及其历史资源刍议”9）。语言和文学是一体两翼的关系。语言的边界即世界的边界。语言蕴含着一个民族的精神、信仰与历史，凝聚着民族独特的处世哲学与思维方式。文学则是语言之“镜”与语言折射的思想价值。正如聂珍钊先生所言，“文学经典是在人类文明社会发展过程中自然形成的，它承载着人类在历史上对自然和社会的认识、理解，并为我们现在社会 and 个人的生活提供借鉴”（“文学经典的阅读、阐释和价值发现”34）。文学力求凝固语言，封存记忆、感觉与情感，在时空中跨越，赋予我们文化记忆。由是，回归母语便是回归故土，回归自身的文化认同，通过“对镜自照”的方式获得自我审视的途径。

### 三、文学的“陌生化”、距离与童心辨析

在陈众议先生的学术思想中，“陌生化”、距离与童心是其核心学术观念。“陌生化”作为俄国形式主义理论的重要术语，其影响力延续到现今的文艺批评与创作实践之中。有关论著卷帙浩繁，但未有学者依托本土理论与话语资源对其概念的旅行、演化、确立及其与本土文艺创作的融合进行解析。陈众议先生另辟蹊径地从距离和童心的角度出发，重新审视了“陌生化”理论，并依托本土资源辨析了“陌生化”与距离和童心的关系，丰富了文学研究的理论适用性。

因距离而产生的“陌生化”出现在诸多文学作品的内容之中。陈众议先生列举了博尔赫斯重述的《天方夜谭》故事、科埃略的《双梦记》、佛学经典当中的《大藏经》以及古希腊悲剧《俄狄浦斯》等文学作品中的“陌生化”手法，并对陌生化的距离、眼光与寓言产生的审美效果进行了深入辨析。陈众议先生认为，今天普通读者阅读文学作品（尤其是外国文学作品）更多是为了获得对外国文化与故事的认知，这本质上就是“陌生化”过程。该论点肯定了“审美距离”在认知活动为主体赋予的意义。读者如能与所在的文化母体形成距离感，便可实现对日常生活的审美超越。陈众议先生列举了博尔赫斯的例子，后者把《红楼梦》归类为幻想小说。这种看法显然不能服众，但不失为一种“陌生化”的解读。<sup>1</sup>“陌生化”与距离为文学的接受过程提供了崭新的解读视角。在“陌生化”的期待中，读者穿梭在文学世界与现实世界之间，通过阅读完成心灵冒险、认知、解构与重构之旅。

不仅如此，“陌生化”与距离还转化为陈众议先生从事文艺研究与创作

1 参见陈众议：“‘陌生化’与经典之路”，《中国比较文学》4（2006）：11-22。

实践的内在属性与价值立场。由于他与研究对象保持适当距离，他的研究结论往往具有很强的穿透力。主要体现在以下几个方面：其一，他早在1984年就提出20世纪二三十年代拉美文学的“寻根文学”是其后拉美魔幻现实主义文学的先驱与“导火线”，为中国“寻根文学”的发展提供了参照与凭依。<sup>1</sup>其二，他对学界高度推崇的拉美魔幻现实主义进行了澄清，提出所谓幻想融合现实的创作手法早已是古今所有文学创作的共性。他还对马尔克斯本人所说的“拉美现实的魔幻与神奇”表达了质疑，认为不可完全相信作家的话。拉美魔幻现实主义的真正独到之处，在于它折射出了拉丁美洲的集体无意识。<sup>2</sup>其三，他对被誉为“作家们的作家”的博尔赫斯的“书斋式”写作进行了追本溯源，揭示出博尔赫斯的某些作品是基于他人作品的“再创作”，从而破除了博尔赫斯的“作家们的作家”神话。<sup>3</sup>其四，对乔伊斯等强调写作技巧的作家与市场 and 资本的共谋关系进行了有保留的评述。<sup>4</sup>其五，在《西班牙文学：中古时期》《西班牙文学“黄金世纪”研究》《塞万提斯学术史研究》等宏论之中，援引了大量一手资料对塞万提斯、西班牙文学与墨西哥文学进行历时性分析，详实论述了阿拉伯人在占领伊比利亚半岛后对西班牙文学产生的影响。在此基础上，通过对弗莱的“原型批评”、荣格的“集体无意识”、列维-斯特劳斯的神话学等理论资源的借鉴和对作家卡彭铁尔的援引，为西班牙文学、古代印第安文学与墨西哥文学等拉美文学与欧洲文学的关系阐释提供了全新维度。洞悉作家创作背后的秘密，必须得具备深谙其道的创作经验、学养与才情才能得以实现。作为作家型学者的陈众议先生对此具有信手拈来的从容。秉承着距离与“陌生化”的理念，陈众议先生在研究中展现出前所未见的史料与另辟蹊径的独到创见，不仅带有颠覆常识的乐趣，也为学界开辟了独树一帜的研究视角。

童心是构建“陌生化”的关键。文学的“陌生化”手法试图从孩童视角对世界进行重新挖掘、打捞与建构，以恢复人们对生活的原初印象，打破沉疴的处世顿感。儿童睹世的眼光先验地带有诗性与接踵而至的惊奇感。儿童常因涉世未深而较易得到刻骨铭心与弥足珍贵的审美与认知体验。在陈众议先生的论述中，文学“陌生化”的底色便是童心。童心总是与纯真、无邪与无忌相关联，总是在直面“陌生”。如此，童心与文学的“陌生化”写作不谋而合。童心的逝去不可避免，但所幸，文学艺术的存在得以留住童心。

“而今，人类虽然早已远离童年，但童年的艺术创造一直通过其不灭的原型顽强地、鲜活地留存于这个世界艺术”（陈众议，“‘陌生化’与经典之路”21）。神话是一切伟大故事的基本因子，是人类童年时期的艺术创造，

1 参见陈众议：“拉丁美洲文学的崛起”，《外国文学研究》4（1984）：61-66。

2 参见陈众议：“评莫言”，《东吴学术》1（2013）：5-12。

3 参见陈众议、阎连科：“文学资源两人谈”，《渤海大学学报》4（2018）：19-30。

4 参见陈众议：《想象的边际》，广州：花城出版社，2015年，第292页。



这种创造彰显出人类旺盛的生命力与无与伦比的想象力。“童心从远的说是神话母题，从近的说是一种尽力摆脱了世俗束缚的相对纯粹的审美活动，从而对某些宏大的理论保持警惕。文学最重要、最可贵的也许就在于保持住这颗纯洁的童心，并使之充满愉悦”（陈众议，《游心集》336）。因之童心，麻痹人心的日常生活获得二次审验与咀嚼的可能，以此重焕光彩。文学的“陌生化”让“少见多怪”语境下的“无知”转变为“人生若如初见”般的渴望，以审美接受的方式使精神“返老还童”。文学中的“童心”见诸中西方神话、传说与经典文学。作为一种永恒的理想与追求，童心理应成为人类构建理想人格的归宿与家园。

陈众议先生缘何对童心如此关注？一方面，童年乃人生伊始，其珍贵性自不必说。许多艺术家都热衷于描写童年，在创作中有意识或无意识地掺杂童年经验。这符合文学创作的规律。另一方面，这也来自陈众议先生对童年的体会和感悟。作为绍兴人，陈众议先生从小受地方无数文人墨客精神足迹的启发与熏陶，一心沉浸在文学的世界之中。他日后在复旦大学与墨西哥的求学生涯也处处彰显出“童心剖诗”的学习激情。童年经验很大程度上形塑了陈众议先生的精神秉性与人格气质。如他所言，“读书犹如饮食，从小培养的味蕾其实会伴随人的一生”（“我们为什么需要文学”214）。对故土的深厚感情，使陈众议先生的学术思想中处处流露出童心与对民族文化的深厚情感。

那么，中西方经典文论中是否也存有“陌生化”与童心的踪影呢？陈众议先生对中西方文论中与“陌生化”和童心相关的理论与创作实践也进行了深入思辨，别出机杼地提出了他的独到创见。童心之文学，方为真文学——这是明代思想家李贽的文学思想核心。在李贽看来，“夫童心者，真心也。若以童心为不可，是以真心为不可也。夫童心者，绝假纯真，最初一念之本心也。若失却童心，便失却真心；失却真心，便失却真人。人而非真，全不复有初矣”（563）。李贽所高扬的是抽象意义上的童心。在他那里，童心是用以反抗封建礼教，批判时人之虚伪的工具。陈众议先生认同李贽对于童心之真的看法，但认为其只说对了一半。童心不仅有“真”，还有“幻”的一面，二者都能在中西方经典文学中找到无数的例证。进而，陈众议先生将童心在《红楼梦》《堂吉珂德》与《百年孤独》等经典文学中的发展脉络娓娓道来。在曹雪芹笔下，宝玉的童心在于“真”，体现在他的情感不加修饰，由心而发。他的“真”在礼教社会不合时宜，又难能可贵。刘姥姥出场不多，却贯穿始终。作为贾府之外的第三者，她的“真”反衬出贾府的穷奢极欲，见证了贾府由盛转衰的巨变。在西方文学经典中，塞万提斯笔下堂吉珂德大战风车的情节表现了童心之“幻”。这一情节天真荒唐，却又有着浪漫的理想主义色彩。塞万提斯生活的时代，人文主义誓要冲破一切藩篱。正因如此，《堂吉珂德》被推崇为理想主义的经典。堂吉珂德的悲剧在于追求不可求之物。生活的荒唐与残忍

彰显了堂吉诃德的童心之可贵。<sup>1</sup>在马尔克斯的著作《百年孤独》中，童心之“幻”则表现为马孔多人在面对冰块、磁块、火车、电灯等器具时所产生的惊奇、激荡乃至恐惧——其中的魔幻现实主义屡屡拨弄着读者麻木已久的内心。值得注意的是，“真”与“幻”并非截然两立。陈众议先生认为，“所谓童心，也许本来就是真中有幻，幻中有真，或真即是幻，幻即是真”（“‘陌生化’与经典之路”19）。在“童心剖诗——论博尔赫斯的老虎、镜子与迷宫”一文中，陈众议先生从博尔赫斯的童年入手，对其作品、自述与遗留物品进行了剖析，认为其中有三大关键意象——老虎、镜子与迷宫。他进而谈到：“20年代开始，博尔赫斯就已是个不折不扣的叔本华式的怀疑主义者。而童年的邈远、童心的模糊又那么真切地实现了这种怀疑：真虎与梦虎、镜子与现实、迷宫与世界或者书本（文本）与读者、读者与诗人、诗人与宇宙、宇宙与书本之间的关系乃是何等的确定与不确定”（“童心剖诗”91）。

西方文学总是有意或无意地保护童心。即使在现实主义风行的19世纪，人们也没有忘记肯定塞万提斯那种孩童般的随心所欲。在中国文学经典中，童心尤其宝贵。陈众议先生谈道：“我们很早就放弃了神话思维，即便不断地有一些美好的传说和想象，也总会很快地被赋予理性主义和功利主义的浓重色彩”（《游心集》336）。如《天仙配》的最早版本出自东晋时期的《搜神记》，而后人画蛇添足式地在其中加入宏大叙事的成分，致使其中的天真被极大地消解。<sup>2</sup>儒家文化有着积极的入世主张，而传统文学又有着“文以载道”的强烈诉求。在功利主义的文化熏陶下，中国文学不免成了“早熟的儿童”。在对重要的中西方文学作品分析的基础上，陈众议先生一以贯之地在文学研究中阐释童心的重要性。他也在各类著述中表达了对中国文学神话思维逝去的惋惜，多次呼吁挖掘“集体无意识”下的童心与“陌生化”思维，表达了一个学者对传统文化精神回归的寄望。

#### 四、深厚学养与责任意识

坚持将创作、翻译与研究贯穿学术生涯，是陈众议先生治学的一大特征。在中国社会科学院的钱钟书、杨绛、卞之琳、袁可嘉等诸位知名学者的影响下，陈众议先生不仅坚持学术深耕，更是在文学创作领域探索出了独特天地。他创作出《如是所闻》《冥合天人》《玻璃之死》《风醉月迷》等拥抱现实、叩问现实又超越现实的小说经典及大量杂文与散文，体现了体用合一与知行合一的学术主张。陈众议先生对于文学创作的方法与体悟是独特的——寓言般的情节铺陈、生动的人物塑造与语言修辞也抵达了“以文学的方式研究文学”的境界，而此境界非有陈众议先生“作家型的学者”与“学者型作家”的身份才能实现。

1 参见陈众议：“‘陌生化’与经典之路”，《中国比较文学》4（2006）：11-22。

2 参见陈众议：《游心集：陈众议自选集》，郑州：河南大学出版社，2011年，第336页。

陈众议先生在其文学创作中践行着对中国传统文化资源的借鉴与重塑。他的小说里展现了大量《老子》《庄子》《红楼梦》与唐诗宋词，显示出他深厚的中国古典文学修为。同时，他还在情节中融入了心理学与社会学等人文与社会科学知识，试图通过古今对话诠释与强化中华民族的审美价值与共同体意识，显示出他基于本土文化的创作自觉以及作为学者的深厚学养与文化情怀。

陈众议先生的小说显示出他对现实的独特思考与社会责任意识。比如，在《如是我闻》这部以揭露迷信为己任的小说中，陈众议先生表达了破除迷信和回归理性的诉求。在当下的媒介融合与数字时代，作为“人的延伸”的媒介已成为现实不可忽视的所在。陈众议先生敏锐地展现出克隆、剧本杀、元宇宙与虚拟空间等时代议题，对由此产生的媒介与技术伦理进行深入思考，使他的创作具有很强的当代性。

创作实践和翻译经验也对陈众议先生的学术生产形成反哺，使他对国内文艺界面临的问题进行了多维度的思考与深入分析。在跨国资本主义主导的全球化背景下，我国文艺界提前进入了“全球化”及“娱乐至死”的狂欢。陈众议先生将其总结为：“或轻浮或狂躁，致使伪命题及去中心化现象比比皆是；文学语言简单化（却美其名曰‘生活化’）、卡通化（却美其名曰‘图文化’）、杂文化（却美其名曰‘国际化’）、低俗化（却美其名曰‘大众化’）等等，以及工具化、娱乐化等去审美化、去传统化趋势在网络文化的裹挟下势不可挡”（陈众议 高照成 119）。面对如此乱象，陈众议先生指出了问题的关键——“全球资本的主要支配者所追求的利润、所奉行的逻辑、所遵从的价值、所代表的集团和它们针对弱国或发展中国家的去民族化、去本土化意识形态，显然与各民族的传统文化和信仰不可调和地构成了一对矛盾”（陈众议 高照成 119）。全球化建立于西方在经济、政治、文化等各个方面的先发优势之上，既是西方发达国家维系现有秩序的战略选择，也是资本增值的天性使然。资本借助跨国流动实现利益的最大化与对各国文化的隐秘控制。对此，陈众议、王宁、聂珍钊等学者共同呼吁回归文学经典的重要性。陈众议先生以忧国之心、兴国之责的态度揭开跨国资本的面纱，并警醒人们，面对跨国资本主义缔结的神话应保持清醒。

面对跨国资本主义带来的文化扩张，接踵而来的问题是：中国文学创作与研究在全球化时代应当何去何从？陈众议先生提出，拉美文学的发展道路为中国文学与文化发展提供了借鉴。“拉美当代作家成功的秘诀是博采众家、取其所长，亦即我国五四作家所取法的拿来主义——正确处理民族性和世界性、继承与扬弃、借鉴与创新的关系”（《游心集》133）。以马尔克斯为代表的拉美文学的成功无疑对第三世界国家作家群体形成鼓舞。需要强调的是，这种成功只有在后工业时代，依靠跨国资本主义及其技术政治才有可能实现。<sup>1</sup>对于文艺界而言，全球化时代既充满挑战，也充满机遇。正是

1 参见陈众议、阎连科：“文学资源两人谈”，《渤海大学学报》4（2018）：19-30。

全球化带来的分工与协作使中国在改革开放之后获得了飞速发展的机会。面对全球化的挑战与资本支配者的话语压力，文艺界绝不能自我放逐，当谨慎面对，重新审视与发现文学经典的价值。面对文学经典，聂珍钊先生提出：

“文学经典是一个国家、一个民族的思想和文化精华，集中体现了一个国家和民族过去或现在的最高道德理想和精神追求”（“文学经典的阅读、阐释和价值发现” 42）。陈众议先生也提出：“古今中外，文学终究是一时一地人心的艺术呈现，建立在无数个人基础之上，并潜移默化、润物无声地表达与传递、塑造与擢升着各民族活的灵魂。这正是文学不可或缺、无可取代的永久价值、恒久魅力之所在”（《塞万提斯学术史研究》2）。陈众议先生对外国文学界“引进多、分析少，借鉴多、批判少，向西多、自顾少”的现象进行了审视与反思，提出中国的外国文学研究者应将“古为今用，洋为中用”的五四运动传统发扬至当下，以外语翻译、外国文学研究与文化研究作为研究路径，在体用结合与知行结合的辩证法中挖掘中国母体文学与文化的拓进之路，在中外互鉴的文化交流中实现中国文化的对外传播。

通过对陈众议先生的核心学术思想进行审视，可以发现学术研究为其赋予的独特人格魅力与社会责任意识。陈众议先生对西方发起的“世界主义”和“世界文学”保持批判态度，在此基础上对虚无主义和后现代主义等学说进行了纠正，这种将“批判的武器”转化为“武器的批判”的理论自觉彰显出陈众议先生鲜明的学术立场与广阔的跨文化视野。陈众议先生从常数变数与童心辨析等方面为中外文学与文化研究提供了全新的理论资源，以学科史与学术史的高度对中国的文学与文化研究路径进行了设定，推动了我国的“四个自信”和“三大体系”建设。

## Works Cited

- 陈众议：《西方当代文化思潮评析》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2014年。  
 [Chen Zhongyi. *Analysis of Western Contemporary Cultural Trends of Thought*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2014.]
- ：《向书而在》。深圳：海天出版社，2017年。  
 [— *Being in the Book*. Shenzhen: Haitian Publishing House, 2017.]
- ：《想象的边际》。广州：花城出版社，2015年。  
 [— *Boundary of Imagination*. Guangzhou: Huacheng Publishing House, 2015.]
- ：“童心剖诗——论博尔赫斯的老虎、镜子与迷宫”，《文艺研究》4（2002）：83-91。  
 [— “Childishness Analysis of Poems: On Borges’s Tiger, Mirror, and Maze.” *Literature and Art Studies* 4 (2002): 83-91.]
- ：“经典背反及其他”，《外国文学研究》2（2010）：71-79。  
 [— “Classics, Contradictions and Others.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 2 (2010): 71-79.]

- ：“‘陌生化’与经典之路”，《中国比较文学》4（2006）：11-22。
- [—.“Defamiliarization and the Path to Canonization.” *Comparative Literature in China* 4 (2006): 11-22.]
- ：“文学学科话语原理及其历史资源刍议”，《当代外语研究》4（2021）：5-12。
- [—.“On Discourse Principles of the Discipline of Literature and Its Historical Resources.” *Contemporary Foreign Language Studies* 4 (2021): 5-12.]
- ：《说不尽的经典》。北京：作家出版社，2020年。
- [—.*The Endless Classics*. Beijing: The Writers Publishing House, 2020.]
- ：《游心集：陈众议自选集》。郑州：河南大学出版社，2011年。
- [—.*A Journey of the Mind: Chen Zhongyi's Anthology*. Zhengzhou: Henan UP, 2011.]
- ：“下现实主义与经典背反”，《东吴学术》1（2010）：17-24。
- [—.“Lower Realism and Classics Contradiction.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2010): 17-24.]
- ：“评莫言”，《东吴学术》1（2013）：5-12。
- [—.“On Mo Yan.” *Soochow Academic* 1 (2013): 5-12.]
- ：“经典重估”，《江南大学学报（人文社会科学版）》6（2016）：68-71。
- [—.“Reevaluation on Classics.” *Journal of Jiangnan University (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 6 (2016): 68-71.]
- ：《塞万提斯学术史研究》。南京：译林出版社，2011年。
- [—.*Research on the Academic History of Cervantes*. Nanjing: Yilin Publishing House, 2011.]
- ：“拉丁美洲文学的崛起”，《外国文学研究》4（1984）：61-66。
- [—.“The Rise of Latin American Literatures.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 4 (1984): 61-66.]
- ：“文学的变数与常数——兼论‘外部研究’与‘内部研究’”，《中国社会科学》4（2023）：83-98。
- [—.“Variables and Constants in Literature: ‘Extrinsic Research’ and ‘Intrinsic Research’.” *Social Sciences in China* 4 (2023): 83-98.]
- ：“我们为什么需要文学”，《世界文学》1（2018）：212-232。
- [—.“Why Do We Need Literature.” *World Literature* 1 (2018): 212-232.]
- 陈众议、高照成：“消费主义与‘世界文学’”，《吉首大学学报（社会科学版）》1（2018）：118-123。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Gao Zhaocheng. “Consumerism and ‘World Literature’.” *Journal of Jishou University (Social Sciences)* 1 (2018): 118-123.]
- 陈众议、潘佳宁：“全球化与文学研究的民族意识——陈众议教授访谈录”，《当代作家评论》4（2014）：203-207。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Pan Jianing. “Globalization and National Consciousness in Literary Research: An Interview with Professor Chen Zhongyi.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 4 (2014): 203-207.]
- 陈众议、阎连科：“文学资源两人谈”，《渤海大学学报》4（2018）：19-30。
- [Chen Zhongyi and Yan Lianke. “A Discussion on Literary Resources between Chen Zhongyi and Yan



Lianke.” *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy and Social Science Edition)* 4 (2018): 19-30.]

陈众议、叶隼等：《外国商业电影及其影响研究》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2014年。

[Chen Zhongyi and Ye Jun et al. *Study on Foreign Commercial Film and Its Influence*. Beijing: China Social Science Press, 2014.]

高照成：“外国文学研究·世界文学·国家意识——学部委员陈众议研究员专访”，《复旦外国语言文学论丛》2（2022）：23-28。

[Gao Zhaocheng. “Research on Foreign Literature, World Literature and National Consciousness—An Interview with Chen Zhongyi, Researcher and Member of the Faculty.” *Fudan Forum on Foreign Languages and Literature* 2 (2022): 23-28.]

焦佩：“外国文学与文学发展规律——访中国社会科学院学部委员、外国文学研究所所长陈众议”，《马克思主义文化研究》1（2020）：3-14。

[Jiao Pei. “Foreign Literature and the Law of Development of Literature: An Interview with Chen Zhongyi, Member of the Faculty of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences and Director of the Institute of Foreign Literature.” *Research on Marxist Culture* 1 (2020): 3-14.]

李贽：《焚书》，张建业译注。北京：中华书局，1997年。

[Li Zhi. *Burning Books*, translated and annotated by Zhang Jianye. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1997.]

聂珍钊：“文学经典的阅读、阐释和价值发现”，《文艺研究》5（2013）：34-42。

[Nie Zhenzhao. “Reading, Interpretation, and Value Discovery of Literary Classics.” *Literature and Art Studies* 5 (2013): 34-42.]

弗里德里希·威廉·尼采：《权力意志》，孙周兴译。北京：商务印书馆，2007年。

[Nietzsche, Friedrich William. *The Will to Power*, translated by Sun Zhouxing, Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2007.]



# Ethical Literary Criticism in Vietnam: Situation and Prospects

**Anh Dan Nguyen & Van Thuan Nguyen**

**Abstract:** Vietnam is witness to the indispensable relationship between literature and moral issues in the influential area of Chinese culture and literature. In the medieval period, “prose carries morality” (文以载道) was even one of the primary principles of literary creation and aesthetics in Vietnamese literature. However, criticism that contained ideological ethics in the revolutionary literature (1945-1975) created a specific allergy among writers and critics to criticisms based on morals after the Vietnam war. This has become a significant reason why local academia is not interested in the ethical turn of world literary criticism. Despite being introduced to Vietnam in 2016, ethical literary criticism (ELC) has not flourished as expected. Although there are some achievements, the dissemination of the method has shown some limitations. Nevertheless, given the indigenous characteristics of Vietnamese literature, the context of interdisciplinary studies, the usability and, particularly, the humanity of ELC, the method has excellent prospects to blossom in Vietnam. The development of ELC in Vietnam represents achievements of the school’s “go global” strategy and dedicates Vietnamese voices to the popularity of ELC worldwide.

**Keywords:** Vietnam; ethical turn; ethical literary criticism; prospect; subsidised literature

**Authors:** Anh Dan Nguyen is Lecturer at the Literature Department, University of Education, Hue University (Hue 530000, Vietnam). His research interests include ethical literary criticism, Vietnamese literature, comparative literature, and world literature (Email: [nguyenanhdan@hueuni.edu.vn](mailto:nguyenanhdan@hueuni.edu.vn)). Van Thuan Nguyen is Lecturer at the Literature Department, University of Education, Hue University (Hue 530000, Vietnam). His current research interests include intertextuality, literary theory, Vietnamese literature, and ethical literary criticism (Email: [nguyenvanthuan@hueuni.edu.vn](mailto:nguyenvanthuan@hueuni.edu.vn)). This research is funded by the Hue University, Vietnam [Project Grant Number: DHH2023-03-187].

**标题：**文学伦理学批评在越南——现状与前景

**内容摘要：**在中国文化和文学的深远影响下，越南见证了文学与道德问题之

间不可或缺的关系。在古代时期，“文以载道”甚至成为越南文学创作和审美的首要原则之一。但是，革命文学（1945-1975）中包含意识形态伦理的批评在越南战争后引起了作家和批评家对基于道德的批评的特殊敏感。这也成为越南学界对世界文学批评的伦理转向不感兴趣的一个重要原因。尽管文学伦理学批评（ELC）于2016年被引入越南，但它并没有像预期的那样蓬勃发展。虽然取得了一些成果，但该理论在越南的推广也呈现出一定的局限性。然而，鉴于越南文学的本土特色、跨学科研究的背景、ELC的实用性，特别是其人文性，文学伦理学批评在越南会有良好的发展前景。ELC在越南的发展是其“走出去”战略的成果，为ELC在世界范围内的普及发出了越南的声音。

**关键词：**越南；伦理转向；文学伦理学批评；前景；补贴文学

**作者简介：**阮英民，越南顺化师范大学文学院讲师，研究领域包括文学伦理学批评、越南文学、比较文学和世界文学等；阮文舜，越南顺化师范大学文学院讲师，研究领域包括互文性、文学理论、越南文学和文学伦理学批评等。

## Introduction

Oriental literatures—such as those of Vietnam, Korea and Japan—historical influenced by Chinese culture and literature are often closely related to categories of morality (道), in which “poetry expressing will, prose carrying morality” (诗以言志，文以载道) is the command that practitioners of literary art need to remember by heart. Vietnamese written literature over the past ten centuries has thus always been inseparably associated with ethical and moral issues. For example, medieval literary life required writings to contain moral and ethical values; writers must be the ones who “express will” and “carry morality.” This was long the core principle of the local literature. However, since 1930, especially since 1975, this tradition has faded in both literary creation and literary criticism. Contemporary scholars no longer seem to be interested in identifying, analysing and evaluating moral lessons and ethical models in literary works. Sometimes they even express scepticism of and alienation from the moral tendency in literary criticism and desire to separate literature from ethics. Although deeply influenced by Marxist sociological criticism, Vietnamese critics currently tend to take Western literary criticisms as the centre, and they are particularly fond of formal-structural tendencies. Literary criticism also tends to lack the indigenous consciousness of Vietnam and ignores the inheritance of Eastern theoretical systems. This reality raises the question of re-examining the relationship between ethics and literature, as well as the role of literary-critical

methods that promote the development of the relationship, including ethical literary criticism (ELC).

### Dissemination of ELC in Vietnam

The 2016 essay “The Potentiality of Ethical Literary Criticism in Vietnam Nowadays” by scholar Do Van Hieu<sup>1</sup> marked the debut of ELC in Vietnam. The study deals with the ethical turn in world literature, points out the specificity of the ELC method and analyses the opportunity to apply ELC in Vietnamese literature. Do Van Hieu is highly appreciative of Nie Zhenzhao’s significant contributions in inventing and spreading ELC in his own country and worldwide, and he considers the publication of Professor Nie’s treatise *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* in 2014 as an event marking a striking achievement in “conducting to redefine towards perfect the concept of Ethical Literary Criticism” (“The Potentiality” 55). According to Do, ELC restores the author’s position in literary creation, acknowledges the sociality of literary texts and discovers the moral purpose in the formal structure, genre model and discourse form of literature.<sup>2</sup>

One year later, Nguyen Anh Dan became the leading researcher to apply this method to the study of literature with the essay “Tu Cham A and the Vietnamese Translator’s Ethical Choice,” in which the author investigates the translation and reception of romantic novels by Chinese writer Xu Zhenya (徐枕亚) in the first half of the twentieth century.<sup>3</sup> By embracing the ELC method, Nguyen looks back on the formation and development of the “Tu Cham A phenomenon” in Vietnam; it is both a literary and an ethical affair that creates many predicaments for Vietnamese translators, writers and readers. Its complexity is not new, but analysing it from the lens of ELC provides opportunity for discovery. Nguyen tries to indicate the “misunderstanding” of the phenomenon and the ethical dilemmas of Vietnamese translators in translating Tu’s works, dilemmas which arose from the struggle between the new and the old, tradition and modernity, development and stagnation, Western and Vietnamese culture. The local translators’ choices occurred within the ethical environment of modernising Vietnamese literature. From any ethical angle,

1 Unlike the English-speaking culture, Vietnamese names are presented as last name before first name. For example: Vietnamese = Do Van Hieu. English = Van Hieu Do. In this case, “Do” is surname. “Van Hieu” is first name (including the middle name).

2 See Van Hieu Do, “The Potentiality of Ethical Literary Criticism in Vietnam Nowadays,” *Journal of Science of Hanoi National University of Education* 5 (2016): 56.

3 See Anh Dan Nguyen, “Tu Cham A and the Vietnamese Translator’s Ethical Choice,” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 4 (2017): 44-60.

their choices are a specific response to the calls for national renovation movements.<sup>1</sup> One of the obvious creative points of the essay is that if Chinese ELC primarily studies the ethical choices of literary characters, then Nguyen considers the choice to translate Tu Cham A's novels into the local language as the translators' ethical choice. This remarkable milestone marks Nguyen's endeavour to spread ELC to Vietnamese readers. He has since continued to publish many noticeable papers in prestigious domestic and international forums.

During the fifth International Conference on Language, Society and Culture in Asian Contexts (LSCAC 2018), Nguyen presented the study "Ethical Literary Criticism: Retrospect and Prospect." The presentation demonstrates the definition, history, basic features and terms of ELC quite fully. For the first time, essential terms and connotations—such as ethical selection/choice, natural selection/choice, ethical taboo, ethical environment/context, ethical identity, ethical confusion, ethical knots, ethical order, brain text, rational will and natural will—were introduced to a large number of scholars. If Do's essay laid the foundation for the emergence of ELC in Vietnamese academia, Nguyen's paper provides a significant overview of the theory in his country.<sup>2</sup> Again, in 2018, Nguyen published another essay, "Nie Zhenzhao and Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism," which emphasises the vital role of Professor Nie in the Chinese literary circle and his major contributions in the field of scholarly research, especially his origination of ELC. In Nguyen's opinion, ELC has an incredible humanism, which is not only useful for literary criticism but also dedicated to constructing a perfect world.<sup>3</sup> In the same year, Nguyen released the article "Adam, Eva, the Forbidden Fruit in the Garden of Eden, and Ethical Literary Criticism," which is essentially a re-introduction of Professor Nie's unique analysis related to some of the core terms in ELC. The article describes the story of Adam and Eve eating the forbidden fruit and being expelled from Eden in the Bible from an ethical standpoint. Nguyen correctly learns from Nie, which helps his readers deeply understand natural and ethical selection, ethical taboo and ethical choice.

Along with his interpretation of the theory of ELC, Nguyen also applies it to specific literary cases. His essay "'Picture Brides' and Japanese Women's American Dream: An Ethical Studies on *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka" is one such

1 See Anh Dan Nguyen, "Tu Cham A and the Vietnamese Translator's Ethical Choice," *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 4 (2017): 53.

2 See Prabhakara Roa et al., editor. *The 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Language, Society, and Culture in Asian Contexts (LSCAC 2018)*, Hue City: Media Nusa Creative, 2019.

3 See Anh Dan Nguyen, "Nie Zhenzhao and Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism," *Journal of Science of University of Education, Hue University* 2 (2018): 22.

application. Nguyen uses the ELC method to explore the tragic ethical fate of “picture brides” in the novel and dissects characters’ ethical dilemmas when they nearly give up everything in their homeland to immigrate to America. Through the perspective of ethical identity, Nguyen describes the tragedy of Japanese immigrants in a strange culture, which is a tragedy that is passed on from generation to generation. He highlights the ethical lessons for contemporary people, including Vietnamese women. Whoever admires changing their life in another culture needs to make accurate ethical choices, because it is possible that the so-called “new horizons” will only result in ethical dilemmas and moral tragedies.<sup>1</sup> In general, Nguyen uses aspects of ethical identities, dilemmas and choices to investigate Julie Otsuka’s *The Buddha in the Attic*, which makes it a useful example of the application of ELC to specific literary case studies for local researchers.

Another of Nguyen’s article spreading ELC theory, “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Voice from East Asia,” was published in 2019. It is worth noting that the study takes an awe-inspiring approach to the matter, as the author looks back at the famous German Sinologist Wolfgang Kubin’s opinions on Chinese literature, in which the scholar called contemporary Chinese literature “trash”.<sup>2</sup> His judgement caused a wave of intense debate in China about the value of the literature. Nguyen connects this debate with the driving motivation of the creation of ELC, and parts of the so-called “trash” are the harmful effects of the market economy (after reform and opening up) on literature. These impacts led to ethical defects in literature and literary criticism. Nguyen asserts that “One of the sensitive scholars who recognises the nature of the ‘trash’ of Chinese literature circle is Nie Zhenzhao” (“Ethical Literary Criticism” 52). The invention of ELC is thus the way to solve this phenomenon thoroughly. The establishment of a new critical school that binds writers and critics to moral and ethical values shows both China’s creative and discourse rights in particular and those of Asia in general.<sup>3</sup> This is the basis for Nguyen to confirm that the birth of ELC contains an evident right to an Eastern literary discourse: “Nie Zhenzhao’s viewpoint expresses the desire for equal academic dialogue between the East and the West. It shows the great stature of the

1 See Anh Dan Nguyen, “‘Picture Brides’ and Japanese Women’s American Dream: An Ethical Studies on *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka,” *Hue University Journal of Science: Social Sciences and Humanities* 6B (2018): 84-85.

2 See Ben Davey, “Trash or Treasure? Wolfgang Weighs in,” *China Daily*. 10 Apr. 2007. Available at: [https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2007-04/10/content\\_846626.htm](https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2007-04/10/content_846626.htm).

3 See HCMC University of Education, editor, *The International Conference on Eastern Asia: Issues on Literary Research and Education*, 3 Aug. 2019, Ho Chi Minh City, Ho Chi Minh City Culture—Literature and Arts Publishing House, 2019.

creator. His aspiration has been realised by initiating Ethical Literary Criticism.” (56) Here, Nguyen Anh Dan does not hide his great admiration for Nie Zhenzhao and ELC.

In 2019, Nguyen’s challenging paper “Women and Ethics in Land Reform: Why?” was also in the limelight. This paper is impressive because he chose a “taboo” topic in Vietnamese culture, politics and literature: land reform (or land revolution). In doing so, however, he indicates the mistakes of local critics in discussing the problems of the reform. Some studies on the topic are not supported by an appropriate ethical stance, which tends to blacken history, express hostility towards the past and attack politics. Critics perhaps exploit the flaws of the agrarian revolution and use literary names to overturn the ideology and indisputable achievements of the campaign. Deeply aware of the requirement to bring literature back to its ethical environments through ELC,<sup>1</sup> Nguyen has a moral standpoint to analyse with precision the many moral issues related to the local women in land reform that are portrayed in contemporary novels. By utilising the terms of ELC—such as ethical environment, ethical dilemma, ethical taboo, ethical identity and ethical confusion—Nguyen investigates in detail the outstanding ethical problems in these works. He also persuasively uses the Sphinx factor theory to explain women’s moral tragedies in agrarian reform, and his paper illustrates matters connected with female characters from an ethical perspective instead of a simple sociological or political one.<sup>2</sup> It is thus a detailed and suggestive study of the application of ELC in Vietnamese academics.

Based on this study, Nguyen germinated a further essay, “The Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels after 1986,” which no longer emphasises only the ethical issues about women in land reform but also examines the wider range of the case in pastoral novels. Nguyen starts from the features of and changes in ethical environments after the Vietnam war to consider the moral attitude and ethical viewpoint of local writers. Ethical contexts are the primary element affecting some of the sensitive, inherent and familiar problems in rural society and the fate of farmers as described in these writings. The reform in northern Vietnam in the 1950s–60s was a “world-shaking” movement, and people’s ethical identity often changed suddenly. The period combined violence, sex, power, personal hatred and greed, causing farmers to make unethical choices that betrayed the moral virtues of

1 See Nie Zhenzhao, *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*, Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014, 14.

2 See Hue University of Education, editor, *The National Scientific Conference on Literature and Gender*, 26 Oct. 2019, Hue City, Hue University Publishing House, 2019.



the community and led to the collapse of the ethical order. The core reason affecting farmers' unethical choices, according to these novels, is the ethical environment to which they belong: "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" ("Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels" 57). On the contrary, though, many characters defend ethical orders at all costs, and they become the last bastion of morality and ethics. Nguyen also roundly studies the conflicts among pastoral families related to honour, power and interests in rural communities. The contradiction pushes farmers into ethical dilemmas and moral tragedies. By surveying other matters—such as traditions, beliefs, gender and sexuality—Nguyen highlights the didactic function that writers want to convey to readers.

In another experiment, encouraged by the desire to enhance the dissemination of ELC in Vietnamese literature, Nguyen uses the method to criticise contemporary poetry. In the essay "Ethical Choices in Do Thanh Dong's Poetry" (2020), he enlarges the scope of a "local" poet rather than considering a famous representative. Nguyen would like to reassert the usability of ELC in literary research and criticism, regardless of whether it is ancient or contemporary literature, prose or poetry, renowned or minor writers. He uncovers many ethical aspects in the poet's verses, and from the analysis of his poetic themes, for example, Nguyen demonstrates that the poet's ethical choices are returning to the traditional world, folklore culture, hiding in religions and seeking salvation in supernatural forces. Although Do bravely exposes the negative aspects of human morality, he shows the type of a "halfway" ethical choice. Do does not give a thorough answer to the ethical matters he has described, although he illuminates the ethical crisis and the moral deficiency in Vietnamese society, thereby alerting people to make the right ethical choices.<sup>1</sup>

In another study, "Talks on Ethical Taboos," Nguyen relies on the ELC theory of the ethical taboo to analyse the novel *Storm of the Tran Dynasty* by Hoang Quoc Hai.<sup>2</sup> Nguyen clarifies the concept of moral taboo and provides an analytical model using Hoang's multi-volume works. There are two primary taboos in the novels:

1 See Anh Dan Nguyen, "Ethical Choices in Do Thanh Dong's Poetry," *Journal of Science of University of Education, Hue University* 1 (2020): 22.

2 This study is developed from and supplemented supplements the presentation titled "King Characters and Their Ethical Taboos in *Storms of Tran Dynasty* by Hoang Quoc Hai," which was published in the *Proceedings of the 8<sup>th</sup> Scientific Conference of Young Researchers of National Pedagogical Universities* 2020, edited by Hue University of Education, Hue City, Hue University Publishing House, 2020: 64-76.

incest (or the Tran's endogamous marriage) and patricide. Based on the theory of ethical taboo, Nguyen engages in a fascinating interpretation of the story of Tran Thu Do (1194-1264) usurping the Ly dynasty (1009-1225) to establish the Tran dynasty (1225-1400). To consolidate their power and avoid losing the kingship to outsiders, Tran Thu Do paved the way for the "tradition" of inter-ethnic marriage, which is essentially incestuous, among the members of the Tran clan. Under the desire to maintain their power, the clan also repeatedly committed another great ethical taboo: killing relatives. According to Nguyen, the dynasty's downfall had many causes, but one of the striking reasons was that they committed ethical taboos. The two taboos devastated the Tran dynasty, in terms both of biology and social ethics, and this eventually, along with other political mistakes, drove them to extinction.<sup>1</sup> Nguyen demonstrates the ethical taboos associated with the theory of Sphinx factors, which is critical to displaying the failure of the rational will in the battle with the natural will. As Professor Nie states: "In an ethical sense, mankind is the outcome of the Sphinx factor, which can be seen as the combination of the human and animal factors" ("Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection" 398). If we consider the Tran dynasty as a "moral body," animal factors have destroyed human factors and led to the demise of an entire dynasty. Finally, in the spirit of ELC's didactic function, Nguyen advocates that the characters' violations of ethical taboos are necessary for moral enlightenment, so every person is aware of the importance of the rational will: "As a result, the human being must always pay attention to controlling the natural/free will. Only then can they truly maintain their humanity before the encroachment of the animal factors" (110).

Besides Do Van Hieu and Nguyen Anh Dan, some literary studies and criticisms applying the method of ELC have also recently appeared in Vietnam. The most notable are the treatise *Travelling Among Texts—Nguyen Huy Thiep and Vietnamese Society after 1975* by Nguyen Van Thuan and the essay "Traditional Culture in Contemporary Vietnamese Poetry: A Perspective from Nie Zhenzhao's Ethical Literary Criticism" by Hoang Thi Hue and Nguyen Hoang Nguyen. The treatise dissects one of the most famous and controversial contemporary Vietnamese writers, Nguyen Huy Thiep (1950-2021). The book consists of nine chapters and uses many different research approaches to uncover the writer's profound values of artistic thought and his multifaceted contributions to the local literature after *Doi moi* (i.e., the renovation of Vietnam that was officially implemented after 1986). Particularly, in Chapter 2 and Chapter 5, the author quite subtly applies the complex ethical thought of the French philosopher and sociologist Edgar Morin (1921–)

1 See Anh Dan Nguyen, "Talks on Ethical Taboos," *Văn Nghe Quan Doi* 7 (2021): 107.

and uses the terminology and methodology of ELC to analyse ethical dilemmas, ethical choices, benevolent resources, the relationship between kindness and faith and the theme of birth-death and impermanence in Nguyen Huy Thiep's writings. Following, in particular, the appropriate moral vision and Professor Nie's methods, Nguyen Van Thuan points out the writer's talent in depicting complicated characters. He places his characters in complex ethical contexts to present their "ironic" ethical choices in their ethical plights. Nguyen Huy Thiep thus raises questions about the relationship between individuals and communities, men and women, good and evil, literature and politics in the intricacy of an ethical environment of Vietnam after 1975. Nguyen Van Thuan reveals the mystery and erases many of the prejudices and doubts about Nguyen Huy Thiep's writings with suitable critical methods: he is not a writer who likes to insult and be cruel to humans. Going beyond the classic dualism of good and evil and a simplified view of reality, Nguyen Huy Thiep helps readers soberly realise the complexity of life and soul. "The aesthetic ethics of Nguyen Huy Thiep helps readers clarify their simple thinking about good and evil, the illusion of a perfect human being, and contributes to an appropriate and humane view of and for humanity." (*Travelling Among Texts* 92) Nguyen Huy Thiep inspires readers to bravely face severe social upheavals, fight against evil, keep their faith and desire to live honestly and kindly in life. Nguyen Van Thuan convincingly analyses and affirms that Nguyen Huy Thiep is a writer who is always consistent in praising and preserving national moral values and stimulating people to be kind-hearted.

Hoang Thi Hue and Nguyen Hoang Nguyen, meanwhile, mention many theories of ELC, such as the origin of art, natural selection, ethical identity, ethical choice and the ethical environment. These categories are viewed in reference to Vietnamese society, culture and poetry. The authors put the local traditional culture in the context of globalisation to recognise the risks to that culture, and their essay emphasises clarifying ethical selection, ethical identity and the preservation of local cultural traditions, as well as matters of ethical choice, ethical identity in the contemporary poetry of Vietnam. They believe that the local poetry from *Doi moi* is a journey that involves searching for and discovering the nature of society. This poetry thus possesses a kind of ethical choice and ethical environment to form "a moral human model," which has multi-dimensional contemporary cultural characteristics.<sup>1</sup> They examine the works of some renowned contemporary poets—

---

1 See Thi Hue Hoang and Hoang Nguyen Nguyen, "Traditional Culture in Contemporary Vietnamese Poetry: A Perspective from Nie Zhenzhao's Ethical Literary Criticism," *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 1 (2020): 59.

including Hoang Hung (1942–), Truong Dang Dung (1954–), Tran Anh Thai (1955–), and Nguyen Quang Thieu (1957–)—and they try to apply the ELC method to study Vietnamese poetry while glorifying the great role of Nie Zhenzhao.

The spread of ELC in Vietnam is also supported by several Vietnamese international students studying at Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China, which is considered the cradle of ELC. By receiving ELC and applying it to issues of Vietnamese literature, researchers such as Nguyen Anh Dan and Tran Dinh Nhan have provided examples of the application of ELC to literary cases for local readers. In 2021, for instance, Nguyen Anh Dan successfully defended the doctoral thesis “A Study on Ethical Choices in Vietnamese Novels Since Reform and Opening Up,” which was supervised by Professor Nie Zhenzhao. In his dissertation, Nguyen applies one of the central terms of ELC, ethical choice, to study the pastoral, urban, war and historical novels of Vietnam after 1986. The issue is, in turn, examined in two aspects: characters’ ethical choices in the stories and writers’ ethical choices in the creative process. Ethical choice is associated with other categories, such as the ethical environment, ethical identity, ethical confusion, ethical dilemma, brain text and teaching function to interpret Vietnamese literary works from an ethical standpoint. It thus avoids the political, social or moral criticism that is often dominated by ideology. At more than 300,000 words, Nguyen’s doctoral thesis is an enormous exemplar of the application of ELC in Vietnamese academia. In 2022, Tran Dinh Nhan also passed the thesis “Research on Ethical Choices in Drama by Contemporary Vietnamese Playwright Luu Quang Vu” under the supervision of Professor Su Hui. Tran’s study is the first application of ELC in Vietnamese drama studies, further affirming the method’s usability. The thesis opens up a new way for his local readers to interpret Vietnamese plays in general and Luu Quang Vu’s works in particular—that is, reading way from an ethical perspective.

In recent years, the highlights of the ELC journey in Vietnam have involved Nguyen Anh Dan’s academic activities. First, in 2022, his essay “The Ethical Environment after the Vietnam War and Novel Creation Since Renovation” was published in the journal *Forum for World Literature Studies*. It analyses the sociocultural and political-economic changes, and especially the moral crisis after the Vietnam War, as a particular ethical environment. Novels written after 1975 thus have a close relationship with their ethical context. Based on the democratisation and literary innovation movements called for and supported by the Communist Party of Vietnam, local writers have created a fruitful harvest of novels. These achievements are primarily reflected in four aspects: the apparent renovation of thinking about fiction, the expansion of themes in fiction, the diversification of styles and the

specialisation of novel-writing skills. The moral crisis that emerged in the post-war period produced a severe impact on fiction writing, however; the ethical environment led to the phenomenon of “không tải”—novels with no educational function.<sup>1</sup> In the latest update, in early 2023, Nguyen’s research project “Ethical Literary Criticism: Theory and Application” was approved by Hue University, Vietnam. The project will be implemented over the course of two years, becoming the country’s first in-depth and large-scale research on ELC. Last but not least, ELC, as an academic discipline for literary masters, has appeared in the graduate training programme of the Faculty of Linguistics and Literature, Hue University of Education, which is a virtual channel to popularise ELC in Vietnam, starting from schools and academies, which would follow a path similar to that taken by ELC in China.

### Limitations in Spreading of ELC in Vietnam

The history of the dissemination of ELC in Vietnam makes it clear that the school is still developing. Its achievements are, however, marked both in the theoretical transmission and practical experiments. Vietnamese scholars tend to be interdisciplinary in utilising ELC, by, for example, using it in combination with feminist criticism, cultural criticism and intertextual theory. This does not mean, however, that the dissemination of ELC in Vietnam has no limitations that need to be addressed. Overall, the history of ELC in Vietnam shows a few typical limits: the weak team of ELC researchers, the remarkable gaps in ELC theory, the lack of a comprehensive range of study objects and scope for ELC, the trend of a lack of diversity in ELC research and the faint voice of ELC academic influence in Vietnam.

Regarding the team of researchers, there are not many representatives of Vietnamese academia who are ready to adopt and take part in disseminating ELC. The ambition to establish a branch of ELC in Vietnam remains challenging in reality. The lack of scholars who study and propagate ELC theories makes significant obstacles for the school in accessing Vietnamese researchers and readers. The limitation of the team is more severe because some scholars who have encountered ELC have not truly invested time in studying the method. Do Van Hieu, for example, laid the foundation for ELC in Vietnam, but Do has not made any further developments related to the school. This is apparent even in the case of Do’s newly published book in 2021, *Modern Literary Theory: Trends and Receptions*, in which the scholar classifies ELC in the section “Reception of modern literary theory in Vietnam” (Section II, Part II). The content about ELC is the same as in the essay

---

1 See Anh Dan Nguyen, “The Ethical Environment after the Vietnam War and Novel Creation Since Renovation,” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 5 (2022): 939-940.

published in 2016. However, despite changes in the field, Do does not provide the necessary updates. The information about the number of International Association of Ethical Literary Criticism (IAELC) conferences, for example, is not accurate.<sup>1</sup> He also does not illustrate the situation of ELC research and application in Vietnam after 2016 (i.e. the year he published his introductory essay).

Even so, the history of ELC in Vietnam could not have flourished without the path paved by Do Van Hieu. From Do's opening, several domestic researchers have followed and tried to create a life for ELC in Vietnam. The most persistent and optimistic among these inheritors is Nguyen Anh Dan, who became one of the most serious contributors to the spread of ELC in his country with a doctoral dissertation and a series of essays. His dedication in terms of both introducing the theory and in providing models for method application is credible. Besides Do and Nguyen, the remaining scholars—such as Nguyen Van Thuan, Hoang Thi Hue, Nguyen Hoang Nguyen, and Tran Dinh Nhan—do not truly participate actively in developing ELC. Except for Tran, it is worth mentioning that ELC is not the primary method used in their works: it is only a part or is used in combination with other methods. Indeed, Nguyen Van Thuan's treatise is an intertextual study, and ELC is only one technical manipulation integrated among others. ELC itself is thus not a core method of the book. Similarly, although Hoang and Nguyen's essay uses many ELC terms, it remains, in essence, a study in the direction of cultural-literary criticism. Their passivity is also reflected in the fact that, after these two studies, they have not published any works related to ELC at home or abroad. The force of scholars who receive, research and propagate ELC in Vietnam is thus not sufficiently vigorous enough. This is a significant reason why the achievement of ELC in the country in recent years has not prospered much. Despite this grim reality, Vietnamese academia has the opportunity to change this tragic situation thanks to many Vietnamese students studying in China. Through the guidance of outstanding ELC scholars such as Professor Su Hui, Professor Shang Biwu, Professor Yang Jian, Professor Li Exian, Professor Yang Gexin, Professor Chi Shuiyong, Professor Luo Liangong, Professor Huang Hui and many others, young Vietnamese researchers will have favourable conditions to study the ELC method and apply it effectively. They should therefore contribute to the development of ELC in their homeland, and local academics have the right to hope for a return or continuation of engagement in

1 In Do's argument, from 2004 to 2021, Professor Nie Zhenzhao has chaired five international conferences on ELC (*Modern Literary Theory: Trends and Receptions* 253), but this figure is only accurate as of 2016. A total of nine international conferences on ELC have been held annually from 2012 to the present (2023). See Van Hieu Do, *Modern Literary Theory: Trends and Receptions*, Hanoi: Social Sciences Publishing House, 2021.



the ELC field by familiar pioneers.

Up to 2023, there have been roughly twenty works on ELC in Vietnam. Fortunately, these works cover both the theoretical and applied fields of ELC. After Do Van Hieu introduced ELC in the country, Nguyen Anh Dan's published studies have attempted to account for ELC's theoretical system, while also using it to research and criticise literature. In terms of theoretical aspects, Nguyen's essays explain most (but not all) of ELC's key terms; his papers introduce the inventor of ELC, Professor Nie Zhenzhao, and review the founding background, study objects, scope and research tasks of ELC, as well as making the distinction between ELC and other schools. Regrettably, existing works about ELC by the two local scholars are incomplete compared to other achievements of the method. In particular, Nguyen's articles have duplicate content, and other articles are reprints or further developments from conference papers. Many essential issues of ELC have not been fully introduced and evaluated in Vietnam. One of the significant theories of ELC is that the brain text (脑文本), for example, has not been fully conveyed to Vietnamese academia. Professor Nie attaches a momentous role of brain text in literary formation. He argues: "Without brain texts, there would not be texts produced by writers, and thus there would not be written texts or digital texts." ("Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory" 194) In other words, brain text is the foundation for all other types of texts, including literary texts. Without brain text, there are no literary works. It is a pity that the ELC creator's unique theory has not been disseminated to Vietnamese readers. Not only brain text but also the local academia has not had access to many other vital aspects of ELC, such as its formation, development, academic results, and the relationship between words, the brain text, and written text. Besides, the interrelationships and interdisciplinary nature of ELC and other schools, ideologies, theories, methods, and sciences have also not been discussed in detail. In addition, except for Nie Zhenzhao, Vietnamese readers are not acquainted with other typical representatives of ELC inside and outside China. These are the current theoretical gaps of ELC in Vietnam.

In relation to the study objects and scope, the research by some of the Vietnamese scholars mentioned above shows the broad and effective range of application for ELC, which includes translation, novels, poetry, plays and literature cases, among others. There are still many opportunities to use ELC. Existing works on ELC in Vietnam have primarily concentrated on Vietnamese writings. Except for Nguyen's essay on Julie Otsuka's novel, domestic critics have rarely studied world classics or foreign literature. This means that, in terms of theory, Vietnamese scholars' introductions to and research on ELC are insufficient. Application has not

been comprehensive. Because of the narrowness of the study objects and scope, the tendency for Vietnamese ELC research is not diverse, as scholars have only focused on reintroducing the theory or presenting in other words Professor Nie's concept from some of his well-known essays and, particularly, his great treatise *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. More specifically, articles by Nguyen and Do chiefly introduce the theory of ELC. Notably, there is almost no scepticism present in these introductions; instead, the common feature is praise and acceptance of Professor Nie's views and ideas. Studies that fall under this trend include Nguyen Anh Dan's "Ethical Literary Criticism: Retrospect and Prospect" (2018), "Adam, Eva, the Forbidden Fruit in the Garden of Eden, and Ethical Literary Criticism" (2018), "Nie Zhenzhao and Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism" (2018) and "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Voice from East Asia" (2019).

The application of ELC by local scholars also displays some remarkable trends with respect to method. The first is the application of ELC independently, such as in Nguyen's "Tu Cham A and the Vietnamese Translator's Ethical Choice" (2017), "'Picture Brides' and Japanese Women's American Dream: An Ethical Studies on *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka" (2018), "Women and Ethics in Land Reform: Why?" (2019) "Ethical Choices in Do Thanh Dong's Poetry" (2020) and "The Ethical Environment after the Vietnam War and Novel Creation Since Renovation" (2022). The second is the combination of theoretical explanation and practical experiment, including Nguyen Anh Dan's "The Role of Literary Storytelling and Preschool Violence from the Teaching Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism" (2020) and "Talks on Ethical Taboos" (2021). Finally, there are the interdisciplinary studies, which integrate the ELC method with other critical approaches, such as Nguyen's essay "The Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels after 1986" (2020) and his doctoral thesis (2021); Hoang Thi Hue and Nguyen Hoang Nguyen's paper and Nguyen Van Thuan's book (2020); and Tran Dinh Nhan's dissertation "Research on Ethical Choices in Drama by Contemporary Vietnamese Playwright Luu Quang Vu" (2022). Even with such works, it is difficult to say that the current trend of ELC research in Vietnam is diverse.

Last but not least, it seems that the most concerning matter is the degree of scholarly influence published works on ELC have in Vietnam. This is a crucial limitation preventing the school from being more attractive to the local readers. For the roughly twenty existing works on ELC, there are four essays published in A&HCI journals, two chapters in one treatise, two doctoral dissertations, five articles in academic journals published by local universities, one presentation at an international conference, three presentations at national forums, two articles

in domestic art magazines and one translation.<sup>1</sup> Regarding language, eight works are written in foreign languages (two dissertations, one paper in Chinese and five essays in English). Publishing research in non-Vietnamese languages makes it more difficult for domestic writers and most readers to read these works, and this language barrier prevents knowledge of these studies from disseminating to the local literary circle. Many studies on ELC are also published in scientific journals run by universities, but this is not an influential channel for the spread of ELC in Vietnam. These journals are primarily intended for their members, doctoral or master's candidates, seeking "scientific marks" to meet graduation requirements. University journals are hardly an academic bridge between researchers and readers across the country. It is not easy to spread information outside the community. A more effective approach for the dissemination of ELC seems to be national and international conferences. By presenting papers at the event and publishing them afterwards in proceedings, studies on ELC have a chance to reach a wider audience. Unfortunately, the current state of research suggests that the number of scholars who attend such conferences to study and publish essays on ELC in Vietnam today is still rather dismal. This situation has limited the scope and spread of ELC to the broader literature-loving public. Therefore, Vietnam therefore needs a professional academic forum for ELC. The influence of ELC in Vietnam also stems from a fact that needs to change related to the research team: local researchers are not yet affiliated with a research group nor have they developed a sense of international cooperation in spreading ELC to Vietnam. There are few ELC scholars in Vietnam, and they still tend to work individual, lack strong links to a team and have yet to engage in close contact with foreign scholars.

All of the analysed reasons leave room for improvements in the career of ELC. Despite what has been achieved thus far and the efforts of pioneers such as Do Van Hieu and Nguyen Anh Dan, the fate of ELC in Vietnam remains an open question. These limitations seem less critical, however, than the internal barrier from the local literary critics themselves. Vietnamese critics have experienced the "consequences" of literary criticism closely related to ideological ethics, called "subsidised literary criticism," which has become a powerful obstacle preventing the development of ELC in Vietnam.

### **"Subsidised Criticism" and Barriers to ELC in Vietnam**

In the essay that introduced ELC to Vietnam, Do Van Hieu designates the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Nie Zhenzhao, "Talks on Ethical Literary Criticism," translated by Anh Dan Nguyen, *Tap Chi Cua Viet* 12 (2018): 73-80.

opportunities of the method that come from the outside (the ethical turn in world literary studies) and the inside (based on Vietnamese literary life itself). However, ELC research and application in Vietnam did not blossom as expected after Do's paper. Some queries need to be answered thoroughly: Where is ELC on the contemporary map of literary criticism in Vietnam? What is its future going to be? How will ELC compete with the current system of literary approaches in the country? Regarding reception, a significant matter that requires a response is why ELC, which was founded in 2004, only had its first debut in Vietnam twelve years later? Behind these questions are a set of problems that needs to be solved for ELC to flourish. The answers will reveal a causal connection between the consequences of Vietnam's subsidised literary criticism and the ideas of ELC.

The year when Do Van Hieu published the essay that marked the emergence of ELC in Vietnam (2016) corresponds to the third stage in the development of the approach. According to Professor Su Hui, from 2004-2009, Professor Nie and his colleagues researched issues such as the theoretical basis, study objects, value and meaning of ELC. The second stage of ELC emerged in the years 2010-2013, when "The essays published by Nie Zhenzhao and other scholars not only expound the theory of Ethical Literary Criticism but also devote themselves to constructing its discourse system" ("Academic Influence" 36-37). In 2013, Professor Nie's treatise *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* was selected for the "National Achievements Library of Philosophy and Social Sciences," and a year later, Peking University Press published the book. Up to now, this book still is a beacon for worldwide readers and ELC practitioners. It devotes to affirming Professor Nie's incredible talent and merit for the destiny of ELC, as Galin Tihanov once asserted: "The author of this book, Nie Zhenzhao, is undoubtedly a preeminent literary scholar who has gained international prominence and has been instrumental, through his publications, editorial work, and numerous doctoral students, in initiating a new version of ethical literary criticism, powerful in China and increasingly visible abroad." ("On the Significance and Originality" 560) The third stage of ELC emerged after 2013, when Nie Zhenzhao continued to delve into its fundamental theories and provide many in-depth critiques of its practice. This is the moment when ELC achieved many accomplishments and gained significant academic resonance at home and abroad.

During its invention and development, ELC has constantly improved its theory, expanded its application and constructed academic influence in China and worldwide. ELC strives to build its own right to the international discourse in literature and to spread abroad actively according to the strategy of going global.

The first Vietnamese scholar who responded to the call of ELC was Do Van Hieu, who had been an international student in China.<sup>1</sup> Do studied in China from 2009 to 2013, during the second stage of ELC, with the advantage of the academic environment—and especially his knowledge of Mandarin—he received and introduced this theory to the Vietnamese literary circle. Even so, Do's essay on ELC was still quite a late “pioneering” step. The reason for this lateness lies in the twelve years mentioned above.

One must wonder whether, if Do Van Hieu had not been in China at that time, ELC would have come to Vietnam. The answer is still likely to be yes, but the delay, as mentioned earlier, would have extended even further. Besides Do, many other Vietnamese students pursue literature majors in China, particularly in Central China Normal University, Wuhan. Nguyen Anh Dan approached ELC through Professor Nie Zhenzhao and a team of Chinese scholars, rather than through Do Van Hieu (This fact makes it even more understandable that the influence of Do's introductory article on ELC is relatively modest). Without Do, however, ELC would have arrived in Vietnam even later, and the later it comes, the more unfortunate it is for both ELC and the Vietnamese literary community. Another question that must be answered is if Do had not known Chinese, would he have received and introduced ELC into Vietnam? The answer depends on the Vietnamese scholars themselves. As of 2016, there have been six conferences on ELC held in China, of which five were international.<sup>2</sup> Notably, the statistics indicate that Vietnamese scholars seem to be absent from these activities.<sup>3</sup> The foreign language barrier, scientific enthusiasm, spirit of learning and international integration of Vietnamese scholars are reasons for this absence that should not be ignored. It is possible, however, that the indifference

---

1 From 2009 to 2010, Do studied Mandarin at Beijing Normal University, and during the period 2010-2013, he was a PhD candidate at Renmin University in China.

2 The first conference, a national one, took place from 31 October to 2 November 2005, at Central China Normal University (Wuhan city, Hubei province) with the theme “Ethical Literary Criticism: A New Approach to Literary Studies” (文学伦理学批评: 文学研究方法新探讨). The conferences organised after this event were all international conferences.

3 See Su Xi, “A Review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism,” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2013): 173-175; Xu Yan and Xi Yun, “Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Openness, Inclusiveness and Vitality,” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2013): 171-176; Lin Yuzhen, “A New Monument in Ethical Literary Criticism: A Review of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism,” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2015): 161-167; Huang Hui and Zhang Lianqiao, “Ethical Literary Criticism and New Construction of International Academic Discourse,” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2015): 165-169; Liu Xiying, “Ethical Literary Criticism and Trans-National Culture Dialogue: A Review of ‘The 6<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism’,” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2016): 169-171.

of the Vietnamese literary community towards ELC depends on its nature.

ELC is a particular method of literary criticism. Even if it distinguishes itself from Western ethical criticism and moral criticism, it still involves ethical and moral categories. This is one of the most striking reasons why Vietnamese literary critics are not keen on ELC. Their attitude may stem from the weighty effects of a one-sided and erroneous period of moral judgment of literary works and writers in revolutionary literature (1945-1975)—in other words, a “subsidised literary criticism.” The term “subsidised” here should be understood as a form of ideological and moral manipulation. Due to the characteristics of the wartime ethical environment, the most vital goal of the time was national liberation and independence for the country. Vietnamese literature and art during this period emphasised militancy, class character, the Communist Party spirit, nationalism and popularity. A list of epochal requirements forced literature to observe this ideological direction. This can be considered as a moral standard that Vietnamese writers must follow. If they betrayed these norms, they would be violating the ethical taboo created by the wartime ethical context. Because of these strict ethical requirements, Vietnamese revolutionary literature is formulaic, clichéd and ideological, and there is not much innovation in terms of form. This literature confined writers to strict moral rules, which may be the primary reason why the local literature after the Vietnam war, especially after *Doi moi*, is no longer interested in ethical and moral content.

Such literary criticism, oriented by the moral norms of the mainstream ideology, constitutes a mechanism for an “allergic” reaction among many Vietnamese critics, who ignore moral criticism in general and ELC in particular. Vietnamese literature and its literary criticism before 1986 tended to be a matter of literature serving politics, and literary criticism carried dense political nuances and did not pay proper attention to aesthetic characteristics. On the other side, due to the specific requirements of the wartime ethical environment, it was thought that writers ought to conform to the revolutionary spirit and communist moral standards. From a methodological point of view, the norms of the socialist realistic method of literary composition put rigid demands on writers, who, along with their products, became “combat weapons.” If they violated these standards, they broke the ethical taboo. Even more remarkable, the inertia of “ideological ethics” continued weigh heavily on Vietnamese literature and literary criticism after the war. Since *Doi moi*, the ethical environment has changed, the spirit of democracy has been opened and the academic circle seems to have lost interest in the socialist realistic method and quickly embraced Western literary criticism. But the “literary scandals” related to



ideological ethics have not stopped. This criticism involving ideological morality is an obstacle to many writers and seeks to separate the relationship between literature and ethics. This does not mean that Vietnamese literary critics do not care about the moral and ethical content of literature. On the contrary, it is still their great concern. Their writings still convey the didactic function as a desideratum of real works.<sup>1</sup> However, they do not want to go back to a state “akin” to a literature of “ideological ethics.” This is the popular response among writers to all methods of criticisms based on ethics, not just ELC. It is also why Vietnamese literature has not undergone the same ethical turn as world literary criticism. In short, although ELC has been established and flourished inside and outside China for two decades, it has not yet created a worthy position in Vietnam, where the local academia currently favours Western schools such as narratology, psychoanalysis, structuralism, receptionism, postmodernism, feminism, ecocriticism, intertextuality, archetypal criticism and post-colonial criticism.

It is undeniable that some Vietnamese scholars are trying to put ELC on the country’s literary criticism map, but it needs more time to gain a prominent position. The Vietnamese scholarly community also makes itself less valuable by not paying enough attention or ignoring this “made in China” school of literary criticism, and it may lose the opportunity to renew and enrich itself. Therefore, to develop ELC in Vietnam, it is also necessary to remove the barriers created by the consequences of subsidised literary criticism in addition to solving the limitations of scholars, research objects and scope and improving the level of academic influence of ELC.

### **The Prospects of ELC in Vietnam**

Vietnamese culture attaches great importance to morality and ethics, and the country’s literature is closely linked with ethical and moral issues. Accordingly, ELC has the potential to grow in the country. Do Van Hieu believes that Vietnamese literary criticism after 1986 is trying to break away from the form of ideological-moral criticism, which is a somewhat extreme view, and at the same time, to broaden chances for foreign literary theories, including ELC. In Do’s opinion, the probability of success for ELC in Vietnam originates in two sources. First, it comes from the reality of literary creation. Vietnamese literature contains profound moral and ethical connotations, and this is the essential basis for the development of ELC in the country. Second, ELC can provide new methods and new horizons for

<sup>1</sup> At the beginning of the essay, the author mentions that contemporary Vietnamese scholars are not interested in discovering moral values and ethical models in the literature. It is necessary to distinguish between the writer’s moral sense in literary works and the manipulation of revealing edificatory functions, ethical and moral values in the writings of literary critics.

literary research and criticism in the country. Similar to the ethical turn in world literary criticism in the 1980s, contemporary Vietnamese literature also needs a “blood change” to promote its rejuvenation. According to Do, this period is thus an opportunity for a so-called “ethical turn” in Vietnamese literary criticism. In other words, this is an opportunity to apply ELC to study literature in the country: “Therefore, developing Ethical Literary Criticism is also building and applying a critical method. It can help researchers more favourable find out characteristics of Vietnamese literature in comparison with other literature around the world, especially Western literature” (“The Potentiality” 58).

Do’s belief is entirely reasonable. Creating space for ELC to grow in Vietnam is both an opportunity and a necessity for the country’s literary life. It is important to note that Do’s comments appeared more than five years ago. At present, the prospect of ELC in Vietnam is still linked to Do’s two reasons, but it also resonates with other sources. For example, there are representatives in Vietnam who are following Do’s footsteps. They continue to introduce, apply and disseminate ELC to local readers. Although this team is not populous, they have the advantage of being very young, good at foreign languages and very dynamic. These scholars will be a significant bridge to connect ELC with Vietnam.

The most outstanding reason why ELC is likely to prosper in Vietnam is its usability and its human values. From a cultural perspective, Hoang Thi Hue and Nguyen Hoang Nguyen believe that ELC meets the requirements of choosing cultural identities to preserve the Vietnamese nation’s traditional culture. The method also identifies the role of literature and art in conserving and promoting the values of traditional culture in the context of the industrialisation and commercialisation that Vietnam is pursuing.<sup>1</sup> In their view, ELC is merely a literary tool and a cultural approach—albeit a universal one—that possesses measures to cope with many problems in contemporary life. Hoang and Nguyen’s concept is consistent with the interdisciplinary nature and ethical foundation of ELC. This illustrates the depth of humanism that ELC nourishes in its missions. Nguyen Anh Dan has noted this essence of ELC and considers it a reliable basis for the method to flourish in Vietnam:

As a humanistic method of literary studies, ELC not only enters the vast literature but also improves human life and society. In the case of the

---

<sup>1</sup> See Thi Hue Hoang and Hoang Nguyen Nguyen, “Traditional Culture in Contemporary Vietnamese Poetry: A Perspective from Nie Zhenzhao’s Ethical Literary Criticism,” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 1 (2020): 58.

contemporary world, where we witness lots of violence, wars, conflicts, bombings, and killings around the world, the teaching function of literature invented by Nie Zhenzhao and ELC is more and more useful. Literary studies can play an essential role in making peaceful dialogues among countries and nations, religions and communities, and further creating an ideal world for humankind. (“Ethical Literary Criticism” 270)

Nguyen’s statement shows faith in ELC’s universal humanity, and in the context of the contemporary world, this is necessary not only for Vietnamese academics but also for world literature.

The prospects of ELC, however, will not materialise and the project will fall into ruin if Vietnamese scholars cannot change or improve the situation of ELC in the country. It is thus vital to actively study theories, apply the practice and propagate ELC. The study team should include theoreticians, reputable literary critics and professors at institutes, universities and colleges. It is indispensable to establish a research centre for ELC in Vietnam. This team also needs to spread ELC energetically through effective means, such as translation. There is only one essay by Nie Zhenzhao, “Talks on Ethical Literary Criticism,” that has been translated into Vietnamese. At the same time, the classic works by this and other ELC scholars have not yet reached a large audience in Vietnam, because most of their writings are in Chinese and English, which makes it hard to disseminate ELC into the local community without Vietnamese translations. Celebrated works by scholars of ELC and essays by Vietnamese researchers written in foreign languages should certainly be translated into Vietnamese.

It is also essential to organise more academic activities related to ELC. Vietnamese literary circles should participate in international symposiums organised by IAELC. They also need to manage their own seminars, forums, symposiums and conferences on ELC in Vietnam, especially at universities and colleges, to help students—graduate students in general and the vast community in particular—approach this method. Those who study ELC in Vietnam should also publish articles, supervise master’s and doctoral theses and conduct research projects that use ELC as the dominant method. These publications must “go abroad” to contribute a global voice to the development of ELC and affirm the Vietnamese identity on the international academic map. Local researchers should publish more writings on ELC in prestigious domestic journals to amplify the popularity of ELC within Vietnam.

Vietnamese scholars must also study the theoretical issues of ELC more

deeply. Besides presenting its central theories—including natural selection/choice, ethical selection/choice, ethical environment, ethical dilemma, ethical taboo and teaching function—other terms also need to be clarified, such as moral emotion (道德情感), brain text (脑文本), rational will (理性意志), irrational will (非理性意志), scientific selection (科学选择), ethical paradox (伦理悖论), ethical confusion (伦理混乱), ethical knots (伦理结), ethical structure (伦理结构), ethical enlightenment (伦理启蒙) and so forth. It is particularly significant to repeat and indicate the distinction between ELC and moral criticism and ethical criticism to help Vietnamese critics stop the anticipation of “subsidised literary criticism”.

In terms of the application of ELC, it is essential to expand the study objects and scope to cover Vietnamese and foreign literature, classical and contemporary works, literary fields and interdisciplinary categories. In both theoretical research and practical application, it is fundamental to enhance the interdisciplinary and humanistic nature of ELC. The development of the method in Vietnam cannot proceed without the IAELC’s support and direction in terms of professional references, academic exchanges, research sponsors and cooperative projects. Last but not least, Vietnamese scholars must illustrate their own identity and creative personality in the field of ELC, thus making ELC more colourful and more diverse, while devoting their contributions to the field in Vietnam.

### Conclusion

Since 2004, global academia has seen the step-by-step development of ELC year after year. As a local experience in studying literature, this approach to criticism, which was founded in China, gradually became a global instrument that has received wide-ranging reception and application, including among Vietnamese scholars. International academia is attempting to re-read literary canons from an ethical view to expose the ethical nature of literature, and they are thus developing a new humanism in studying literature. With its outstanding theoretical and practical contributions, ELC is an influential voice that responds positively to world literary theory, and its presence in Vietnam manifests the response of the country to ELC. The reception of ELC by Vietnamese scholars took place during a period when the school was flourishing, and they had many advantages in developing ELC. Unfortunately, the history of the reception of ELC in Vietnam is not as impressive as expected. Although its situation in the local literature is not particularly bright, through the current efforts of young researchers who are diligently pursuing ELC, the future of ELC in the country is very hopeful. This prospect is the impetus for Vietnamese academics to dispel preconceptions about literary criticism related

to ethics. Contemporary Vietnamese literature survives in a dynamic ethical environment that is witnessing openness, freedom, democracy and modernity in literary life. This ethical context also draws attention to many negative elements in the moral life of people and literature. ELC thus deserves and needs to be promoted in Vietnam.

### Works Cited

- Davey, Ben. "Trash or Treasure? Wolfgang Weighs in." *China Daily*. 10 April 2007. 4 August 2023.  
Available at: [https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2007-04/10/content\\_846626.html](https://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2007-04/10/content_846626.html).
- Do, Van Hieu. *Modern Literary Theory: Trends and Receptions*. Hanoi: Social Sciences Publishing House, 2021.
- . "The Potentiality of Ethical Literary Criticism in Vietnam Nowadays." *Journal of Science of Hanoi National University of Education* 5 (2016): 53-58.
- HCMC University of Education, editor. *The International Conference on Eastern Asia: Issues on Literary Research and Education*. Ho Chi Minh City: Ho Chi Minh City Culture—Literature and Arts Publishing House, 2019.
- Hoang, Thi Hue and Hoang Nguyen Nguyen. "Traditional Culture in Contemporary Vietnamese Poetry: A Perspective from Nie Zhenzhao's Ethical Literary Criticism." *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 1 (2020): 53-64.
- 黄晖、张连桥: "文学伦理学批评与国际学术话语的新建构——'第五届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会'综述", 《外国文学研究》6 (2015): 165-169。
- [Huang Hui and Zhang Lianqiao. "Ethical Literary Criticism and New Construction of International Academic Discourse." *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2015): 165-169.]
- Hue University of Education, editor. *The National Scientific Conference on Literature and Gender*. Hue City: Hue University Publishing House, 2019.
- 林玉珍: "文学伦理学批评研究的新高度——'第四届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会'综述", 《外国文学研究》1 (2015): 161-167。
- [Lin Yuzhen. "A New Monument in Ethical Literary Criticism: A Review of the 4<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2015): 161-167.]
- 刘兮颖: "文学伦理学批评与跨国文化对话——'第六届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会'综述", 《外国文学研究》6 (2016): 169-171。
- [Liu Xiyang. "Ethical Literary Criticism and Trans-National Culture Dialogue: A Review of 'The 6<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism'." *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2016): 169-171.]
- Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.
- . "Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection." *Forum for World Literature*

*Studies* 3 (2021): 383-398.

—. 《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.]

—, “Talks on Ethical Literary Criticism.” Translated by Anh Dan Nguyen. *Tap Chi Cua Viet* 12 (2018): 73-80.

Nguyen, Anh Dan. “The Ethical Choice in Vietnamese Pastoral Novels after 1986.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 2 (2020): 39-59.

—, “Ethical Choices in Do Thanh Dong’s Poetry.” *Journal of Science of University of Education, Hue University* 1 (2020): 16-22.

—, “The Ethical Environment after the Vietnam War and Novel Creation Since Renovation.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 5 (2022): 939-949.

—, “Nie Zhenzhao and Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Journal of Science of University of Education, Hue University* 2 (2018): 15-23.

—, “‘Picture Brides’ and Japanese Women’s American Dream: An Ethical Studies on *The Buddha in the Attic* by Julie Otsuka.” *Hue University Journal of Science: Social Sciences and Humanities* 6B (2018): 77-86.

—, “Talks on Ethical Taboos.” *Van Nghe Quan Doi* 7 (2021): 107-110.

—, “Tu Cham A and the Vietnamese Translator’s Ethical Choice.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 4 (2017): 44-60.

Nguyen, Van Thuan. *Travelling Among Texts—Nguyen Huy Thiep and Vietnamese Society after 1975*. Hue City: Hue University Publishing House, 2020.

Prabhakara Roa et al., editor. *The 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Language, Society, and Culture in Asian Contexts (LSCAC 2018)*. Hue City: Media Nusa Creative, 2019.

苏西：“‘第二届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会’综述”，《外国文学研究》1（2013）：173-175。

[Su Xi. “A Review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Symposium on Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2013): 173-175.]

Tihanov, Galin. “On the Significance and Originality of Nie Zhenzhao’s Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 4 (2022): 559-562.

徐燕、溪云：“文学伦理学批评的新局面和生命力——‘第三届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会’综述”，《外国文学研究》6（2013）：171-176。

[Xu Yan and Xi Yun. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Openness, Inclusiveness and Vitality.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2013): 171-176.]



# 《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播与伦理选择

## The Spread and Ethical Choice of *Journey to the West* in Vietnam

刘志强 (Liu Zhiqiang)

**内容摘要：**本文从文学与历史以及文学伦理学批评三重维度，探讨《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播情况。尽管《西游记》及其故事迟于18世纪就传入越南，但因越南最后两个封建王朝都崇儒，排斥佛教，《西游记》及其故事均未能获得官方意识形态的认可。但作为世界文学经典之一，其仍被越南人民不断改编和翻译。19世纪至20世纪上半叶是《西游记》及其故事在越南传播的一个高峰期。不同历史时期的伦理选择，对《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播发挥着重要的作用。

**关键词：**《西游记》；越南；传播；文学伦理学批评

**作者简介：**刘志强，广东外语外贸大学东方语言文化学院教授，主要研究方向为东南亚文史。本文为2020年教育部哲学社会科学研究重大课题攻关项目“‘中国故事’在世界文学中的征引阐释及启示研究”【项目批号：20JZD046】和2019年国家社会科学基金一般项目“中国四大名著在越南的传播及影响研究”【项目批号：19BWW033】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** The Spread and Ethical Choice of *Journey to the West* in Vietnam

**Abstract:** The paper discusses the spread of *Journey to the West* and its derivative stories in Vietnam from three dimensions of literature, history and ethical literary criticism. It is believed that although *Journey to the West* and its stories were introduced to Vietnam in the 18th century at latest, neither of them received official ideological recognition because the last two feudal dynasties of Vietnam favored Confucianism while rejected Buddhism. However, as one of the world literary classics, *Journey to the West* and its stories were still adapted and constantly translated by Vietnamese people. From the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century was a peak of spread in Vietnam. The ethical choice in different historical periods plays an important role in the spread of *Journey to the West* and its stories in Vietnam.

**Keywords:** *Journey to the West*; Vietnam; spread; ethical literary criticism

**Author:** Liu Zhiqiang is Professor at the Faculty of Asian Languages and

Cultures, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (Guangzhou, China 510420). His academic research focuses on Southeast Asian literature and history (Email: luuchicuong@163.com).

根据越南汉文文献《北使通录》的记载,《西游记》传播至越南至少有200余年的历史。过去100余年来,关于《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播情况,国内外学界也有一些研究,但相对而言,从历史纵向角度进行更深入探讨的成果不多,研究其传播过程中的伦理选择则更少。<sup>1</sup>文学伦理学批评从起源上把文学看成道德的产物,认为文学是特定历史阶段人类社会的伦理表达方式,文学本质上是关于伦理的艺术。<sup>2</sup>以《西游记》为例,每个历史阶段,其在越南传播都具有特定的伦理选择。这些选择不选择的历史和伦理基础是什么?不同阶段的传播形态如何?这是本文探讨的主要问题。

### 一、《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播

有关早期《西游记》在越南传播的文献记载并不多,但自明清之际,中越仍保持朝贡关系,赴华朝贡的使臣多为儒人,购买或获赠诗书已为常事。但有明一代,在国人的撰述中,《西游记》在越南的传播并不起眼。16世纪曾任明朝行人司行人刑科右给事中的严从简在其《殊域周咨录》中的记载:

(安南)如儒书则有少微史、《资治通鉴》史、《东莱》史、《五经》、《四书》、《胡氏》、《左传》、《性理》、《氏族》、《韵府》、《玉篇》、《翰墨》、《类聚》、《韩柳集》、《诗学大成》、《唐书》、《汉书》、《古文四场》、《文选》、《文萃》、《文献》、《二史纲目》、《贞观正要》、《太公家教》、《明心宝鉴》、

1 如1989年,法国学者克劳婷·苏尔梦编著有《中国传统小说在亚洲》(北京:国际文化出版社,1998年),其中收录有颜保教授所撰“中国小说对越南文学的影响”一文,涉及内容较少。1997年,马祖毅、任荣珍等著有《汉籍外译史》(武汉:湖北教育出版社,2003年),涉及相关内容也仅数行文字。2008年,范宏贵、刘志强著《越南语言文化探究》(北京:民族出版社,2008年)略有论及从语言追溯中国“四大发明”与“四大名著”之传越南的内容,但篇幅不大。近四十年来,越南学界较具代表性的著作主要包括阮春和所撰《中国古代小说对越南古代小说的影响》(顺化:顺化出版社,1998年),丁潘锦云所著《越南中世纪文学对中国叙事散文体裁的接受》(胡志明:胡志明市社会科学院印行,2001年),黎亭卿于2005年所著《越南文学与〈三国演义〉》(胡志明市师范大学,硕士论文,2013年),黎亭卿在华东师范大学完成的博士论文《中国古代小说在越南——以〈三国演义〉、〈水浒传〉、〈西游记〉为中心》(华东师范大学,博士论文,2013年)等。尽管涉及中文、外语两个学科,历史的视角不多,但前人学者的成果为本文提供了诸多参考。

2 参见Nie Zhenzhao, “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory,” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 190.

《剪灯新话》等书。(238-239)<sup>1</sup>

其中的原因,大体在后黎朝(1428-1789)已独尊儒术了。越南后黎朝独尊儒术,官方刊行有《黎朝教化条律四十七条》,其三十五条说:“凡经、史、子、集及文章有裨于世教者,方可刊板通行。若道释异端邪说诸书,并国诸传,及歌诗涉于淫荡者,不可刊板印刻,以伤风化”(1017)。其三十八条说:“凡佛寺浮屠,皆无益之事,係有名蓝原额弗禁。若某乡村无原额佛寺,不得私自构作,劳人费财。违者抵罪”(1017)。

就存世越南文献而论,即使无类似《黎朝教化条律四十七条》的要求,后黎以前,越南的志怪小说也较少,且篇幅较为单薄,较为著名的是14世纪李济川始撰的《越甸幽灵录》。尽管有尊儒的教化,越南在后黎朝也还是出现了一些神灵故事或传奇小说。15世纪陈世法等撰的《岭南摭怪》,16世纪阮屿模仿《剪灯新话》而作的汉文小说《传奇漫录》,以及18世纪段氏点的《传奇新谱》。谢超凡在“《越甸幽灵集》五种总提要”中说,越南汉文小说中,《越甸幽灵集》与《岭南摭怪》同为神灵故事的代表之作。《越甸幽灵集》记载越南祠庙供奉诸神的传记及灵验事,神主都受朝廷祀封,包括帝王将相、民间英雄和山川精灵等。<sup>2</sup>文学的产生是有目的性的,这个目的就是教诲。文学的基本功能就是教诲功能。文学的教诲是读者在阅读文学的审美过程中实现的。<sup>3</sup>越南陈朝李济川于1329年为《越甸幽灵集录》所撰序言“越甸幽灵集录序”即表达了这一功能:

古圣人言:“聪明正直足以称神。”非淫祠邪崇,滥得而称也。我皇粤宇内诸神,古来多矣。能彰厥续,阴相生灵者有几哉?然从来品类不等。或山川精粹,或人物杰灵。腾气势于当时,总英烈于来世。若不纪实,朱紫难明,因随浅见罕闻,编集成书。或好事者,尚其正之,是所望也。(6)

越南汉文文献较早明确记载《西游记》传入越南的时间是乾隆二十六年(1761年)。越南如清贡使黎贵惇(1726-1784)在其回忆录《北使通录》中记载,1761年八月初五赴京途经江西九江府,与清朝钦差官秦朝釭笔谈,笔谈内容明确了黎贵惇曾读过《西游记》。《北使通录》载:

午时,伊邀甲副使官道船,以笔谈诗谈文,问贵国制何如?曰:

1 此段文字原文为繁体字,笔者进行了简化。

2 参见孙逊、郑克孟、陈益源编:《越南汉文小说集成》第2册,上海:上海古籍出版社,2011年,第1页。

3 参见聂珍钊:《文学伦理学批评导论》,北京:北京大学出版社,2014年,第13页。

“亦仿中朝”。开科何如？曰：“一样”〔……〕曰：“贵国产物如何？”曰：“传记不曰‘称奇草木皆在南方乎？’不敢过说，《西游记》有云‘中华虽是中华，虽是大邦，其穷无此’，此非仆等捏言也。”（6B-7A）<sup>1</sup>

尽管黎贵惇在《北使通录》的记载可以证明《西游记》在18世纪传入越南，但一方面由于后黎朝儒家思想在越南已占据正统，《西游记》传播至越南并没有获得儒士和高层的重视。2013年，越南学者黎亭卿认为：“证明《西游记》最晚从18世纪传入越南的第二件事情就是一本叫《西游传》的无名氏喃字诗传。虽有许多不同的情节，但从内容来看，《西游传》是从章回小说《西游记》的一部分内容创造出来的。这部喃字诗歌集还没确定是何时间问世的，可是，根据颜保教授，如果从创作的作风来看，这个喃字诗歌集可能是在十八世纪问世的”（52）。笔者并不想否定这一推测，但就现存越南汉喃文献考察，我们发现无名氏喃传诗《西游传》是19世纪下半叶才诞生的。

至20世纪初，越南出现了较多的《西游记》故事的拉丁化越南文译本。就《西游记》的拉丁化越南文译本的研究而言，前辈学人也进行过一些重要的研究。2003年，马祖毅在其《汉籍外译史》中提及，《三国演义》和《西游记》传入越南的时间最早，在喃字时代就有了《西游记》的改写本。马祖毅还提及，1914年前，有陈丰穰译的《西游记》，其后，河内、西贡、边和三地出版了乐苦、阮公矫、黄明自、苏镇的译本。1961年，河内普通出版社又出版了越文本《西游记》，译者为瑞亭，该译本是根据北京作家出版社1957年的印本。<sup>2</sup>遗憾的是这些译本未曾能见，《汉籍外译史》对《西游记》在越南的翻译仅此一段话而已。考察颜保1989年在《中国传统小说在亚洲》一书中相关的研究，1945年越南民主共和国成立以前，《西游记》大致有四个拉丁化越南文译本。<sup>3</sup>

另据笔者的考察，法国国家图书馆所藏黄明自翻译的《西游演义》，实际上这个译本只翻译到七十九回，共计369页。但七十九回却翻译至大雷音寺，雷音寺的出现应是第九十八回。尽管不全，但陈丰穰等人的译本在20世纪上半叶，受到了越南民间读者的喜爱，曾数度再版。

1935年，黄明自翻译的《西游演义》，实际上是《西游记》的节译，如第一回略去诸多诗句，只以律诗一首，略译了猴王在西海牛贺洲地界突遇樵夫所唱之词——《满庭芳》。在20世纪上半叶，译者这样对诗词的处理，让

1 此段文字原文为繁体字，笔者进行了简化。

2 参见 马祖毅、任荣珍：《汉籍外译史》，武汉：湖北教育出版社，2003年，第615页。

3 参见 克劳婷·苏尔梦编：《中国传统小说在亚洲》，颜保等译，北京：国际文化出版公司，1989年，第231页。

《西游记》的文学审美受到一定的损害，但这并未让小说故事情节对读者的吸引减弱，因为普通读者更多地从娱乐角度欣赏《西游记》。20世纪中叶，越南才出现了《西游记》的全译本。越南学者在评价《西游记》在越南的传播时说道：“世界上存在诸多《西游记》的译本。在越南，《西游记》和《三国演义》《水浒传》一样有名，遗憾的是，现行的译本并不完整，遗漏了许多段落的内容”（Trương Chính 85）<sup>1</sup>。

至1961年，瑞亭对原著的诗词全部进行了翻译，但全译本篇幅较长，两册共计1666页。如果没有被《西游记》深深吸引和对汉语、越南语都精通的才华，全部翻译是难以做到的。瑞亭的《西游记》在越南的译本较为充分地体现出文学审美价值。这一译本也获得了读者的认可，自1961年越南河内普通出版社出版以来，曾六度获得不同出版社的再版。

## 二、越南对《西游记》故事的诗传和戏曲改编

越南对《西游记》故事进行诗传和戏曲形式的改编，主要集中于19世纪末至20世纪初。就喃字诗传而言，目前我们能考察到的版本见少，《越南汉喃文献目录提要》载：“《西游传》（Tây Du Truyện，喃文书），今存印本1种，法国远东学院藏书。河内同文堂成泰五年（1893）印，六八体喃文诗传，中国《西游记》的译编”（刘春银 王小盾 陈义 887）。

1925年，阮玉春（Nguyễn Ngọc Xuân）从喃文转写为拉丁化越南文，在河内和海防印行。遗憾的是存世的《西游传》喃文书并不全，因此阮玉春转写的篇幅也较少，但其运用“六八体”诗式进行改写，具有浓厚的越南本土特色，其开篇曰：

Tây Du Truyện cũ lược bày （《西游》故事略说），  
Thừa đòi Đường - để kén thầy cầu kinh （唐皇寻人索求经）。  
Đường - Tăng thầy tứ bộ hành （三藏师徒徐行），  
Khâm - sai sắc chỉ lấy kinh chợ nàn （钦差指令却犯难）。  
Thăng dong ngựa tểch gác an （唐僧鞍马直布来），  
Thanh thanh bước tới, khoan khoan lộ trình （碎步轻盈缓缓来）。  
Đường trường dặm liễu cảnh thanh （沿途柳绿景青），  
Cỏ hoa đua đón ngàn xanh một màu （花接绿迎一片）。（Nguyễn Ngọc Xuân 1）

值得一提的是，就存世文献考察，《三国演义》《水浒传》《红楼梦》在越南均没有被改编为“六八体”诗传，而只有《西游记》被部分改编了。至于《西游记》没有被改编全部内容的原因，不得而知，但是若真全部改编

1 凡未特殊注明，本文外文引文均出自笔者拙译。



了，能理解的也许更多还是文人士子。我们设想一下，假如中国四大名著全部于18-19世纪都被改编为“六八体”诗式，其在越南的影响是否能超过阮攸的《金云翘传》呢？但值得思考的是，如果中国四大名著都被改编为“六八体”诗式，其未必能像直接翻译更能表达出四大名著文学艺术的细腻和精华。

确实，“六八体”的《西游记》容易朗朗上口，贴近越南语口语，但是由于越南后黎朝和阮朝（1802-1945）独尊儒术，以佛、道教理念为主的《西游记》并不符合这一时期越南官方对社会的伦理教化需求。阮朝于明命十五年（1834年）“颁训条于中外”，其《皇朝圣谕训迪十条》正心术条载：

夫心者，人之本也。其心正则万善所由生，其心不正则百恶所从出，可不慎欤？惟皇上帝，降衷于下民，若有恒性，是以仁义礼智，蔼然四端，人之初生，无不固有。朕原尔百姓等，各思恒守善心，存养良知，虽所业有不同，而向善则一。辟恶去邪，咸归于正。〔……〕若不思警者，淫僻邪秽，无所不为，到此陷于刑章，噬脐何及！（北京大学《儒藏》编纂与研究中心 1029-1030）

其崇正学条也提醒：“务崇正学，讲明人伦。尧舜之道，孝悌而已；孔孟之教，仁义为先；是皆所当讲也。若夫一切左道异端，勿为其所诳惑”（北京大学《儒藏》编纂与研究中心 1033）。正由于此，我们在存世越南官方文献和士大夫的汉文作品中，几乎看不到任何征引《西游记》的内容。这一点，与《三国演义》在越南传播的情况明显相左。值得一提的是，尽管官方和士大夫由于主流意识形态的原因，在阮朝结束以前，较少征引或进行模仿再创作，但作为民间对《西游记》的戏剧改编，则是另一番现象。存世所藏较早的《西游记》戏剧改编本至迟出现在19世纪。《越南汉喃文献目录提要》载：

《西游记演传》（*Tây Du Ký Diễn Truyện*，喃文书），今存抄本1种，藏于法国远东学院。2414页，100册，据《西游记》所撰噍剧，共一百回，存97回，欠13，29，30回。第53回残缺，第72，100回重出。汉喃两种文字间用，内容为唐玄奘跋山涉水往西竺求经的故事。（刘春银 王小盾 陈义 878）

另据张秀民早年的研究，1878年，有越南嘉定城惟明氏撰《西游演歌二板》（戏曲剧本）在广东佛山粤东陈村永和源刊刻，并发售于越南堤岸（西贡）。<sup>1</sup>此书现藏于荷兰莱顿大学图书馆，篇幅也不长，共18页。英国皇家图书馆另藏有《西游唐僧求经歌传》戏曲剧本，共52页，年代不详。越南国家

1 参见 张秀民：“中越关系史书目续编”，《中国东南亚研究会通讯》1（2002）：34-47。



图书馆又藏有《西游》《西游传》分别23页和30页篇幅的戏曲剧本。<sup>1</sup>

20世纪初，拉丁化越南文逐渐推广和近代印刷术在越南引入，拉丁化越南文版的《西游记》故事在越南北方和南方均具有较大的民间读者市场。由此，戏剧形式的《西游记》故事市场逐渐为商家发现和推广。1929年，《西游记演传——大圣闹天宫》在河内印行，并不署名改编者，但署“富文店出版”。值得一提的是这一《西游记》故事的戏剧改编本从审美上并没有过多的特色。只是把《西游记——大圣闹天宫》故事全部以对话的形式进行描述，改编者也没有署名。但在《西游记——大圣乱打妖洞》这一剧本中，则出现了少量的诗歌，但这些诗歌并没有运用越南特色的“双七体”或“六八体”诗式，而是模仿了中国律诗，尽管没有署名改编者，但所创作的诗歌仍具有较高的审美。如《西游记——大圣乱打妖洞》第一场描述孙悟空为百姓除妖降魔的功绩时，有诗曰：

Giới đã sinh ra một giống yêu (世间尽生妖孽种)，  
 Làm ra quấy rối chốn dân miếu (骚扰民间躲庙中)。  
 Ai hay Hành Giả nhiều oai phép (谁知悟空多法力)，  
 Đánh phá toang hoang rất hiểm nghèo (除魔降妖扫荡空)。(无名氏1)

这些诗歌使用越南语进行朗诵，朗朗上口，也是《西游记》故事本土化和民间化的一个重要标志。越南吴永康(Ngô Vĩnh Khang)还曾把《西游记》的故事改编为改良戏(Tuồng Cải Lương)，较为出名的是1930年由西贡今夕出版社出版发行的《孙悟空闹地府》等。其改编的蓝本，应是18-19世纪问世的喃字唢剧剧本。

另根据其封面、封底广告，尚有《石猴出世》《混世魔王》《水帘洞》《孙悟空补任弼马温》《齐天大圣乱天庭》《唐太宗游地府》《唐三藏救孙行者》《三藏出世》等销售。与全部用“六八体”诗式改编为喃传不同，唢剧改良的文本，既有旁白，也有对话，更穿插“双七体”、“六八体”诗式，且增添诸多场景。如《孙悟空闹地府》第一幕，先描述混世魔王与青柳娘在水脏洞中寻欢取乐的对话，随即侍女们主动歌舞，其歌曰：

Gió xuân - phong thổi cùng khắp nơi (春风吹送回大地)，  
 Khiến cỏ hoa múa khoe sắc đẹp (花草迎风，曼舞争艳)。  
 Cùng với cảnh sắc đua tươi (景色醉人可堪)，  
 Thế - gian thú này mấy mươi (世间乐趣无穷)。  
 Xuân cảnh xuân chén rượu nồng (春景春酒正浓)，

1 参见黎亭卿：《中国古代小说在越南——以〈三国演义〉、〈水浒传〉、〈西游记〉为中心》，2013年，华东师范大学，博士论文，第170、171、177页。

Thú vui chẳng cùng, cúi đầu quì dưng (幸事无尽王尽享)。

Chén huỳnh tiệc xuân, cúi xin nhậm dưng (金樽春宴请王赏)！(Ngô Vĩnh Khang 3)

1935年，由新山（Tân Sơn）编剧的另一个版本的《孙悟空闹地府》改良睺剧剧本问世，同样是由范文盛（Phạm Văn Thịnh）在越南西贡印行出版。

不同历史时期的文学有其固定的属于特定历史时期的伦理环境和伦理语境，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。<sup>1</sup>19世纪末，越南沦为法国殖民地，南部以西贡为中心的交趾支那、中部阮朝、北部东京。越南传统思想和文化在法国的殖民统治下，受到强烈冲击，尤其是西贡和河内。作为民间，惩恶扬善、反抗不公、修身爱民，依然具有较强的民族共情和教诲能力。以《西游记》在越南的戏曲改写本为例，除了娱乐功能外，其对于下层社会的教诲功能是毫无疑问的。

### 三、《西游记》在越南传播的伦理选择

《西游记》在越南传播最重要的原因，是越南对其进行了伦理选择。确切的说，是不同的历史背景下，越南官方和民间对《西游记》所包涵的伦理做出相应的选择。这一选择决定了《西游记》在越南传播的层次和范围。

理性意志约束自由意识的文学范例，在《西游记》描写的孙悟空身上也同样可以看到。孙悟空究竟是一个什么形象，虽有不同的观点，但是他作为一种自由意识的体现，则是显而易见的。<sup>2</sup>《西游记》问世的时代，正是越南独尊儒术的时代，而儒家是提倡修身，自我约束的。这与《西游记》孙悟空为所欲为，无法无天的形象相悖，尽管最后孙悟空同样得道成佛，但在越南独尊儒术的后黎朝和阮朝并未获得过官方和士大夫阶层的认可，这是造成早期《西游记》在越南传播有限的伦理因素。考察越南现存相关历史文献，尚未发现15世纪至20世纪初的官修史籍和士大夫的汉文作品有任何征引《西游记》的痕迹，我们也未发现这两个朝代的任何地理书有对《西游记》中人物形象和故事情节书写的记载。这与三国故事在越南的伦理选择完全不同。尤其到了19世纪越南阮朝时代，明命十六年（1835年），阮朝官方明文规定设立武庙，三国人物之一诸葛亮被官方点名奉祭。《明命政要》载：

礼部臣奏言：“为国之道，文武并行，令内外并建文庙，而武教尤未之及。夫设立武教，使弁胄知所视效，亦是礼之所以义起也。唐玄宗开元年间，两京各设太公庙肃尊，又尊古名将及本朝功臣可为后人矜

1 参见 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》，北京：北京大学出版社，2014年，第14页。

2 参见 Nie Zhenzhao, “Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection,” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 396.

示者，配飧用召激励”。帝从之。乃命于京城外之西，建庙祠。尚父姜太公，以北朝管仲、穰苴、孙武子、张良、韩信、诸葛亮、李靖、郭子仪、李晟、岳飞、徐达，我国陈国峻、黎魁，本朝阮有进、阮有谔、尊室会、阮文张等从祀。（阮朝枢密院何权等 12: 14a）

与三国故事在越南提倡“忠、孝、节、义”的儒家思想不同，《西游记》在后黎朝和阮朝的官方伦理中并未获得选择。由于担心触犯官方伦理正统的忌讳，士大夫的作品中均未征引过《西游记》这一作品。

但是降至19世纪中叶，由于西方殖民者的入侵，使越南的社会发生了巨大的变革。19世纪中叶，法国殖民者开始侵占越南。1884年，越南完全沦为法国的殖民地。法国治下的越南，对于儒家“忠君爱国”的主旋律并不推崇，同时还希望推广新的文字，试图割断中越传统文化的联系。至19世纪后半叶，法国殖民统治者认为，如果强制推行法文会受到越南民族主义的抵制，于是法国殖民者在越南开始推行拉丁化越南文，通过这种方式让一部分越南人逐步接受西方的价值观。但是如何使拉丁化越南文吸引更多人？这是一个让殖民者难办的问题。

在这一过程中，法国一些文化素质高的官员、商人，通晓汉语的华人知识分子们似乎达成了一种默契，翻译出版大量的中国明清小说，通过拉丁化越南文的报刊、印刷商进行翻译传播，这样一来，不但使普通的越南人的文化认知得益于拉丁化越南文，也让商人、华人知识分子们各得其所。毕竟，越南在整个封建历史时期的识字率是较低的。这是20世纪初《西游记》被拉丁化越南文改编、翻译的重要因素。这一时期的伦理选择，与后黎朝和阮朝不同，法国殖民者为了普及拉丁化越南文，对文学的意识形态管控较为宽松，让《西游记》在这一时期的传播具有相对自由的伦理选择权。这一时期，《西游记》在越南的传播更体现出其民间性，即没有官方的干预。民间对《西游记》进行相对自由的伦理选择，运用喃字或拉丁化越南文对《西游记》进行戏曲或诗歌的改编，对读者、观众等接受者进行伦理教诲，维系各自选择的伦理价值观。

佛教的伦理教诲功能选择也是20世纪初《西游记》被不断重复翻译的重要因素之一。1933-1935年越南学者乐苦（Lạc Khổ）重译了《西游记》，在译本序言中，他说道：

有人说，《西游记》是一部描写神圣变化，魔鬼妖精的荒唐小说，这样一部会让读者产生心乱头痛的小说，已经不少人翻译牟利去了，奈何你还翻，还要评价它？这些人说得也没错，但是就我而言，《西游记》的读者可以分为两派，一派是沉迷的读者，被离奇的故事所吸引的。另一派则是清醒的读者，它就像符咒一样把读者带入佛界。

我试举《西游记》中的五点绝妙之处。一是阅读《西游记》，你可以明白化福转运、乐极伤悲、否极泰来之机，守住专一精神，哪怕是千妖万怪都会避而远之，他们的千变万化都迷惑不了你。若离开一个“缘”，一个“一”字，则魔鬼即来扰乱。若自己阅读，您会发现诸多奥妙皆在《西游记》中。二是阅读《西游记》，会让我们体会到世间无所谓困境，只要我们一心向佛、道，则菩提之路不远，灵山自在眼前，极乐自在心中。多少苦恼和灾难皆是空，正如唐三藏，是修行者的旗帜，是信徒们的光明火炬。反之，若不专一，心无精诚，遇难丧志，见色起意如八戒则一无所成。三是阅读《西游记》，让我们明白，修行需要忍辱、精诚，谦和、淳勤方能到达彼岸。无论多么聪明，多么勇猛，如何有才，如何厉害之如孙悟空，都难以跳出造化之极。四是阅读《西游记》，让我们体会到，无论人如何愚钝、窘迫，只要皈依佛门，洗刷前罪，出生入死，一心向佛如唐三藏，亦无憾矣！五是阅读《西游记》，让我们知道我们的心是无比神圣，无比美好的，皆因染上尘埃，而生出诸苦、厄、惊、惧。如唐三藏所遭遇的八十一难皆由心生，看似荒唐而非荒唐也！（Lạc Khô 2-5）

在读者眼中，也许自己可以成为《西游记》中的任何一个人物，但无论如何，孙悟空这个人物是读者最青睐的。因为无论是东方还是西方，认为人性善恶共存是多数人的共识。正如聂珍钊教授说，无论西方文学，还是中国文学，大量的文学文本给我们提供了斯芬克斯因子不同组合与变化的范例，证明斯芬克斯因子对于理解文学的价值。斯芬克斯因子是由人性因子和兽性因子构成的，并通过理性意志和自由意志发挥作用。两种意志之间力量的消长，导致文学作品中人物性格的变化和故事情节的发展。<sup>1</sup>法国殖民者统治政策，客观上又让《西游记》的伦理价值获得一种非儒家的选择。除了精神娱乐的伦理选择之外，作为普通读者，乃至儿童读者，在戏曲改编本和译本中也可以获得一种“人定胜天”，反抗不公的朴素的伦理价值选择，这也与儒家王朝主流意识不完全相悖。

1945年，越南最后一个封建王朝阮朝灭亡，越南民主共和国成立，但法国殖民者卷土重来，越南随即进入抗法战争时期（1945-1954）。在这一时期，领导抗法战争的是胡志明领导的越南共产党，抗法战争又是在中国的大力支持下取得胜利的。由此而观之，两国在主旋律的思想上是具有较大共性的。如讽刺和批判封建社会的不公和官场黑暗，封建社会统治阶级对普通百姓的压迫等。这一时期，越南翻译出版了《西游记》的全译本，蓝本是1957年北京作家出版社出版的版本，具有较为深刻的时代烙印。1955年人民文学

1 参见 Nie Zhenzhao, "Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection," *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 383.

出版社出版的《西游记》前言说道：

宋、元至明初几百年间关于取经故事的民间口头传说以及话本小说和杂剧，使《西游记》取经故事通过不同的途径和文艺形式得到不断的发展。在长期的故事流传过程中，人民群众不断地改造和丰富原有故事的情节内容，同时也把他们对于封建统治阶级、封建社会的观察和认识，对于封建社会里种种丑恶势力的批判和斗争，乃至他们征服自然力的理想和愿望注入了取经故事。（郭豫适 简茂森 6）

因此，20世纪中后期，《西游记》在越南的传播，具有社会主义伦理价值观的选择，与越南被法国殖民时期不同，这一时期《西游记》在越南的传播，官方的伦理选择占据主流。越南自1986年改革开放，此后东西方外部的文学和各种伦理价值观冲击着越南。越南读者在阅读《西游记》时，有了更多元的伦理思考。但有一些是不会改变的，如对乐观、机智、勇敢、坚定和神通广大的孙悟空的喜爱，对贪吃好色的猪八戒的讽刺，对社会不公现象的不满等。2014年，越南再版的瑞亭翻译的全译本《西游记》，对人民文学出版社的前言进行了全译，其中即强调小说反映了劳动人民对封建社会权威和等级制度的轻蔑，以及有一个民主、平等社会的愿望。<sup>1</sup>

《西游记》在越南传播的一个重要伦理选择，是家长对子女的教诲。这种教诲一方面是通过阅读漫画故事集或《西游记》儿童版进行的。如由慧文翻译的《西游记》漫画故事集，2010年由河内美术出版社出版。2011年，河内文化通讯出版社出版了由王梦宝翻译的《西游记》缩略版。2012年，由陈友弄翻译的《西游记》漫画故事集由河内教育出版社出版。<sup>2</sup>此外，诸多由唐僧师徒四人的形象作为模型的儿童玩具在越南较为盛行。值得一提的是，《西游记》对青少年朴素的伦理教诲，是可以穿越不同的历史时空的，尤其在越南民间，因为这种伦理选择属于东方传统的，朴素的价值观。

### 余论

纵观《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播，我们可以得出以下不成熟的看法。首先，作为小说形态的《西游记》在越南的传播，至迟是18世纪已经明载。但由于与官方主流意识形态儒教思想相左，没有被官方和士大夫的作品征引。作为故事形态的传播，也许更早，但是我们并没有发现有现存的相关记载。其次，作为戏曲形式的《西游记》故事在越南获得较为广泛的传播，在19世纪至20世纪上半叶最盛。这一方面是由于法国殖民的文化政策使然，

1 参见 Thừa Ân Ngô, *Tây Du Ký* and Thụy Đình dịch, Chu Thiên hiệu đính, Hà Nội: Nhà xuất bản Văn học, 2014, tr.5.

2 参见 黎亭卿：《中国古代小说在越南——以〈三国演义〉、〈水浒传〉、〈西游记〉为中心》，2013年，华东师范大学，博士论文，第55页。



但商业和资本的注入，印刷术的推广和城市人口的增加等因素也不可忽视。第三，19世纪至20世纪初，拉丁化越南语在越南获得前所未有的推广，客观上促进了《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播。从拉丁化全译本的文学审美而言，好的译本依然是可遇而不可求，因为汉文原著的文学审美相对于越南译者而言，实际上需要具有较高层次的汉越语言和文化修养才能办到。第四，《西游记》及其故事在越南的传播离不开不同历史时期和不同层次受众的伦理选择，其中佛教伦理在20世纪初的影响不容忽视。20世纪50年代以来，其积极价值观的一面同样被新的社会制度所选择。正如聂珍钊所言，理解一部文学作品，需要从斯芬克斯因子的分析入手进行，进而对作品做出客观的价值判断，挖掘其对于我们今天的意义。

### Works Cited

- 无名氏：《西游演剧——大圣乱打妖洞》。河内：河内富文出版社，1929年。
- [Anonymous. *Play of Journey to the West—The Monkey King Fights the Demon Cave*. Hanoi: Phu Van Publishing House, 1929.]
- 北京大学《儒藏》编纂与研究中心编：《儒藏》（越南之部），《黎朝教化条律四十七条》。北京：北京大学出版社，2013年。
- [Editorial and Research Center for Confucian Canon, PKU, eds. *Confucian Canon (Vietnam)*, 47 *Articles for Edification in Le Dynasty*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2013.]
- 郭豫适、简茂森：“《西游记》序”，《西游记》，吴承恩著。北京：人民文学出版社，1980年。
- [Guo Yushi and Jian Maosen. “Preface to *Journey to the West*.” *Journey to the West*, Wu Chengen. Beijing: People’s Literature Publishing House, 1980.]
- 阮朝枢密院何权等撰修：《明命政要》卷之十二礼乐下。西贡：南越政权国务卿府文化特责处影行，1972年。
- [He Quan from Privy Council of Nguyen Dynasty eds. *The Governance of Ming Mang* Vol.12. Saigon: Special Cultural Office for the Secretary of State of the South Vietnamese Regime, 1972.]
- Lạc Khô dịch thuật. *Tây Du Ký—Phê bình theo Tâm lý học và Triết học*. Hà Nội: Trung Ký xuất bản, 1933-1935.
- [Lac, Kho. *Journey to the West—A Critique of Psychology and Philosophy*. Hanoi: Trung Ky Publishing House, 1933-1935.]
- 黎贵惇：《北使通录》，阮氏雪译注。河内：师范大学出版社，2018年。
- [Le, Quy Don. *Complete Account of an Envoy to the North*, translated and annotated by Thi Tuyet Nguyen. Hanoi: Normal UP, 2018.]
- 刘春银、王小盾、陈义编：《越南汉喃文献目录提要》。中国台北：“中央研究院”中国文哲研究所编印，2002年。
- [Liu Chunyin, Wang Xiaodun and Chen Yi, eds. *A Bibliography of Han Nan Documents in Vietnam*. Taipei (China): Academia Sinica, Institute of Chinese Literature and Philosophy, 2002.]
- 马祖毅、任荣珍：《汉籍外译史》。武汉：湖北教育出版社，2003年。



- [Ma Zuyi and Ren Rongzhen. *History of Chinese Classics' Translation*. Wu Han: Hubei Education Press, 2003.]
- Ngô Thừa Ân. *Tây Du Ký*, Thụy Đình dịch, *Chu Thiên hiệu đính*. Hà Nội: Nhà xuất bản Văn học, 2014.
- [Ngo, Thua An. *Journey to the West*, translated by Dinh Thuy, revised by Thien Chu. Hanoi: Literary Publishing House, 2014.]
- Ngô Vinh Khang soạn. *Tôn Ngộ Không Náo Địa Phủ*. Sài Gòn: Nhà in Xưa Nay, 1930.
- [Ngo Vinh Khang. *Monkey King in the Underworld*. Saigon: Xua Nay Publishing House, 1930.]
- Nguyễn Ngọc Xuân. *Tây Du Truyện*. Hà Nội: hiệu ÍCH KỶ, 1925.
- [Nguyen, Ngoc Xuan. *Journey to the West*. Hanoi: ICH KY Publishing House, 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. *An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- . “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.
- . “Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 383-398.
- 克劳婷·苏尔梦编: 《中国传统小说在亚洲》, 颜保等译。北京: 国际文化出版公司, 1989 年。
- [Salmon, Claudine, ed. *Chinese Traditional Novels in Asia*, translated by Yan Bao et al. Beijing: International Culture Publishing Company, 1989.]
- 孙逊、郑克孟、陈益源编: 《越南汉文小说集成》第 2 册。上海: 上海古籍出版社, 2011 年。
- [Sun Xun, Zheng Kemeng and Chen Yiyuan, eds. *Vietnamese Chinese Novel Collection Vol.II*. Shanghai: Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 2011.]
- Trương Chính. *Lịch sử Văn học Trung Quốc*. Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất bản Giáo Dục, 1971.
- [Truong, Chinh. *History of Chinese Literature*. Hanoi: Education Publishing House, 1971.]
- 黎亭卿: 《中国古代小说在越南——以〈三国演义〉、〈水浒传〉、〈西游记〉为中心》, 2013 年。华东师范大学, 博士论文。
- [Le, Dinh Khanh. *Chinese Ancient Novels in Vietnam, focusing on Romance of the Three Kingdoms, Water Margin and Journey to the West*. 2013. East China Normal University, PhD dissertation.]
- 李济川: “越甸幽灵集录序”, 《越南汉文小说集成》第 2 册, 孙逊、郑克孟、陈益源编。上海: 上海古籍出版社, 2011 年。
- [Ly, Te Xuyen. “Preface of Viet Dien U Linh Tap” (Anthology of the spirits of the departed of the Vietnamese udomain), *Vietnamese Chinese Novel Collection Vol.II*, edited by Sun Xun, Zheng Kemeng and Chen Yiyuan. Shanghai: Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 2011.]
- 严从简: 《殊域周咨录》, 余思黎点校。北京: 中华书局, 1993 年。
- [Yan Congjian. *Shuyuzhouzilu (Ming dynasty record of exploration and foreign relations)*, collated by Yu Sili. Beijing: Zhong Hua Book Company, 1993.]
- 张秀民: “中越关系史书目续编”, 《中国东南亚研究会通讯》1 (2002): 34-47。
- [Zhang Xiumin. “Continuation of Bibliography on History of Sino-Vietnam Relations.” *Communication of China Southeast Asian Research Association* 1 (2002): 34-47.]

# 《乌有乡消息》中的博物馆叙事及其文学伦理学反思

## An Ethical Reflection on the Museum Narrative in *News from Nowhere*

李立新 (Li Lixin) 杨金才 (Yang Jincai)

**内容摘要:** 博物馆是一个展示秩序、教育国民、增进文化认同的公共空间，对现代生活产生了重大影响。英国作家威廉·莫里斯肯定博物馆的教育潜能，并将其看作实现社会主义理想的阵地。但在资本主义体制下，博物馆发展受制于政治权力，遵从商业资本的逻辑，其发展方向与莫里斯的政治理想相悖。莫里斯在《乌有乡消息》中抨击以操控为目的的观看理念，试图构建以平等、互动与共享为基调的展现艺术与社会伦理的博物馆空间。从文学伦理学批评视角看，文物收藏、展览受到的政治、资本干预是小说博物馆叙事的伦理结，观者的身份焦虑是串联其中的伦理线，二者相互交织构成博物馆的存在危机。

**关键词:** 威廉·莫里斯；《乌有乡消息》；博物馆叙事；文学伦理学批评

**作者简介:** 李立新，山东大学外国语学院副教授，主要研究方向为英国文学与博物馆文化；杨金才，南京大学外国语学院教授，主要从事英美文学与西方文论研究。本文为国家社科基金重大项目“威廉·莫里斯艺术社会主义思想的文献译介与理论阐释”【项目批号：18ZDA289】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** An Ethical Reflection on the Museum Narrative in *News from Nowhere*

**Abstract:** Museum was a public space to display order, cultivate citizens, and construct cultural identity, which exerted a major influence on modern life, and then became an object of literary writing. William Morris affirmed the museum's education role, and viewed museums as a field to realize his socialist ideals. However, under the capitalist system, museums are subject to political power and follow the logic of capital. The direction the museums taking is contrary to Morris's political ideal. In *News from Nowhere*, Morris attacks the manipulative purpose of museum visits, and attempts to construct a museum as an equal, interactive and sharing space to highlight art and social ethics. From the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, the political and capital intervention of collection and exhibition serves as the ethical knot of the museum narrative, while the visitors' identity anxiety as its ethical line, and they interweave with each other to constitute the museums' existential crisis.

**Keywords:** William Morris; *News from Nowhere*; museal narrative; ethical literary criticism

**Authors:** Li Lixin, PhD., Associate Professor, School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Shandong University (Jinan, China 250100). Her main research focus is on British literature and museum culture (Email: lilixin@sdu.edu.cn). Yang Jincai, PhD., Professor, School of Foreign Studies, Nanjing University (Nanjing, China 210000). He is primarily engaged in the study of English and American literature and Western literary theories (Email: jcyang@nju.edu.cn).

19世纪英国作家威廉·莫里斯（William Morris）撰写了多部奇幻小说与诗歌作品，传播其关注民生、变革社会的政治理想，其代表作《乌有乡消息》（*News from Nowhere*, 1890）围绕穿越到共产主义世界的男主人公盖斯特的见闻，聚焦他与大英博物馆管理员的交谈，呈现了关于博物馆的全方位叙事。博物馆以多种形式出现在文本叙述中，包括大英博物馆、汉默史密斯货币博物馆、温莎城堡、老房子等，“作为象征，作为机构，作为意象或作为实践体现了维多利亚社会和文学的意识形态运作”（Black 4）<sup>1</sup>。莫里斯在作品中尝试融合博物馆空间批评与观者伦理，表现出他对乌托邦虚构叙事艺术和社会实践的兼收并蓄。针对这个话题，英美学界批评家们着重讨论了博物馆权威地位在小说中的式微，以及为何在新社会成为一个“敌托邦”（dystopia）<sup>2</sup>，而博物馆叙事中内嵌的收藏、展览与观看的伦理内涵却无问津。本文关注小说中具有社会主义色彩的博物馆伦理建构，运用文学伦理学批评视角，审视博物馆收藏隐含的伦理选择、展览的伦理环境以及观者的伦理焦虑，并在此基础上探索博物馆教诲功能对人民精神改造的重要性。事实上，莫里斯的博物馆叙事是利用博物馆教诲功能展开一场具有实际意义的革命，“极大地丰富了共产主义的伦理内容”（Thompson 89），这也意味着作家试图通过重构当下的收藏、展览与观看体制，释放博物馆的伦理潜能。

### 一、收藏即教化：博物馆叙事的伦理立场

现代博物馆有两个传统，一是以古希腊“缪斯神庙”（mouseion）为原型的学习、研究之地，一是17、18世纪欧洲贵族阶层以“珍奇屋”为表征的物品收藏所。到了19世纪，博物馆开始向大众开放，逐渐演变成一个融收

1 本文外文引文均出自笔者译。

2 乔纳森·康林（Jonathan Conlin）认为出现于19世纪80年代的“博物馆疲劳”，甚至“博物馆恐怖”等对博物馆、美术馆等帝国文化机构的批判情绪，起源于威廉·莫里斯1890年出版的《乌有乡消息》。他指出，在这部小说中博物馆似乎过时了，是因为在乌托邦世界艺术已融入人们的日常生活。参见 Jonathan Conlin and A. Bremner, *Making history: Edward Augustus Freeman and Victorian cultural politics*, Oxford: OUP, 2015, 139-156.a.

藏、展览和阐释为一体的文化娱乐与教育空间。莫里斯小说中的博物馆在收藏目的、方式与藏者身份等方面与19世纪公共博物馆奉行的理念大相径庭，揭示了将博物馆“作为展示国家荣耀的工具”（Alexander 7），“为文物提供一个安全、中立的环境”（Vergo 9）等主流观点中隐含的伦理困境。

维多利亚人热衷物品的收藏，多源于“对于安全的考虑、社会地位与知识的追求以及名垂青史的渴望”（Alexander 8），因而私人收藏多为了彰显文化品位及标识身份。但在莫里斯笔下的乌有乡，物品丰富且共享，日常物与对象物之间的界限被打破，这给物与人的关系带来颠覆性的改变，收藏是为了满足人们的生活与艺术需求，而不是受到商品社会中权力、财富、身份或欲望的驱使。年轻人迪克感兴趣的是14世纪的货币藏品，并通过模仿这些古物来学习雕刻，享受手工劳动带来的快乐。这不仅传达出莫里斯对中世纪艺术形式的推崇，也说明凝结了匠人精神的古物是具有精神性或文化性的物质载体，能够启迪观者心智，激发艺术想象力。

博物馆藏品可以与观者进行面对面的交流，具有独特的美学教育优势，是传播莫里斯“人民的艺术”观念的助推器。莫里斯一再强调藏品是普通人日常劳作的结果，以南肯辛顿神秘的美学迷宫、令人心神愉悦的神兽花鸟为例，指出人民在富有艺术性的工作中总是伴随着乐趣，并由此提出只有源于人民、为了人民，为创造者和使用者带来幸福的艺术，才是值得追求的艺术。<sup>1</sup>他给予伯明翰艺术学院学生的首要建议就是去研究古物，去挖掘古物蕴含的时代精神，即让学生了解人民在文化创造中的主体地位，明了艺术最根本的服务对象是人民。在“艺术、财富与钱财”（“Art, Wealth and Riches”）的演讲中他进一步强调了藏品的教诲价值：“为什么那些有教养的、清醒的、理性的，深谙金钱价值的人，会花大价钱购买碎花布、粗糙的陶器、虫蛀的雕刻品或破旧的金属制品，并把它们珍藏在造价高昂的公共建筑里，由学识渊博的专家进行监护呢？”（144）原因在于这些物品具有教育意义。那么如何让观者在文物鉴赏中感受到这些藏品传达的情感、哲思、信念和理想是博物馆美学教育需要解决的关键问题。“从美学诞生时开始，审美就同道德紧密联系在一起，即使到了21世纪，也没有人能够否定审美同道德的天然联系”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构” 88）。莫里斯在其艺术生涯中也逐渐意识到审美追求的终极价值是伦理道德价值，因此其文本中的博物馆教育同样将美育同道德教诲联系在一起。他充分利用文学的教诲功能，揭示维多利亚社会审美意趣中存在的问题，建构以“民主、民生、民享”（唐莹 杨金才 179）为核心的社会批评话语，引导读者从阅读中获得道德启示，做出正确的伦理选择。

除了探究如何在博物馆教育中纳入“人民艺术”思想，莫里斯还在小

1 参见 William Morris, “The Art of the People,” *The Collected Works of William Morris* XXII, edited by May Morris, London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914, 28-50.

说中对欧洲博物馆的藏品收集方式展开伦理批判。在19世纪,大英博物馆是“帝国行政核心”中的“知识生产机构”(Richards 4),具有鲜明的西方中心主义和殖民主义色彩,但在乌有乡已失去了昔日的辉煌,是“一座相当丑陋的老房子”(莫里斯 67)。迪克认为这个建筑之所以被保留是因为其中的藏品,老哈蒙德在与盖斯特的交谈中指出这些藏品来源的不正当性。他提到在圆形阅览室的藏书中记载了一个被视为民族英雄的英国探险家斯坦利爵士(Sir Henry Morton Stanley),斥责其是个“粗暴鲁莽、无所不为、愚昧无知”(莫里斯 120)的冒险家,用廉价的机械产品去交换当地的珍宝。文中用“infest”一词描述这些殖民者的掠夺行为,揭示了他们在非洲害虫般的“文明”(莫里斯 120)交往活动。按照文学伦理学批评的观点,兽性因子在帝国殖民者身上占了上风,他们的动物性收藏行为使其丧失了人的道德性,而要成为有理性的存在就必须通过伦理选择脱离野蛮。“伦理选择过程是自然选择完成之后人类道德文明的新阶段,是人必须经历的通过具体的自我伦理选择活动获取人的道德本质的过程”(聂珍钊,“文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构”75)。大英博物馆内琳琅满目的藏品很多是帝国军队殖民抢掠来的“战利品”,还有一部分是考古学家以保护文化遗产的名义搜罗来的他国文物,这种收藏方式暗示藏者长期浸淫在非理性意志纵容下的贪婪欲望中,自我伦理选择受控于帝国意识。莫里斯批判博物馆藏品来源的不正当性,在“少数人的艺术”(“The Lesser Arts”)演讲中指出“博物馆里有某种使人忧郁的东西”,那些藏品诉说的是“关于暴力、毁坏和淡漠的故事”(17)。他从一个观者的角度作出道德层面的评价,还通过哈蒙德这个文学形象质疑帝国收藏伦理,控诉博物馆等文化机构面对帝国暴力的集体沉默,这种沉默不仅姑息、纵容了文物收藏的非法途径与方式,也使机构自身在教诲方面的合法性受到质疑。

此外,哈蒙德还在谈话中指出,现代资本主义衍生出的人们对商业利益疯狂追逐,不仅摧毁了本国艺术的根基,还通过殖民扩张对东方艺术产生破坏性影响。<sup>1</sup>他将这种“灾难”归因于资本驱动下世界市场的形成,痛斥商品贸易体系是个“贪得无厌的怪物”,“整个社会都被抛入了世界市场所造成的‘廉价生产’的血盆大口中”,并斥责考古家和冒险家们用“‘文明’制造出来的毫无价值的东西”(莫里斯 123)来迷惑亚洲和非洲人民,交换甚至骗取他们手中的艺术珍品,使其与原有文化语境脱离,然后以保护之名将其陈列在博物馆并为其构建新的伦理关系以展帝国之威。“东方艺术正在西方的商业入侵下加速消失。印度艺术已被扼死于现代商业文明”,是因为“他们放弃了其古老而闻名的艺术,去迎合不足挂齿的商业利益”(Morris, “The Art of the People” 36)。莫里斯以印度瓷器为例,说明它们原本是可以市

1 参见威廉·莫里斯:《乌有乡消息》,黄嘉德、包玉珂译,北京:商务印书馆,1981年,第123页。



场上购买到的日常用品，却受到机器产品的影响而停产，“只能作为稀有的珍宝和遗产出现在博物馆。而讽刺的是，博物馆正是为艺术的普及和教育而建”（Morris, “The Art of the People” 37）。从这个意义上看，博物馆收藏是一个伦理选择的过程，对被征服民族艺术生态的破坏，使观者对博物馆代表的国家荣耀产生认同困惑。作为帝国象征的大英博物馆的外在建筑在乌有乡已接近废墟，莫里斯以外观的残败来讽喻博物馆帝国话语的消解，强调“除非发达文明孕育出更为健康的环境，艺术所处的境况才会有所改善”（Morris, “The Art of the People” 37），而健康环境的营造必须摒弃资本主义与帝国主义的商业伦理控制。

藏品能够反映收藏家的社会身份，包括权力、威望和社会地位<sup>1</sup>，那么藏品的阐释者担负着评估文物价值以及缔造知识体系的责任，但这种绝对阐释的权力极易形成权威解读，从而造成固化的社会价值体系。小说中两位藏品的阐释者老哈蒙德与其“在乡间的化身”莫森都是“很有智慧的老人”（莫里斯 224），精通古代历史，在新社会却是一种背景式的存在。在介绍哈蒙德的身份时，莫里斯用了“custodian”一词，而不是博物馆学界常用的“curator”<sup>2</sup>。布莱克认为这种身份界定“让哈蒙德的职位失去了专业性，颠覆了博物馆作为一种社会文化机构的定位”，“莫里斯认为博物馆使维多利亚社会的艺术变形，导致艺术与日常生活之间的分裂”（Black 180），在新社会“已没有艺术品这个名称，因为艺术已经成为每个生产者劳动的必然组成部分了”（莫里斯 168），这在一定程度上削弱了珍藏艺术品的博物馆的存在价值。相应地，作为联结过去与现在的过渡性人物以及新旧社会更迭的见证者，哈蒙德的管理与阐释权力也被消解，物品的“保管者”的身份更突出其作为劳动者为人民服务的一面，其身份重构也昭示着新的收藏伦理的形成及博物馆代表的强大的社会权威体系的崩塌。

现代博物馆通过收藏打造艺术经典暗含一种脱离大众需求的精英主义，对莫里斯而言这种精英性与社会主义精神格格不入。他将收藏这一令维多利亚人着迷的社会实践活动的历史属性、文化属性与伦理属性予以文学赋形，让收藏与资本扩张以及传统艺术的衰败形成联想上的直接对应关系，从而使读者反推作家博物馆书写的起因，重新思考意义渐趋定型的乌托邦叙事，提供新的意义生产空间。

## 二、展览即叙述：博物馆叙事中的伦理铺展

如果说教化是博物馆的基本功能，展品是承担教化功能的材料，那么博物馆教化功能往往通过展陈的布置来实现。莫里斯在小说中将收藏背后的资

1 参见 Edward P. Lexander, *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums*, New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1996, 204.

2 指馆长或策展人。



本与殖民行为通过乌有乡居民的叙述声音呈现出来，以辩证、对话的方式勾勒新社会的博物馆样貌，引导读者质疑西方博物馆是否曾对自身的收藏行为进行伦理反思。他还进一步探索了藏品的展览方式、如何借助展览构建藏品意义以及教育大众，将叙述焦点放在由展品带来的视觉体验如何触发观者关于艺术背后的劳动伦理的思考。

在小说第27章，盖斯特等人参观了位于泰晤士河上游地带一个乡村博物馆中的工业品与艺术品展览。展览位于一个相当大的厅堂，由乡村老人莫森陪同观看并诠释展品，行使了馆员的讲解与教育职责，在形式上沿袭了19世纪中后期“让公众在教育、社会和道德上受益”（Vergo 71）的南肯辛顿大型展览的模式。莫里斯在文本中重新定位了展品、讲解者与观者等主要元素，两种模式的对照“构成一个个紧密交织的伦理结，表现为伦理混乱或秩序重构”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》15）。通过解析这些伦理结，可以窥见莫里斯对这些工业展览潜藏的唯利是图的商业主义与政治宣传的批判，他不满机器大生产存在的制造伦理问题，倡导新手工工业时代的劳动模式，持守一种“人类完全平等”（莫里斯 226）的政治理想。

首先，新社会的展览在展品组织与摆放方式层面并未遵循传统要求的“整齐有序”（Alexander 259），而是随意堆放，透视出莫里斯对强调秩序与统一的资本主义工业生产方式的抗拒。“堆放”一方面表明机械生产能力强，产品数量多，另一方面暗指产品造价低，设计感差，不具备收藏、展示的价值。对博物馆颇有研究的约翰·罗斯金（John Ruskin）强调：“一个以伦理和科学教育为指向的博物馆必须不包含邪恶的、野蛮的或浮躁的艺术”（qtd. in Hanley 45）。莫里斯吸收了罗斯金构建现代博物馆的一些观念，在小说中模拟博物馆展览，刻意将不同层次、时代的艺术品勾连在一起，批判意识更明显。比如，新社会的展览将“标志着由机器的粗制滥造时期到新的手工业时代初期的过渡”（莫里斯 226）的工业品与当代的手工艺品并置在一起，使二者之间的生产方式与美学价值的差异被清晰地呈现出来。莫里斯以夸张、反讽、想象等文学叙事手段，跨越时空边界，绘制出一个更符合其艺术理想的展览体系，颠覆了现实中工业展览宣称的先进性与知识性。

其次，乡村老人莫森临时扮演了讲解员的角色，以讽刺的口吻介绍藏品的历史与艺术内涵，启发以盖斯特为代表的观者对藏品价值的思考，这与19世纪工业展览组织者的阐释理念形成了极大反差。1874年以后，南肯辛顿“以商业、工业和帝国为主题”的系列展越来越专业化，组织者公开强调展览不再是单一的公众参观活动，而应向“专业教育者和资料提供者”的身份进行转变，“公众被降级成了通过展览提高管理和技工意识的首选目标”（Vergo 75）。帝国博物馆自身意义体系的形成表明其本质上是规范有用知识和构筑具有国家群体意义的身份，其展览必然沦为技术与帝国意识操控的工具。工业展讲解者程式化的介绍配上机器操作不仅传达其教育意图，也将

物品内嵌的意识形态结构强加给观者，遮蔽观者自主性、质疑性的声音。莫里斯设想的展览是把教育与娱乐合为一体，比如盖斯特一行人在欢快的旅行中穿插了对工业展览的参观，这其实在一定程度上将参观活动“降级”为一种休闲娱乐。莫里斯还借莫森之口指出机器产品丑陋的根本原因在于人们使用机器工，感受不到劳动的快乐，传达出其社会变革思想中的核心观点，即“废除特权阶级（……）所有人必须劳动”（Morris, *Useful Work and Useless Toil* 106），劳动不是痛苦而是一种幸福。这种劳动观挑战了当时英国政府利用工业展览灌输给工人阶级的“将工作视为一种牺牲”（Vergo 81）的道德传统，意在说明工作与娱乐之间不是非此即彼的二元对立关系，而是一体两面，可以根据劳动者的主体需要自由转化。

再者，早期博物馆的展览叙事具有封闭性，进入展览的观者往往缺乏自主权，按照固定的路线、叙事的安排完成参观活动。按照现代博物馆学的观点，“只有在思维上保持独立性，或者在行为上能具体参与到叙事建构中，才有可能击碎角色对人的禁锢，打破展览叙事的封闭性，并由此建立起一种‘行动’的展览叙事关系”（李德庚 143）。小说中的观者被刻画为独立的行动者，对当下所处的情境有清醒的认识，具有独立的判断，甚至表达出具有革命色彩的观感，“让一种单向的‘叙述—倾听’关系演变为一种双向的‘发言—评论’关系”（李德庚 143）。盖斯特等人在一个自由的观展环境里讨论、阐发关于机器文明的伦理困惑。当盖斯特拿起一件造型奇特的陶器，说它看上去“一点也不像野蛮人或半开化的人所制造的东西，可是有着过去所谓痛恨文明的烙印”（莫里斯 228），这里的“文明”特指工业社会的机器文明，而这种文明压制了技术工人的艺术创造力，破坏了其生产物品的美学价值。莫森回应道，“在那个时期，从一个和奴隶毫无二致的人那里，你只能得到这些东西”（莫里斯 228），批判的矛头直指资本主义社会的等级制度将人变成了机器的奴隶。迪克补充指出强制性劳动是一切美学问题的根源，也就揭示出是资产阶级对利润的追逐造成了劳动生产方式的异化，使劳动者无法乐在其中。克拉娜将讨论延伸到资本主义生产方式存在的生态问题，工业化生产使劳动环境恶化，造成了工人阶级物质和精神的双重贫困，这从侧面反映出作家的劳动伦理思想中蕴含的环境忧患意识与生态伦理理念。莫森的讲解与几位观者的对话式参与构成一种双向展览叙事结构，打破传统的一元性、标准化、讲课式的叙述，融入延展、启发、讨论、对话等多元化的叙述方式，解构了传统展览叙事中的主客体关系。

莫里斯以新旧社会对照的手法，通过形塑展览共同体，将来自新旧世界的藏品、讲解者与观者关联起来，这个绘制的展览共同体具有多元声音交汇的对话性特征——物与物、人与人、观念与观念以及观者与另一个时代（文化）对话，阐述作家自身对创造性劳动的思考。希尔（Kate Hill）提出“莫里斯式博物馆物品展示方法能够显影新社会。人们专注于展示未被异化的劳动

的产品，一种人民的艺术，并勾勒出艺术发展的轨迹”（187）。莫里斯的博物馆设想深受罗斯金影响，具有一定的空想色彩。罗斯金曾在谢菲尔德为工人阶级建造了一座博物馆，其目的“不是将艺术和工艺封存在博物馆里，而是希望形成一种鲜活的传统”（Hanley 45），使之成为一个可以在其他城镇复制的榜样，从而复苏传统手工艺技能。莫里斯对博物馆的文学阐释在话语权与影响力层面进一步提升了民众对博物馆展览的影响，与维多利亚教化时代对民众形象的预设形成鲜明对照，蕴含着一种以创造精神为核心的劳动伦理，从而使这个空间成为承载与传递其道德观与伦理观的重要场域。

### 三、从教化到变革：博物馆叙事伦理的终极旨归

小说中的博物馆叙事不仅包含了莫里斯对博物馆教化、讽喻功能的认知，更重要的是包含其利用文学想象为维多利亚人构建一个关于理想社会的认知框架。传统的博物馆叙事以“人”与“物（藏品）”的关系为核心，强调“物性”是其本质特征，决定“人”的价值判断。莫里斯的新社会想象以展览叙事为依托，重构“人”与“物”之间的关系，“人”包括博物馆叙事的主体（馆员），也包括博物馆叙事的受众（公众），他们的阐释能力决定“物性”的指向，并从伦理层面对博物馆的教化功能进行了重新解读。“文学是由于人类最初表达伦理的需要而产生的，文学的产生是为了把伦理文字化，建立社会的伦理秩序”（Nie 193）。因此，莫里斯利用文学想象重构博物馆空间，颠覆博物馆作为资本主义社会德育文化代言人身份，探索适用于新社会的博物馆观看伦理。

乌有乡的博物馆对所有人开放，意味着人们可以自由参观，不受任何形式的限制。反观19世纪中后期受到民主观念影响的欧洲博物馆看似为社会各阶层提供了平等的参观机会，却在具体实践中设置了严格的申请条件，比如大英博物馆圆形阅览室的入馆申请在当时很难被批准，“必须由国会议员、市议员、法官、校长或其他知名人士介绍”（Altick 215），这其实为普通人尤其是底层人民获取读者资格设置了障碍，暗示着博物馆享有对观者进行分类和控制的特权。与其说筛选、检验观者身份是为了确保完美的参观体验，不如说在表达等级观念与文化偏见。莫里斯在“人民的艺术”（“The Art of the People”）中批评当时的“博物馆不过是富人的娱乐活动”，“无法触及广大的民众”（137-138）。管理层站在与人民对立的伦理立场上，把民众预设为秩序的潜在破坏者而将其排除在外。从根本上说，现实中的博物馆是一个典型的帝国文化独裁机构，力图将既定的价值标准与身份认同焦虑传达给观者，也使那些申请受挫者发现自己处于双重困境，因达不到入馆要求，融入不了主流文化而自我怀疑，又不满被定位为较低阶层在公共空间受到排斥而感到焦虑。

博物馆这个看似客观、公平的文化空间实际蕴含着极强的政治性和意识形态性，以精英视角来审视观者，把他们看作教化与怜悯的对象，而非平等

的分享者，从而导致其自我认知层面的焦虑。但莫里斯在小说中试图将“大英博物馆还原成‘家’的样貌，一个家庭式的公共空间”（Black 184），从编织民族神话的空间转变为展现日常生活美学的场所。在小说结尾处，盖斯特参观了“在新人民中的老房子”，这是一个“具有中世纪田园特征的生态博物馆”，藏品是“房子本身及其有关的东西”（Pinkney 405），其样貌是按照莫里斯租住的凯尔姆斯科特宅邸（Kelmscott Manor）绘制的。两个博物馆的所指不同，但皆被型塑成“家”的样子，从现代博物馆发展历程来看，似乎是向17、18世纪“珍奇屋”式私人博物馆的后退，但文中博物馆式的“家”并不具备传统意义上“私人空间”的舒适性、封闭性与隐秘性，装饰极为简单与陈旧。哈蒙德及其他居民在此友好地对待访客，来自异乡的盖斯特在新社会畅行无阻，表明乌有乡这个社会空间具有极大地开放性，也呈现出莫里斯理想中革命性的博物馆面相，即不拘泥于向观者传达一整套精英的审美趣味，而是以观者之间的交流与对话为载体，实现博物馆权威话语从管理者到观者的共享。

以文学方式展开的博物馆叙事空间是一个拥有特殊话语权力的公共空间，也是可以重塑话语权的社会公共空间。莫里斯自身对博物馆始终怀有一种珍视的情感，简（Jane Morris）曾写道：“早年，我父亲就对大英博物馆里书籍了如指掌，仿佛它们都属于他自己（……）他和伯恩·琼斯都在大英博物馆的阅览室度过了许多快乐的时光。我想，除了工作人员，伦敦没有哪个年轻人像我父亲那样熟悉那里的珍宝，也没有哪个年轻人像我父亲那样执着地利用那里提供给学生的机会”（Morris xviii）。从个人经历与文本表达来看，莫里斯支持将博物馆界定为培育、启迪民众的教育机构，乌有乡的博物馆也起到了在人民中传播和增进知识的作用。本尼特（Tonny Bennett）表示“19世纪欧洲政府投资修建博物馆的主要目的是进行科学和道德教育”（31-32）。罗斯金直接指出博物馆的首要目标是“给那些粗鲁无礼的民众提供秩序和优雅的榜样”（Ruskin 260）。除了挖掘博物馆的教育潜能，莫里斯进一步探索如何释放其解放的潜能，抵制资产阶级文化利用此空间的隐形权力监视、规训观者的企图，避免将参观演变成为一种民众教化仪式。这种在权力监控之下的同主导文化联结的教化具有渗透性和约束性，使博物馆参观成为统治阶层进行帝国伦理宣传与熏染的利器，也引发观者被凝视的恐惧以及对自身所处阶层的焦虑。

莫里斯通过观者盖斯特的具身化叙述解构了博物馆空间代表的权威性与精英性，圆形阅览室在乌有乡变得无人问津，只有失去户外劳动能力的老哈蒙德在此看书消磨时光。新社会居民并非失去了对知识与历史的兴趣，而是将知识主体从书籍这种物质存在转化为人民的劳动实践，传达出提升劳动价值与劳动主体社会地位的希冀。值得注意的是，老哈蒙德并未将自己禁锢在博物馆中，而是与朋友们一起游历，以劳动为人生圭臬的迪克等年轻人也走进



博物馆感受古代艺术之美，艺术与劳动结合形成了新社会人民的情感共识与生活方式，反映出莫里斯一直坚持的“以劳动为切入口来实现艺术的审美功能和社会改造功能的融合”（张莉 杨金才<sup>1</sup>），同时消解了观看过程中主客体之间权力关系的对立，代之互动、体验中的和谐共存，从而实现了以博物馆为轴心辐射到其他社会空间的伦理道德规范的重建。

博物馆在小说中既是文化意指，又是嵌入乌托邦叙事中的叙述视角，为读者提供了从伦理角度认识19世纪英国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警示，为人类的自我完善提供道德经验”（Nie 191）。莫里斯重新审视机械文明时代，借收藏行为存在的伦理选择问题指出道德沦落已然成为一个显见的社会问题，而古物蕴含的以人民为核心的道德关怀是治疗资本主义社会道德痼疾的一剂良药。他的博物馆叙事从微观角度完整地呈现了新旧社会的不同样貌，一个重商主义思想盛行的帝国图景与一个人民乐在其中的共产主义愿景，展现了一个在时间与空间中得以延伸的人类命运共同体，使其关于理想社会的愿景表达具体化，也为现实世界提供了一个改革与发展的参照标准。

## Works Cited

- Alexander, Edward P. *Museums in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museums*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1996.
- Altick, Richard. *The English Common Reader: A Social History of the Mass Reading Public, 1800-1900*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1957.
- Bennet, Tonny. *The Birth of Museum History, Theory, Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Black, Barbara J. *On Exhibit: The Victorians and Their Museums*. Charlottesville and London: The UP of Virginia, 2000.
- Conlin, Jonathan and A. Bremner. *Making History: Edward Augustus Freeman and Victorian Cultural Politics*. Oxford: OUP, 2015. 139-156.
- Hill, Kate. *Women and Museums, 1850-1914: Modernity and the Gendering of Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2016.
- Hanley, Keith and Brian Maidment. eds. *Persistent Ruskin. Studies in Influence, Assimilation and Effect*. Farnham: Lancaster University, 2013.
- 李德庚：《流动的博物馆》。北京：文化艺术出版社，2020年。
- [Li Degeng. *Liquid Museum*. Beijing: Culture and Art Publishing House. 2020.]
- Morris, Barbara. "William Morris and the South Kensington Museum." *Victorian Poetry* 3 (1975): 159-175.
- Morris, William. "Art, Wealth and Riches." *The Collected Works of William Morris XXIII*, edited by May Morris. London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914. 143-163.
- . "The Art of the People." *The Collected Works of William Morris XXII*, edited by May Morris.

- London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914. 28-50.
- , “How We live and How We Might Live.” *The Collected Works of William Morris* XXIII, edited by May Morris. London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914. 3-26.
- , “The Lesser Arts.” *The Collected Works of William Morris* XXII, edited by May Morris. London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914. 3-26.
- , “Useful Work versus Useless Toil.” *The Collected Works of William Morris* XXIII, edited by May Morris. London: Longman and Green and Co., 1914. 98-120.
- 威廉·莫里斯：《乌有乡消息》，黄嘉德、包玉珂译。北京：商务印书馆，1981年。
- [Morris, Williams. *News from Nowhere*, translated by Huang Jiade and Bao Yuke. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1981.]
- Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.
- 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 to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Beijing UP, 2014.]
- ：“文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构”，《中国社会科学》10（2020）：71-92+205-206。
- [—, “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020): 71-92+205-206.]
- Pinkney, Tony. “News from Nowhere in the Museum of Literary Interpretations.” *The Routledge Companion to William Morris*, edited by Florence S. Boos. New York: Routledge, 2021. 404-421.
- Richards, Thomas. *The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire*. London and New York: Verso, 1993.
- Ruskin, John. “Letters on a Museum or Picture Gallery.” *The Complete Works of John Ruskin* 34, edited by Edward Tyas Cook and Alexander Wedderburn. London: Cambridge UP, 1908. 247-262.
- 唐莹、杨金才：“民主、民生、民享——论威廉·莫里斯的生态社会主义艺术”，《海南大学学报（人文社会科学版）》3（2022）：179-185。
- [Tang Ying and Yang Jincai. “The Art of the People, by the People, and for the People: William Morris’s Eco-Socialist View of Art.” *Journal of Hainan University (Humanities & Social Sciences)* 3 (2022): 179-185.]
- Thompson, Edward. *William Morris: Romantic to Revolutionary*. London: The Merlin Press Ltd, 1977.
- Vergo, Peter. *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books, 1989.
- 张莉、杨金才：“威廉·莫里斯劳动观的文学阐释”，《中国社会科学报》2022年9月19日，第004版。
- [Zhang Li and Yang Jincai. “Literary Interpretation of William Morris’ Viewpoints on Labor.” *Chinese Social Sciences Today* 19 September 2022: 004.]



# 《乌鸦巫师》与“资本主义原教旨主义”时代的非洲革命及伦理问题

## African Revolution and its Ethics in *Wizard of the Crow* as Seen in an Era of “Capitalist Fundamentalism”

姚 峰 (Yao Feng)

**内容摘要：**小说《乌鸦巫师》在恩古吉的创作中占有重要地位。一方面，恩古吉刻画了众多从属不同阵营的人物在革命运动中的不同选择，隐含了他对革命伦理的思考。另一方面，在冷战后新自由主义潮流中，《乌鸦巫师》提出了非洲革命的别调。恩古吉在此提示了抵抗的必要性与可能性，并重新提出以“第三世界”这种另类世界性思想资源，反抗西方金融霸权对非洲的再殖民化，这种崭新的世界主义与民族主义互动方式即恩古吉抵抗策略的特征。

**关键词：**恩古吉；《乌鸦巫师》；非洲革命；资本主义原教旨主义；第三世界

**作者简介：**姚峰，上海师范大学外语学院副教授，上海市“世界文学多样性与文明互鉴”创新团队成员，主要研究方向为非洲文学与思想。本文为国家社科基金后期资助项目“齐努阿·阿契贝：非洲小民族作家的解域实践”【项目批号：19FWWB012】、国家社科基金重大项目“非洲英语文学史”【项目批号：19ZDA296】及上海市“世界文学多样性与文明互鉴”创新团队阶段性成果。

**Title:** African Revolution and its Ethics in *Wizard of the Crow* as Seen in an Era of “Capitalist Fundamentalism”

**Abstract:** *Wizard of the Crow* is of great significance in Ngugi’s fictional works. On the one hand, Ngugi portrays many characters belonging to different camps, who make different choices in the process of revolution, implying Ngugi’s thoughts on the ethics of revolution. On the other hand, Ngugi proposes a different perspective of African revolution in the post-Cold War neoliberal trend. Ngugi reminds of the necessity and possibility of resistance. “The Third World” is presented as alternative cosmopolitan intellectual resources to redress the recolonization of Africa under the exertion of Western financial hegemony. Therefore, this unprecedented mode of interaction between cosmopolitanism and nationalism is the unique feature of Ngugi’s strategy of resistance.

**Keywords:** Ngugi; *Wizard of the Crow*; African revolution; capitalist fundamentalism;

the Third World

**Author: Yao Feng** is Associate Professor of English at Foreign Languages College, Shanghai Normal University (Shanghai 200000, China) and a member of the innovative research team on “The Diversity of World Literature and Transfers between Civilizations” in Shanghai. His academic research focuses on African literature and African intellectual history (Email: yaofeng1975@shnu.edu.cn).

《乌鸦巫师》（*Wizard of the Crow*，下文简称《巫师》）基库尤语版本完稿于2002年，是长期流亡海外的恩古吉献给肯尼亚同胞的赠礼，其中不乏对不同群体在肯尼亚后殖民政治斗争中所作不同选择的探讨。伦理选择是文学作品的核心构成。《巫师》作为讽喻性政治寓言，通过刻画以妮亚维拉（Nyawĩra）和独裁者（Ruler）为代表的两个知识精英群体的伦理选择，对“资本主义原教旨主义”时代的非洲革命伦理问题进行深刻反思与探讨。肯尼亚知识分子威利·穆通加（Willy Mutunga）准确指认了《巫师》的两大构成要素，即对独裁统治的“去魅”与“抵抗”。不过，此作展开的抵抗叙事与恩古吉以往作品有所不同。<sup>1</sup>美国学者伊恩·麦克唐纳（Ian P. MacDonald）曾明言《巫师》与恩古吉之前作品区别在于“从民族主义走向了全球范围，从而拓宽了早先对于抵抗较狭隘的再现”（MacDonald and Ian 59）<sup>2</sup>。自《巫师》始，恩古吉的论述视角从民族转向世界。应该说，非洲现代文学与外来殖民主义密不可分，民族性与世界性天然地彼此交织。因此，我们不能因为此作涉及大量当代全球性力量就否定其民族性，或认为此前作品就拘泥于地方一隅。本文认为恩古吉在后冷战时代，通过《巫师》重新提出了反殖反帝革命这一彼时思想潮流中（看似）不合时宜的话题，即在全球金融资本主义当道的新语境中，如何提出有效的抵抗策略并展开新的抵抗实践。若将民族主义与世界主义统归于“抵抗”主题之下，二者未必是非此即彼的对立关系，或呈现为彼此借力并相互转化的互动往来。文学伦理学批评要求文学批评必须回到历史现场，即在既定的伦理环境中批评文学。<sup>3</sup>本文即通过此作重返两个知识精英群体走向不同道路的历史现场，拟在《巫师》呈现的肯尼亚后殖民政治斗争史脉络中，从必要性、可能性与具体策略三方面层层揭开恩古吉布局的抵抗图景及其提出的世界主义新论。

1 参见 Willy Mutunga, “Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o at 80: Inspiring Encounters,” *Ngũgĩ: Reflections on His Life of Writing*, edited by Simon Gikandi and Ndirangu Wachanga, Woodbridge, Suffolk: James Currey, 2018, 69.

2 本文外文引文均出自笔者译。

3 参见 Nie Zhenzhao, “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory,” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 192.

## 一、革命的必要性：“全球银行”的金融霸权与“独裁者”的买办属性

《巫师》中的美国特使访问非洲阿布拉利亚国（Aburiria，下文简称阿国），敦促该国“与世界步调一致”，以实现“构筑全球秩序的新使命”（Thiong'o 580）<sup>1</sup>。恩古吉借人物之口、从西方资本一端点明冷战后资本主义的新特征，即“所有盘算都受制于全球化的规律与需要”（580）。恩古吉将此新特征归为“资本主义的原教旨主义”，且“惟此一种组织现实的方式”（Thiong'o, *Secure the Base* 23）。小说以全球银行（Global Bank）与全球金融部（Global Ministry of Finance）为喻体，暗指以世界银行与国际货币基金组织为代表的西方金融霸权对非洲乃至第三世界的深度控制，在资本主义全球体系的边缘地带体现了金融帝国主义的原教旨主义属性。

恩古吉曾预言，20世纪90年代表现为新自由主义的帝国主义面对“激进的民族解放”与“根本的社会变革”诉求，会进入“最后的疯狂阶段”，而斗争的“剧场”依是第三世界（Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre* 53）。恩古吉在《巫师》中次第展开的抵抗未直接指向西方资本或新殖民主义，而主要针对作为西方资本代理人的本土统治集团。《巫师》以较大篇幅叙述了独裁者如何依仗白人权势登上“权力巅峰”（231-232）。独裁者既然选择依附殖民者势力登上高位，就表明已在一己私利与人民利益之间做了伦理选择。《巫师》中的独裁者未必对应肯尼亚或非洲现实政治中的某个人物，而是多个政治人物的“集大成者”，独裁者及其政党独立后在经济与外交上得到了白人殖民者的支持，助其跻身仅次于首任总统的二号人物，这与肯尼亚政治史实大致相符。

整个60年代，乔莫·肯雅塔（Jomo Kenyatta）政府声称既反对西方资本主义，也反对东方共产主义，选择积极的不结盟政策。小说中的独裁者面对美国来使亦持相似论调，称不可能“总是听命于西方”（581）。但事实上，政治精英在独立后竞相寻找域外金援国，为各自政治活动提供资金，故总体采取了亲西方、亲资本的对外政策，导致肯尼亚未获得真正意义上的独立。20世纪70年代以来，西方经济增长乏力，陷入了结构性危机，第三世界随之陷入粮食危机、债务危机。对此，非洲新马克思主义理论家萨米尔·阿明（Samir Amin）认为上述70年代的危机“标志着一个时代的终结”，即对亚非拉而言“民族资产阶级世纪”（*Transforming the Revolution* 115）的终结。领导了民族解放运动的肯尼亚资产阶级，此时甘愿蜕变为西方利益的代理人，迎合西方跨国资本的全球扩张。法国当代非洲政治观察家让-弗朗索瓦·巴亚特（Jean-François Bayart）认为，非洲国家与外部世界关系的最大特征是“依附”；作为殖民主义的后果，肯尼亚的经济力量取决于发达国家

1 本文有关《乌鸦巫师》的引文均来自 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow* (New York: Anchor Books, 2006)。以下引文仅标注页码，不再一一说明。

对其进口需求。由于缺乏足够的资源发展经济，后殖民政权只能在此依附关系中充当“中间人”（intermediaries），赢得政权就等于控制了私人资本投资、出口收益与援助资金的流入。<sup>1</sup>这种由“外向”（extraversion）导致的依附性，是后殖民时代非洲各种社会危机的根源，阿明称之为“买办化臣服”（compradorized subordination），即恩古吉所谓资本主义的原教旨主义在资本主义世界体系边缘地带（如非洲）造成的恶果。

恩古吉对阿布拉利亚国当局的买办属性用墨甚多，主要表现于买办政权对西方金融资本的依附。法农强调，殖民地国家民族资产阶级在心理层面对西方资产阶级的认同，其“内核”是“享乐主义的心态”（Fanon 101）。小说中，塔吉里卡（Tajirika）与妻子维吉尼娅（Vinjinia）对白人的认同，就表现为法农意义上的晚年“享乐主义”。扮作乌鸦巫师的卡米提（Kamĩtĩ）让夫妇二人闭上眼睛想象暮年相伴的画面。此时，塔吉里卡脑中显现的是“殖民者的样子”（186），即曾在阿国“对我们发号施令的那些人”（186）；维吉尼娅又补充说，这些昔日殖民者看上去“是纯粹的白色”（186）；二人臆想自己曾差点成了阿国的总督与第一夫人，回忆起曾拥有的城中大宅与海边别墅，有佣人伺候左右，还想起房前屋后的草坪、绿篱、泳池与车队。按法农的思路分析，非洲买办资产阶级未曾经历西方资产阶级青少年时代的肆无忌惮与生机勃勃，因而《巫师》此处的晚年想象也以文学手法印证了此阶级在思想上的孱弱与依附性。<sup>2</sup>

20世纪80、90年代之交，在以新殖民主义与美国霸权为两大基本特征的历史条件下，帝国主义在政治领域的具体表现形式是扶植与支持“全世界最反动、最压迫的”（Thiong'o, *Moving the Centre* 51）独裁统治。买办资产阶级政权如果对外表现为依附性，那么对内的特征必定是压迫性。《巫师》以夸张的手法淋漓尽致地塑造了典型的独裁者形象，以体现上述“压迫性”特征。民族资产阶级在独立后，无力凭借经济手段确保统治，故无力兑现独立运动时期的承诺，国家在独立后逐步陷入经济停滞的困境中，而为了掩盖这样的停滞或倒退、赋予其统治以合法性，资产阶级惟有在首都修筑庞大建筑，把大量资金用于“形象工程”（Fanon 111）。小说中最典型的“形象工程”是贯穿全篇的通天塔（*Marching to Heaven*）——类似以色列人未能建成的巴比塔。这大致影射了莫伊总统1989年提议在内罗毕的自由公园（Uhuru Park）修建的巨型建筑——科尼亚时代传媒中心（Kenya Times Media Complex）。

独裁者终究只是“一群投机者的CEO”，而民众“痛苦地在无法忍受的贫困中停滞不前”（Fanon 112）。小说中独裁者的阔绰与民众的贫困形成鲜

1 参见 Jean-François Bayart and Stephen Ellis, “Africa in the world: A history of extraversion,” *African Affairs* 2 (2000): 217-267.

2 参见 Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 186-187.

明对比，生日庆典后的一个周日，独裁者前往教堂的豪华车队途径圣玛利亚集市（Santamaria marketplace），与市场中的驴车与人力车之间反差惊人。<sup>1</sup>在这些处于资本主义世界体系边缘的国家，“巨大的财富”与“极度的贫困”（Fanon 117）相伴而生，如同《巫师》中在埃尔达雷斯现代建筑与地产公司外面分别形成的两支队伍——一支是急于从通天塔工程中渔利的投机富商群体，另一支则是嗷嗷待哺的失业贫民群体。恩古吉在《巫师》中，暴露了冷战后金融帝国主义在全球结构乃至第三世界国家内部造成的两极化恶果，揭露了非洲资产阶级执政当局对外依附国际资本、对内强化集权统治。在新自由主义时代，兼具“软弱性”与“有害性”的民族资产阶级，彻底沦为资本主义国际金融霸权的依附者与分享者，恩古吉籍此指明了与之展开“抵抗”斗争的必要性。

## 二、革命的可能性：买办政权的“薄弱环节”与妮亚维拉的革命主体

我们要在此提出，资本主义世界体系的薄弱环节如何为民众有组织的抵抗创造了可能性与前提这一问题。列宁在《论欧洲联邦口号》一文中提出了“经济和政治发展不平衡是资本主义的绝对规律”（709）。作为“绝对规律”，这个“薄弱环节”在冷战后的资本主义世界体系中，很可能存于受其间接控制的后殖民国家，并直接体现为非洲民族资产阶级的软弱性。恩古吉似乎很少使用“薄弱环节”或类似字眼，但在其作品中不乏此类描写，尤其是统治阶级阵营内部的裂痕与倾轧。

《巫师》中，这首先表现为内阁部长之间的相互猜忌与拆台。“邪恶排队事件”发生后，两位内阁部长在独裁者召集的紧急会议上展开了一番唇枪舌剑。希凯奥库（Sikiokuu）主张严禁民众排队集结，暗讽全球银行访问活动的组织者马乔卡利（Machokali）在其“政治袖管”中暗藏阴谋；后者针锋相对，认为排队是民众支持“通天塔”工程的表现，应予鼓励。其他阁员一概作壁上观，不问是非，只会倒向胜出者一边。<sup>2</sup>此外，“薄弱环节”也显现于独裁者与内阁部长之间。独裁者善于挑动部长间的明争暗斗，自己遂成各方争取与依靠的对象，但部长们对他也怀有二心。小说中希凯奥库的满腹欲望塞于“if”不能抒发，后在巫师引导下袒露了对最高权力的觊觎之心，“if”之意为：“如果”独裁者病了或死了，他就能取而代之。<sup>3</sup>“薄弱环节”甚至发生于统治者的家庭内部、至亲之间。小说中的独裁者一直通过特务组织M5暗中监视几个儿子。<sup>4</sup>而儿子们在“宫廷政变”后，为了换取新政权的赦免，居然都声明独裁者父亲确已“自行消失”（754）。最后，“薄弱环节”同样存在于资本主义霸权国家与第三世界国家的代理人之间。小说中，

1 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 26.

2 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 159-164.

3 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 414.

4 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 262.



美国特使直白地向独裁者表达警告与威胁，要求他让位，独裁者虽承认美国或许能扶他上位，但不会任由美国赶自己下台。<sup>1</sup>

需特别指出的是，上文指认的这些“薄弱环节”有赖于革命主体通过具体政治纲领以及对斗争形势的研判才能被识别甚至创造。因此，只有形成反对新殖民主义的革命力量，并展开能够逆转敌我力量对比的革命实践，以上所谓本土买办政权固有的孱弱性及其内部的分裂与倾轧才能充分呈现，并转化为可资利用的“薄弱环节”。法农曾提到，少数正直的知识分子尽管缺乏确定的政治思想，但本能地反感独立后争权夺利的现象，不信任那些投机分子；他因此强调，在将国家引入健康发展方向的决定性斗争中，要对这些知识分子善加利用。<sup>2</sup>《巫师》中，出身富商家庭、受过高等教育的妮亚维拉就是能识别与促成“薄弱环节”的“正直的知识分子”。故事开篇不久，塔吉里卡大谈前日晚上在天堂酒店欢迎全球银行访问团的活动被乞丐破坏的闹剧，断定这些乞丐是政敌派去的搅局者，并论定“我们见不得自己人成功”（102）；妮亚维拉此时准确识别了其中端倪，断定这是刺探消息的“绝佳时刻”（102）。此类对“薄弱环节”的指认与促成始终贯穿于妮亚维拉的革命实践。独裁者及统治集团荒淫腐朽、罔顾民生，推翻他们具有革命正当性。但是，目的正义与手段正义，二者不可分割<sup>3</sup>。展开革命实践的过程中，妮亚维拉难免面临诸多道德选择。道德选择是实现自我约束和抑制自我欲望，在理性引导下追求正确的选择结果。妮亚维拉坚持人道主义伦理，促成了有利于革命目标达成的“薄弱环节”，最典型的事例莫过于维吉尼娅的转化。维吉尼娅遭受丈夫误解、冷遇与家暴，来到乌鸦巫师处讨要毒药谋害丈夫。人道主义思想让妮亚维拉“绝不会给她毒药，也不会扼杀她的希望”（481）。于是，她用“人民法庭”为其讨回公道。表面上，这是法外施暴，属于“蓄意伤人”，但如此才能保住塔吉里卡一命。从此角度看，妮亚维拉“革命有道”，不仅没有残害生命，而且一劳永逸地解决了问题，又造成了维吉尼娅这一统治集团中的“薄弱环节”。妮亚维拉奉行的是一种严苛的政治伦理。作为革命队伍的领导者，她并未“足不履危地”（鲁迅 393），而是身先士卒，多次涉险，迥异于现实世界里只会躲在群众身后“指点江山”的革命者。

抵抗的可能性若要转化为抵抗运动的实践，抵抗的策略就尤为重要。随着冷战终结，第三世界作为两极格局中的国际政治运动似乎也随之终结，但恩古吉在小说中重新提示第三世界的存在，似乎是对新自由主义思潮全球化的反动，也似乎提示我们作为政治运动的第三世界或许已沉寂，但作为思想资源的第三世界依然有效。在《巫师》中，明显可见民族主义与世界主义的

1 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong'o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 582-584.

2 参见 Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Richard Philcox, New York: Grove Press, 2004, 121.

3 参见 林峥：“如何反抗——鲁迅〈铸剑〉的革命伦理思索与国民革命反思”，《中国现代文学研究丛刊》1（2023）：123。



互动，不过恩古吉此处强调的是另一种世界主义，即将第三世界的思想资源引入后冷战时代的非洲民族独立运动。

### 三、革命的策略：作为解放对象的“阿布拉利亚国”与作为思想资源的“第三世界”

恩古吉对于20世纪90年代国际格局的认知，似乎未受历史终结论思潮的裹挟，反认为帝国主义的新殖民主义形式进入了最后疯狂时期。而在恩古吉看来，“斗争的剧场”依然是“第三世界”（Thiong’o, *Moving the Centre* 53），《巫师》中的阿国即体现了这一场域。在社会主义运动陷入低潮的后冷战时代，帝国主义通过“分化、削弱与瓦解抵抗”（21）策略，造成了昔日革命者纷纷倒戈变节，在此条件下非洲的抵抗运动该何去何从？

《巫师》中展开的抵抗图景与恩古吉之前的作品确有区别，体现于大量域外元素参与了小说情节的编织与开展，尤其是小说中反复明确指认的“第三世界”。可见，评论界注意到《巫师》的“世界主义”转向并非没有根据，但问题在于：所谓“世界主义”转向是否以否定民族意识或民族主义思虑为代价，还是与后者构成了某种内在关联与互动，这是解读此作的关键。如果说恩古吉早期小说中非洲本土与西方外来思想更多表现为冲突与紧张，那么在《巫师》中的确有所变化，即内外两种力量还表现为相互借力、彼此呼应的关系。进一步言，这些民族性资源与世界性资源能否进入小说中革命者的视野，完全取决于其成为抵抗实践的手段与力量的可能性。因此，对这些民族性与世界性资源的评判，并不取决于民族性与世界性二者本身孰优孰劣，而取决于能否为革命实践所用。

《巫师》呈现了阿国人对印度教育的负面认知，该国甚至有人妄言印度的学位可购于集市，卡米提为靖浮言，强调自己在印度求学期间收获丰硕，选修了草药学，对植物的根、叶、皮皆有研究。<sup>1</sup>恩古吉引出如此偏门的异国之学，并非随意之举，看似与非洲革命抵抗运动无甚瓜葛的草药学在后文中成为助力革命之显学。小说最后，卡米提被带到了中弹后曾接受手术的医院，强调要根据个人修养的“七草药”（Seven Herbs of Grace）原则将此地建成健康与洁净生活的育儿所；“天赐七草药”旨在推广健康的生活方式，包括饮食禁忌、欲望节制、生命哲学等，其中最重要的思想是善，即平衡。此处的“平衡”乃针对资本主义世界体系之恶。对于森林等自然资源，阿布拉利亚国政府与美国、欧洲、日本大公司连同当地富人没有节制地滥砍滥伐，破坏了降雨的节奏，造成了土地荒漠化。<sup>2</sup>对此，小说所作总结——“他们懂得如何索取，但不知如何回馈土地”（201）——似反向阐明了“七草药”原则作为域外思想对于非洲本土革命实践的意义。恩古吉在小说中建立了源

1 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong’o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 57.

2 参见 Ngugi wa Thiong’o, *Wizard of the Crow*, New York: Anchor Books, 2006, 201.

自印度的“草药学”与老子《道德经》中“道”（Tao, The Way）之间的联系。卡米提把自然之法推荐给妮亚维拉，即“简朴与平衡”，也就是“道”（266）。因此，无论印度“草药学”体现的“平衡”思想，还是中国老庄思想中“道”，皆强调人与自然之间“取”和“予”的和谐关系，都是对资产阶级原教旨主义对非洲的掠夺与破坏行径的否定，提示包括印度与中国在内的第三世界形成思想的共同体，成为可助益非洲革命运动的思想资源。

从有利于抵抗运动的眼光看，不仅作为某种外部性存在的第三世界可进入革命者的视野，而且原本被视为本土文化糟粕的部分也具有反转为革命力量的潜能。恩古吉早期作品中的巫术叙事都较为负面，无论殖民者输入的现代性观念中，还是反殖民主义的民族主义话语中，都难有其地位可言。不过，《巫师》或许标志了恩古吉的某种认知转变，此作中的巫术不是法农所谓殖民主义把非洲文化归入的迷信，而是一种虔诚信念，在恩古吉这里进一步成了可资抵抗与革命的能动性资源。乌鸦巫师这一隐蔽身份屡次帮助两位主角（也是乌鸦巫师的化身）逃脱险境、刺探情报或动员民众。A.G.警官从镇压革命的敌对势力，转变为同情与支持革命的力量，巫师信仰在其中发挥了关键作用。因此，革命者妮亚维拉在认识到卡米提拥有“上帝赐予的占卜力量”（210）时，当即要求他用此天赋为人民服务、为抵抗运动服务。

人类文明三阶段理论由自然选择、伦理选择和科学选择组成，这三阶段承上启下，推动着历史发展。<sup>1</sup>伦理选择阶段，即我们目前所处阶段，是人类文明的开始，也是最重要的阶段。在中文语境里，伦理选择的术语表达两个概念：伦理选择阶段和伦理选择活动。在决定是否成为“乌鸦巫师”的过程中，卡米提就经历了一系列道德伦理选择活动。假扮乌鸦巫师吓走警官后，妮亚维拉希望他以此能力助力革命，但他只想远离政治，遂予以拒绝并遁入森林。之后，妮亚维拉找到他，再次邀请他加入组织，但再次遭拒。后来，妮亚维拉因革命行动暴露受伤，逃进森林后被卡米提所救。妮亚维拉向他询问革命之法，卡米提建议她回到首都并愿意陪她同行，而回到首都意味着卡米提需要重扮乌鸦巫师，即参与到革命活动中来。彼时，卡米提的决定或单纯出于保护心上人的思虑，但他亲眼见证了统治阶级一系列的无道行径，遂转念效仿妮亚维拉救民众于水火，哪怕身中枪伤也在所不惜。所有人都生活在伦理选择之中并通过伦理选择活动体现其存在，最终完成人生的整个伦理选择过程。卡米提所作一系列伦理选择活动即体现了他对个人本质的探索与实现，他对乌鸦巫师身份前后的态度转变根本取决于对革命态度的转变，这一转变源于其目睹人民深陷水火之中，体现了他的人道主义关怀，最终在革命过程中作出了伦理选择。

1 参见 Nie Zhenzhao, “Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection,” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 384.

### 结语：两种世界主义的对峙与非洲革命的伦理

“资本主义原教旨主义”是恩古吉对于新自由主义时代的基本认知，这一时代的非洲革命问题见于不同阵营作出的不同伦理选择，编织了革命进程。革命对象以个人利益为出发点进行伦理选择，激起民愤，造成了革命的必要性；革命者的伦理选择则在人民一方，维护人民利益，提示了革命的可能性。判断任何思想是否有效，恩古吉认为关键未必是“解释世界”，而是“改变世界”（Thiong'o, *Penpoints, Gunpoints, and Dreams* 132）。恩古吉在全球进入金融帝国主义时代后仍提出非洲革命的问题，正是立足于“改变”。这种改变的基本对象依然是肯尼亚乃至非洲大陆，但面对资本主义金融霸权的全球化，单靠肯尼亚一国甚至非洲大陆自身似不足以实现这种改变，因此恩古吉在《巫师》重提“第三世界”这一彼时似已过时的概念，提出了亚非拉重新联合的思想。小说中存在两种世界主义的紧张与对峙，即代表被压迫者与革命者的第三世界与代表压迫者与革命对象的西方世界之间的对峙。因此，恩古吉于此作中彰显的，并非融入西方既定秩序的世界主义，而是与造成全球性压迫的秩序展开斗争的另类世界主义，我们姑且称之为第三世界主义。因此，这种世界主义与非洲民族的独立与解放相互呼应、彼此借力。熟悉恩古吉文学写作与思想演进的读者可从《巫师》中看到恩古吉彼时思想的几重特征，大致可归纳为三个伦理选择：即从早期民族主义思想本位转向第三世界共同体的新论述、从传统的反（新）殖民主义话语转向抵制金融帝国主义全球霸权的新目标、从精英知识分子转向工农大众的新革命主体。需要说明的是，这三重伦理转变是一个渐变过程，而非骤变于《巫师》的创作过程，但我们或可提出，这几重伦理转向至《巫师》基本完成或更为成熟。

### Works Cited

- Amin, Samir. et al. *Transforming the Revolution: Social Movements and the World-system*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1990.
- . *Spectres of Capitalism: A Critique of Current Intellectual Fashions*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1998.
- Bayart, Jean-François and Stephen Ellis.. “Africa in the World: A History of Extraversion.” *African Affairs* 2 (2000): 217-267.
- Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press, 2004.
- 列宁：“论欧洲联邦口号”，《列宁选集》第2卷，中共中央马克思恩格斯列宁斯大林著作编译局编。上海：人民出版社，2012年。
- [Lenin, Vladimir Ilich. “On the Slogan for a United State of Europe”, edited by central Compilation and Translation: *The Collected Works of Lenin* Vol. 2. Shanghai: People’s Publishing House, 2012.]

林峥：“如何反抗——鲁迅〈铸剑〉的革命伦理思索与国民革命反思”，《中国现代文学研究丛刊》1（2023）：121-131。

[Lin Zheng. “How to Resist: Thoughts on Revolution Ethics and Reflections on National Revolution.” *Modern Chinese Literature Studies* 1 (2023): 121-131.]

鲁迅：“致杨霁云”（1935年2月24日），《鲁迅全集》第13卷。北京：人民文学出版社，1981年。

[Lu Xun. “To Yang Jiyun” (24 February 1935). *The Complete Works of Lu Xun* Vol.13. Beijing: People’s Literature Publishing House, 1981.]

MacDonald and Ian P.. “The Cyboge Manifesto: Time, Utopia, and Globality in Ngũgĩ’s *Wizard of the Crow*.” *Research in African Literatures* 1 (2016): 57-75.

Mutunga, Willy. “Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o at 80: Inspiring Encounters.” *Ngũgĩ: Reflections on His Life of Writing*, edited by Simon Gikandi and Ndirangu Wachanga. Woodbridge, Suffolk: James Currey, 2018.

Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.

—. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 383-398.

Thiong’o, Ngũgĩ wa. *Moving the Centre: the Struggle for Cultural Freedoms*. London: James Currey, Heinemann, 1993.

—. *Penpoints, Gunpoints, and Dreams: Towards a Critical Theory of the Arts and the State in Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

—. *Secure the Base: Making Africa Visible in the Globe*. New York: Seagull Books, 2016.

—. *Wizard of the Crow*. New York: Anchor Books, 2006.

# 朝鲜族春香故事的世纪流转与跨国变异

## On the Centenary Circulation and the Transnational Variation of the Korean Novel *Chunhyangjeon*

赵渭绒 (Zhao Weirong)

**内容摘要：**《春香传》是朝鲜古典经典文学名著，其故事历经几个世纪的流传依然经久不衰。春香故事在流传的过程中经历形态演变及文本变异，并在之后形成了数以百计的各种版本及有关春香故事的文本群。我国当代女作家金仁顺于2014年出版的长篇小说《春香》是对《春香传》的续写和改编，作者用一种全新的现代性观念来重写经典文本，与前文本有着明显的互文关系与文化落差，其中亦蕴含着故事文本的种种变异。从比较文学变异学的角度对其具体故事的百年流变进行变异研究，不仅能揭示文学流传与接受的基本规律而且有益对中韩两国的文学与文化的深度认知。

**关键词：**《春香传》；《春香》；文本变异

**作者简介：**赵渭绒，四川大学文学与新闻学院教授，主要从事比较文学研究、中外文学关系研究。本文为2021年度国家社科基金项目“比较文学方法论与话语建构研究(1978-2020)”【项目批号：21BWW021】和四川大学中央高校“双一流”人才专项青年杰出人才培育项目【项目批号：SKSYL201825】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** On the Centenary Circulation and Transnational Variation of the Korean Novel *Chunhyangjeon*

**Abstract:** *Chunhyangjeon* is a classic in Korean literature, which tells of a story circulated among the public for centuries. The circulation processes of the story *Chunxiang* have witnessed various variations, hundreds of different versions and text groups taking shape. A novel of nearly the same, *Chunxiang*, published in 2014 by Jin Renshun, the Chinese female writer, whose ethnic belonging is Korean, is an expansion and adaptation of *Chunhyangjeon*. The female writer reinterprets the classic text through the lens of a new concept of modernity, which ultimately creates an intertextuality with the previous texts and falls behind the previous texts in form and content. It would not only reveal the basic law of literary spread and acceptance but also benefit the in-depth cognition of Chinese and Korean literature and culture if we examined the variation of specific stories in the past century from the perspec-



tive of comparative literature variation theory.

**Keywords:** the Korean novel *Chunhyangjeon*; *Chunxiang*; text variations

**Author:** Zhao Weirong is Professor in the College of Literature and Journalism, Sichuan University (Chengdu 610064, China). Her major research areas include comparative literature and Chinese-foreign literary relationships (Email: zhao-weirong2005@163.com).

《春香传》是韩国古典名著，在韩国文学史上地位显赫。在韩国专门研究《春香传》的“春学”，足见其地位与影响。迄今为止，学者们发现《春香传》版本繁多，大致有韩文版<sup>1</sup>的《谚文春香传》、小说《广寒楼记》《烈女春香守节歌》（全州土版）、《狱中花》、汉文版的《水山广寒楼记》《汉文春香传》、抄本《古本春香传》等。学界普遍认为，最为权威的版本是全州土版的《烈女春香守节歌》，其保留的故事情节比较完整，艺术成就最高。<sup>2</sup>朝鲜学者尹世平在提到《春香传》版本时，认为除了以上版本，还存在朝文本的京版《春香传》《小春香歌》以及《古本春香传》等。此外，在新小说泛滥时期还有黄色本的《狱中花》《狱中香》《狱中佳人》《乌鹊桥》等十几种民间流传的各种手抄本。<sup>3</sup>我国1956年由作家出版社出版的《春香传》就是根据全州土版《烈女春香守节歌》翻译改编的，目前通行的几种版本大概都是在此版的基础上衍化而成。春香故事作为一种民族记忆烙印在朝鲜文人心里，我国朝鲜族女作家金仁顺于2014年出版的长篇小说《春香》正是对春香故事的现代性续写和改编，作者用一种全新的现代性观念重新解读经典文本，与前文本有着明显的互文关系与较大的文化落差。本文拟从比较文学变异学的角度，对其具体故事的百年流变及其跨国变异进行研究，旨在揭示文学流传与接受的基本规律，力图增强对中韩两国文学与文化的深度认知。

## 一、从“春阳”到“春香”：由历史事件到春香故事的形态演变及变异原因

朝鲜族春香故事是由历史上真实发生的事件改编演绎而成，其故事在流传后世的过程中，情节略有不同。在众多的说法中，韩国学界认为以纯祖时期赵在三的说法较为可信。<sup>4</sup>据他在《松南杂识》中记载：“南原府李道会

1 关于《谚文春香传》，学界有争议，有人认为是韩文版《谚文春香传》，也有认为是汉文版《谚文春香传》，笔者认为，由于谚文本采取一个汉字一个韩语的形式，因此称为谚解版较为恰当。

2 参见尹世平：“关于‘春香传’”，《春香传》，冰蔚、张友鸾译，北京：作家出版社，1956年，第2页。

3 参见尹世平：“关于‘春香传’”，《春香传》，冰蔚、张友鸾译，北京：作家出版社，1956年，第2页。

4 参见韦旭昇：《韩国文学史》，北京：北京大学出版社，2008年，第326页。



昞童妓春阳，后为李道令守节，新使卓宗立杀之。好事者哀之，演其义为打令，以雪春阳之冤，彰春阳之节”（韦旭昇 326）。这里的春阳<sup>1</sup>，即是后来在不断演绎的故事文本中的春香。从这段记载可以看到，作为真实事件的“春阳”故事里的春阳，其人物结局无法摆脱死亡的命运。在等级森严的封建社会，艺妓的社会地位非常低下，权贵官僚将艺妓看作私有财产，对她们随意迫害。高丽诗人郑袭明的《赠妓》：“百花丛里淡丰容，忽被狂风减却红。獭髓未能医玉颊，五陵公子恨无穷”（赵云伧影印版），反映的就是封建等级社会下艺妓的悲惨遭遇。可见，艺妓受到虐待甚至致死的案例在当时时有发生，甚至是得到主流社会的默许的。但是，在封建社会日益没落，市民意识逐渐高涨的情况下，春阳作为被侮辱被损害的下层妇女得到了下层民众与一些具有良知的士大夫阶层的普遍同情，他们在诗歌中反映她们的悲惨遭遇，在市井里巷传唱她们的故事，由于内心深深的同情，他们在流传的过程中对故事情节做了根本性的改变。

盘索里是朝鲜民族富有叙事性的曲艺艺术，在表演中兼具文学性与音乐性。关于盘索里的最早文献是柳振汉在英祖三十年（1754）所编订的长篇汉诗晚华本《春香歌》。据说，柳振汉是忠清道的贵族，他在观看了艺人表演的“盘索里”春香故事后写下了《春香歌》，遂将口传形态的春香故事转化为具有文字记载的《春香歌》脚本。<sup>2</sup>因此，盘索里《春香歌》脚本是春香故事最早的文字形态，其中多有对现实故事的改编。正如我国学者指出：“盘索里文学题材内容的意象化、理想化，并不是指盘索里文学是远离现实生活的空中楼阁。恰恰相反，盘索里文学的这种富于理想色彩的生活画面背后，却蕴藏着韩国民众对苦难生活的真切体验以及他们对美好生活的强烈愿望”（池水涌 360-361）。盘索里表演的兴盛，对春香故事的流传起着至关重要的作用，从英祖时期编订的《春香歌》到顺祖时期出现盘索里八大名唱，春香故事随着盘索里的广泛流行而影响深远。到了高宗时期，申在孝把流传下来的《春香歌》进行整理，纠正了其中的错别字，将作品中较为庸俗与不合理的部分进行改写，进一步提升了作品的文学性与艺术性。在盘索里的传唱中，春香的命运发生了根本性的改变，为了适应下层民众的心理需求，说唱艺人将春香惨死的结局加以改编，添加了被恶吏威逼、殴打、入狱、守节、被救、团圆的基本情节。从这个意义上讲，春香故事已不是单纯的男女爱情故事，而是反映平民意识的觉醒、揭示官吏无道、社会黑暗的社会小说。春香故事由历史上真实的春阳事件演变、变异为盘索里脚本体小说，之后又经各类文人改编润色开始了纯粹的小说化道路，形成后来的经典小说《春香传》。

1 在朝鲜语中，“春阳”和“春香”的发音极为相似，在以后的各种版本流传中“春香”渐渐成为学界通说。

2 参见金东旭：《春香传研究》，首尔：延世大学出版社，1965年，第165-166页。

至于为什么会出现故事情节的根本变异？从朝鲜族的传统文化与文化接受心理来看，大概有以下三个方面的原因：一为在古朝鲜的建国神话檀君神话中，有一虎一熊同穴而生，常常祈求神灵愿化身为人类，后经指点，食大蒜、燃灵艾，忌二十一天，虎不能忍，熊终化为女身，并于帝释之子桓雄结合生下檀君王俭的故事。这与《春香传》中春香被救、与化身暗行御史的李梦龙团圆、结合生下三男二女，个个聪明伶俐，三子官至一品，春香被封贞烈夫人，梦龙为吏曹参议和大司丞之职的具体情节相似，都是韩民族在精神上追求身份提升、行动上追求进步的深层民族文化心理意识的体现。二是受朝鲜古代小说中的“贞女、烈女”原型都弥之妻故事的影响而形成的贞烈观念，如《三国史记》列传中的《都弥传》曾记录了发生在百济盖娄王时期的都弥之妻的故事：都弥之妻美丽而有节操，国王知道后派人诱之，都弥之妻派婢女侍奉。后见欺于国王，王怀恨挖掉都弥的双眼，继续诱之，妇佯做答应后逃之流放都弥的江边，与夫羁旅天涯。这些故事在流传的过程中渐渐地成为韩民族的集体无意识，成为民族心理的深层积淀，一旦机会合适便牵制着韩民族的世风追求。三是市民阶层意识的觉醒，底层人民对权贵的反抗意识增强，身处底层的人民不愿看到春香惨死的结局，而对其进行了合理的改编。于是在改编后的《春香传》中，春香在惨遭卞学道殴打时，执行命令的刑吏也不忍心，悄悄地上前低语：“你要挺着点，有什么法子呢。我打在左腿，你往右躲，打在右腿，你往左躲”（佚名 75）<sup>1</sup>。春香在惨遭殴打后，众妓女一起围上，就连南原镇的老寡妇和年轻妇女也出来了，大家纷纷为她流泪叹息，连傻大个子落春也跑过来了，把药面喂到她的嘴里，口中说着：“莫不是咱们南原也要出个能上烈女牌的人了”（佚名 78）。在春香身上，一方面是精神上追求进步上升，虽然母亲出身艺妓，但自己坚决不愿为妓的抗争精神；另一方面是与梦龙结合后在道德伦理上严苛的自我约束能力，即便在遭遇强权压迫命运堪忧的紧迫形势下也誓不屈服。春香的事迹在精神上得到了韩民族的集体强烈共鸣，因而以致她的故事广为流传。

## 二、由“口传故事”到“文学文本”：故事定型后文本变异研究

春香故事经过柳振汉、申在孝的加工整理与改编已经跻身为韩国的经典文学文本，其故事情节也基本固定下来。就这样，历史上的“春阳事件”经各类盘索里艺人的口头演绎、贵族文人的文字文本定型变异转型为后来我们看到的《春香传》。故事定型后的《春香传》包含着多个层面的变异，如语言变异、文本变异、翻译变异等。在跨文化的文学接受中，接受者的传统文化与民族集体无意识会作为“先见”而产生制约作用，从而导致接受变异。

中韩两国地理位置毗邻，韩国文化深受儒家文化的浸染与影响，《春香传》中引用了很多汉文诗，其中最著名的一首便是李梦龙在卞学道的竞诗

1 外文引文均为笔者译。

宴上写的诗：“金樽美酒千人血，玉盘佳肴万姓膏。烛泪落时民泪落，歌声高处怨声高”（冰蔚 张友鸾译 95）。这首诗与我国广州博物馆珍藏的一件乾隆、嘉庆年间的翰林院侍讲梁同书的《恭录嘉庆七年御制骂廷臣诗》十分相似，原诗抄录如下：“满朝文武着锦袍，闾阎与朕无分毫；一杯美酒千人血，数碗肥羹万姓膏。人泪落时天泪落，笑声高处哭声高；牛羊付与豺狼牧，负尽皇恩为尔曹”（柳应九 5-6）。从时间上看，嘉庆在世时间为1760年至1820年，而韩国历史上真实的春阳事件发生时间学界公认是在朝鲜纯祖时期1801年至1834年。由此可见，梦龙的此诗应是韩国贵族在之后改编《春香传》的过程中新加入的，由此可以推断其诗是对嘉庆诗的借用与转化，属于文学变异的一种形式。

此外，梦龙端午初见春香及春香荡秋千是《春香传》里的最著名的情景，也是各个版本着墨最多的地方。以下通过三个译本的对比来阐述共时文本变异形态及变迁过程：

绿荫千尺，红裳迎风放异彩；长空万里，白云闪电发奇光。“瞻之在前，忽焉在后。”荡向前时，如盈盈燕子，桃红一点；荡向后时，似偏偏蝴蝶，粉翼双飘。那里是人间女子挽绳戏弄秋千架，分明是巫山神女乘云飞舞在阳台。（冰蔚 张友鸾译 10）

在一棵大柳树百尺高的枝子上系了秋千，春香摘下罩纱、紫鞋扔在短草坪上，大红裙子紧裹身，纤纤手指握住秋千绳，穿着雪白布袜的两只脚登在了秋千上。

苗条的身子在秋千上匀称地运着劲，身后乌亮的辫子和红甲纱发带随风舞荡，身前佩在腰间的玉佩什物琅琅作响，紫红的腰带随风飘舞。

（佚名 14）

春香嘴里一边叫着让香丹推秋千，一边曲膝躬身，使秋千前后摆动。凭借香丹推动之力，秋千悠悠荡起，时而荡向前空，时而荡向后空，高高飘向天际。衣裙被风掀起，白云间忽而闪现的红色内衣，好像一面鲜艳的红色旗帜。（柳应九 18）

我们可以看到1956版的春香荡秋千用语典雅优美，通过恰如其分的比喻将春香荡秋千的迷人姿态描写得引人入胜，同时又用巫山神女来对春香进行神格处理，读者读来多的是一份爱意与敬意。1991版的春香则多了各类动作描写，摘下罩纱、扔了紫鞋、握住秋千、运着秋千，读来如活泼洒脱的邻家少女，多了一份利索与洒脱，少了一份优雅与含蓄。而2006版的春香，随着社会观念的开放，译文中则出现了“白云间忽而闪现的红色内衣，好像一面鲜艳的红色旗帜”，在用语上则较为开放大胆。

再看梦龙对春香一见钟情后，房子和梦龙的一段对话：

梦龙：“真好看啊！”

房子：“你看着真地那么好吗？嘿嘿……那个春香嘛，她妈虽是艺妓，她心高，有意气，不做艺妓，在家主持家务，她不止会过日子，还满腹文才，无异于良家闺秀。”

公子听了说：“听你这么说，越发漂亮了。你快去把春香叫来。”房子一听这话就着了急。

“春香那雪肤华容在南原出了名。那些监使、府使、郡守等了不起的官老爷都想挑动她，可是都没有做到。她具备了女子的美德，温顺而礼节分明，加上文才不一般，而且贞操如松竹，可以算是女中君子吧。只可惜，怕叫她不来”。（佚名 16）

再看2006版《春香传》：

李公子随口感叹道：

“啊！……不错！很漂亮，漂亮极了！”

“少爷！她的老娘虽是个艺妓，春香可有骨气，拼死不当艺妓。她知书达礼，针黹超群，文才出众，才德双全。不过，她还是跟老百姓家的女孩子一样，是个未出阁的臭丫头片子。”

那个通引的语气中，对“未出阁”三字，特别加强了语调。李公子听后，“嘿嘿”一笑，对方仔吩咐说：

“方仔，既然是个艺妓的女儿。你赶快去，把她带过来！”

方仔回禀道：

“少爷，您有所不知。这个春香小姐，雪肤花容，天生丽质，是三南第一美人。听说，那些方金使、兵府使、郡守、县监等人，还有一些闲暇无事的花花公子，尽皆前往求见，但都被她拒绝。我看，这个春香小姐，有春秋时庄姜的美丽，有周文王后太姒的美德，才如李、杜，更具有娥皇、女英的贞操，真是倾城倾国的美女，确是千古巾帼中的淑女。少爷！这决不是我乱说，您要想呼之即来，恐难办到呀！”（柳应九 21）

我们可以看到1991版中梦龙是基于房子的介绍而对春香产生由衷的爱慕之情，这种爱慕基于春香行为上举止端庄、道德上严以律己、才华上无以伦比的优秀品质，说到底梦龙还是以道德评判为先。在2006版中，通过梦龙的表述，“既然是个艺妓的女儿。你赶快去”，多的是一种轻佻与随意，透出两班贵族的居高临下之感，兼具阶级压迫意识，并且新增添了房子强调春香是未出阁姑娘的新情节，这时的春香对梦龙来说只是一次不经意的猎艳，

调戏的成分更浓，与后来梦龙解救春香的急迫与勇敢是大相径庭的。然而从这种改动与变异却可以透视出时代的特点，充分地说明这时社会对男女关系的态度比较开放与包容。通过细读还可发现1991版是梦龙按捺不住对春香的思念之情深夜拜访春香家，2006版则是春香在母亲的允许之下主动到广寒楼与梦龙相会。前一种通过男性的主动来刻画春香的矜持，体现当时社会对女性在道德上的要求比较严格，而后一种改动则体现出当时社会对女性行为已渐渐放宽。此外，关于梦龙与春香的新婚描述1991版用了聊聊数语来说明他们每晚焦急地等待，天亮不舍地分手，从而恩爱渐深情谊日重，较少有性描写。而2006版则专设一章来，用近20页的篇幅来描述春香与梦龙的洞房春情。这些文本变异充分印证了由于历史发展及社会外部条件改变而导致人们在性观念上的改变，由此可以推断当时社会的开放程度及文化价值风向标。

除语言变异与文本变异外，不同的版本还存在翻译的变异，例如2006版李梦龙在暗访时在路边遇到一个小孩儿，作者从头至尾将这个孩子处理为毫不相识的陌生孩子。事实上，这个小孩儿即房子，是梦龙以前的仆人。由于此处的错译，导致之后的情节断裂，小说情节无法得到合理的解释，无法解释梦龙为何要委托其他地方官将这个陌生的孩子进行秘密关押。另外，在《春香传》中多处通过不同场合、不同人物之口来突出春香德才兼备，对于她的文才最好的展现莫过于她身陷牢狱之后给梦龙的书信，且看两处译文：

一别之后杳无音信，不知在父母面前作儿的郎君是否平安，实为惦念。北往南去不远千里，为何不见郎君的青鸟飞来？遥望北天，只见乌云层层，想起公子心碎肠断。海棠花开，杜鹃啼，夜雨淅沥落在梧桐叶上，独自坐在窗下，念着郎君哭泣，不知有几回。日日夜夜怀念着郎君，在悲酸中度日……

只因不从新使道下学道强点守厅之命，身遭严刑苦牢。我愿作冰雪中的松竹终一生。不日将冤死在刑杖之下。

虽说世间广阔，却无处投奔藏身，虽说那日月明亮，却无处诉怨求明断，写下最后一封信。愿公子万年享幸福，莫为没了春香把心伤。郎君若有夫妻义，但愿照顾我可怜的母亲。（佚名 96-97）

这封信，写得缠绵悱恻，十分契合与梦龙离别后柔肠寸断的人物心理。与之前梦龙离去时，春香的痛哭留别表露出的强烈情感也是一致的。信中对自身所遭受的苦难一带而过，着力强调对郎君的爱意绵绵，对母亲不能尽孝的人生遗憾，符合当时社会条件下人们对于道德情操的要求与社会伦理思想，也充分地解释了春香这一女性形象为何得到朝鲜民众的历代喜爱，以致这一故事在经过了几百个世纪后还在不断地进行流传的原因。



睽别之后，虽鱼雁久疏，但我常在念中。郎君贵体无恙乎？贱妾春香，命蹇运乖，突遭官方之迫害，无辜受刑，身陷囹圄，欲置妾于死地，而后快行将魄飞黄陵之庙，魂游鬼门之关。小妾深知‘烈女不更二夫’之道理，志坚不可夺，身虽万死不辞！小妾之生死，君自不知，特驰书奉报。小妾死之后，所不能安者，惟老母孤苦靡依，流离失所，愿郎君念小妾之情，有以处之，幸甚。（柳应九 164）

此书信采取文言文的形式，从字面上看典雅周正，对整个事件进行不动声色的理性描述，对死后诸事进行妥善安置，但是缺乏情感的力量，少了女性文笔的灵动，仿佛为当时的文人士大夫所代笔，既不利于读者与观众在情感上产生共鸣，也不利于春香性格的立体塑造。

### 三、从《春香传》到《春香》：故事情节的跨国审美变异

时代不同人们对审美对象的认知、感受、理解与评判也是不同的。因此，就出现了面对同一题材或相似的题材时，人们截然不同的态度、理解和评判。我国朝鲜族作家金仁顺的《春香》就是基于对本民族经典文学作品《春香传》的理解与把握的基础上进行故事重构。作为当代作家金仁顺有着自己独特的审美观与叙事方式，小说《春香》既融入了她对于经典的理解与接受，又体现出对经典的批判、改进与反思。由于作家的现代性眼光及与众不同的审美批判意识，她在进行创作时体现出一种不同于传统的审美差异，这种审美差异体现在文本中则是对经典的系列性颠覆与变异。总的来说，小说《春香》审美变异可以从以下三个路径进行：一是人物形象的重塑与变异；二是故事情节的置换与颠覆；三是经典性的消解与解构。

春香无疑是《春香传》中难以绕过的人物形象，传统经典中的春香是深受儒家思想文化影响的贞节烈女形象。当梦龙赴京了无音讯、学道暴戾苦苦相逼之时，她体现出的坚贞勇敢、大义凛然、誓死不从，实际上是儒家贞节思想的外在表现。当狠毒的刑杖打在春香的娇躯之上时，她显得是何等的刚烈。打第一道时她愤然诉道：“一道我的心，丹心一点红，不怕磨折苦，决然从一终。无端打我太狠毒，我一股怨气冲苍穹。恩爱夫妻不到一年整，无情之人天不容”（冰蔚 张友鸾译 63）。打第六道时，她诉道：“六道我的心，一心想梦龙。哪怕审我六六三十六次，把我试刀锋；哪怕身死六万回，我也不能从。我心中委屈怒气冲牛斗，万死一生决不变初衷”（冰蔚 张友鸾译 64）。直到打了二十五刑杖，春香力竭声嘶、晕厥在地，旁观的男女老少开始赞美其坚贞刚烈。春香的美与春香的贞节是分不开的，在这一点上符合当时社会的审美文化心理，因此能唤起人们的普遍同情与赞美。

在金仁顺的《春香》中，春香原有的地位则让位于其母香夫人，月梅也有了一个新的名字“香夫人”，春香则位居其次成了香夫人家里的春香小



姐。在金仁顺的笔下，春香是一位颇具科学甚至魔幻气质的小姑娘，二岁以前靠吃拌了花粉的野蜂蜜过活，她瘦骨伶仃、从不吃饭，对气味有着独特的敏感和感受力，能够辨识香夫人身上的各类气味：“我能闻出她早晨洗发时是否在菖蒲水里滴了米酒和醋，沐浴时放了哪种花汁，薰衣用了哪样香草（……）”（金仁顺4）。不仅如此，少女春香还经常一个人关在外祖父的药房，翻看 he 留下来的医书，并热衷于各类配药实验。她治好了凤周先生的花粉过敏症，通过调理将香夫人变得更加年轻美丽，甚至研制出了一种能让人遗忘掉过去、无忧无虑的“五色”的药水。在性意识方面，春香懵懵懂懂，与金洙有过身体接触。在与梦龙的感情中，她随意而略显轻佻，抱着无所谓的态度来看待和梦龙之间的感情。《春香》中的春香有着强烈的职业追求，希望成为一名药师。而梦龙最初只是将春香误以为是香夫人，在他看来，这不过是一件稀松平常的狎妓事件。由此，我们看到了小说《春香》对经典作品《春香传》的消解与颠覆，主要人物春香与梦龙已经不是对感情从一而终、誓死守护的纯情男女，而是拥有现代开放的性观念的男女。

类似于许多后现代经典创作的续篇，从月梅到香夫人的转换，不仅仅是次要人物在作品中地位的提升，还是作家现代创作意识在作品中的极力体现。在金仁顺笔下，香夫人不再是地位低下、攀附权贵、做事唯唯诺诺的艺妓月梅，而是一位女性意识特别强的女强人，她才貌双全、有胆有谋、以香榭为掩护做着走私私盐的买卖，维持着奢侈的生活，并且经常告诫春香：“记住我的话，春香，俗语说，男人是女人的天，但这个天，是阴晴不定的。越是指望着好天气，可能越会刮风下雨。女人想过上好日子，只能靠自己”（金仁顺 97）。她不但凭借一己之力使自己和春香过上了优越的生活，而且将香榭打造成了一个收容社会弃儿的救助站。香榭俨然成了一个自由、独立、安静与幸福的乌托邦，成为处于社会底层小人物的避难所。

在春香故事文本中，类似的人物形象变异不计其数。比如，卞学道原本是一位风流男子，在盘索里传唱中的卞学道逐渐演化为一位凶残暴戾的荒淫贪官，而在《春香》中他则化身为一位明察秋毫、具有着卓越的断案能力的清官。《春香传》中香丹是一位忠心耿耿、尽职尽责的侍从，而《春香》中的女仆小单却心思诡异、包藏祸心。《春香传》中的李梦龙是对春香一见钟情的贵族两班公子，而《春香》中的李梦龙则是一位视感情为儿戏的浪荡公子。在基本情节方面，与《春香传》的广寒楼初相逢、月梅家盟誓结合、梦龙赴京赶考、卞学道严刑相逼、春香被害入狱、梦龙暗行相助、团圆后共赴京城等基本情节不同，金仁顺的《春香》的故事情节发生颠覆与逆转。其基本情节包括：香榭的修建、春香之父翰林按察副使大人罹难、香夫人门前车马盈门、春香的成长、春香与梦龙相遇、香夫人走私私盐、卞学道阴险要挟、春香酒中下毒、春香成为香夫人、梦龙成为皇帝的驸马、太姜传唱春香故事等。

经过对原有情节的颠覆与置换，故事情节发生完全的变异，人物也因此拥有截然不同的命运。除了情节方面的一系列颠覆与变异之外，金仁顺甚至直接在小说文本中直接揭示，即使在同一叙事作品内部，真实的春香故事、盘索里说唱艺人太姜口中传唱中的“春香故事”、以写奇闻传记出名的书生玉树笔下的“春香故事”都存在很大的差异，而这些春香故事在坊间流传的过程中经过不断的流传与变异，衍生为各种不同的版本。因此，形成一个庞大的春香故事群，也在此基础形成了多样化的春香故事研究文本群。正如金仁顺在小说中借用春香之口指出的那样：“这些都不是我的故事”（金仁顺 195），而小单回应：“写进书里的时候，故事当然要改动改动了。要不然，谁会看啊”（金仁顺 195）。可见，故事的流传变异与接受者的接受过程中的变异已经成为故事发生与流传的必然。唯有充分地认识到故事流传过程中所发生的种种文学变异，才能更为精准地理解一部作品所反映的时代特征及这一时代所独有的审美观。

从“春阳”到“春香”，从《春香传》到《春香》，春香故事在世纪流转中不断地发生着变异，以便适应处于特定时代人们内在的审美需要。“外来影响的发生，决不是历史上孤立的偶然现象，而是来自于接受者的社会条件和时代环境对文学的内在需求，接受者根据自己的需要过滤外国文学的元素，从而产生适合自己需要的变化。从这个角度看，民族文学对外国文学的选择和接受，既是文学史上的一件大事，也是社会学史上的一件大事。因此正如韦斯坦因指出的，文学接受研究指的是对文学的社会学和心理学研究”（Cao 162）。在比较文学影响研究中，依然不能排除对文学的社会学及心理学研究，文学文本在外来影响的基础上发生变异正是社会条件、时代环境、民族文化、接受心理等在文本上的具体显现。从这个意义上来说，对春香故事进行变异学研究，既是追溯当时社会不同的民族文化接受心理状况的基本途径，也是探讨当代文化创新的基本路径之一。

## Works Cited

- 佚名：《春香传》。平壤：朝鲜平壤外文出版社，1991年。
- [Anonymous. *Chunhyangjeon*. Pyongan: Pyongyang Foreign Languages Press, 1991.]
- Cao Shunqing. *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature*. Heidelberg: Springer, 2014.
- 池水涌：“浅谈盘索里文学的美学特征”，《韩国研究论丛》1（2010）：360-361。
- [Chi Shuiyong. “Aesthetic Features of Pansori Literature.” *Collections of Korean Studies* 1 (2010): 360-361.]
- 金仁顺：《春香》。长春：时代文艺出版社，2014年。
- [Jin, Renshun. *Chunxiang*. Changchun: Times Literature and Art Publishing House, 2014.]
- 金东旭：《春香传研究》。首尔：延世大学出版社，1965年。
- [Kim, Dong-wook. *Studies on Chunhyang*. Seoul: Yonsei University Publishing Department, 1965.]

李御宁：《这就是韩国——在泥土中在微风中》。首尔：文化思想社，1989年。

[Lee, Eo-Nyong. *This Is Korea: In the Dirt and in the Breeze*. Seoul: Cultural Thoughts Society, 1989.]

柳应九：《春香传》。北京：新世界出版社，2006年。

[Liu Yingjiu. *The Biography of Chunhyangjeon*. Beijing: New World Press, 2006.]

韦旭昇：《韩国文学史》。北京：北京大学出版社，2008年。

[Wei Xusheng. *History of Korean Literature*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2008.]

尹世平：“关于‘春香传’”，《春香传》，冰蔚、张友鸾译。北京：作家出版社，1956年，第2页。

[Yoon, Sepyung. “About the Biography of Chunhyangjeon.” *The Biography of Chunhyangjeon*, translated by Bing Wei and Zhang Youluan. Beijing: Writers Publishing House, 1956. 2.]

赵云亿：《三韩诗龟鉴》。首尔：梨花文化出版社，2002年。

[Zhao Yunyi. *Poetry and the Tortoise in Three Koreas*. Seoul: Lihua Culture Publishing House, 2002.]

《春香传》，冰蔚、张友鸾译。北京：作家出版社，1956年。

[*The Biography of Chunhyangjeon*, translated by Bing Wei and Zhang Youluan. Beijing: Writers Publishing House, 1956.]

## 《聚言集》诗歌典型主题探索

### A Thematic Study of the Poetry in *Brushstrokes*

肖淳端 (Xiao Chunduan)

**内容摘要：**《聚言集》是一份创办于 20 世纪 90 年代中期的英国华人双语文学杂志，从 1995 年创刊至 2004 年停刊，共形成 28 期近千页 90 余万字的档案。《聚言集》主题广泛、体裁多样、作者群多元。本文聚焦《聚言集》刊发的 150 余首中英文诗歌，探讨其典型主题、文学价值和现实意义。《聚言集》诗歌以移民困厄、种族歧视、中国认同为典型主题，诗歌作者以草根华人诗人为主。作者身份、创作语言和流散境遇赋予《聚言集》诗歌独特的文学风格和重要的文学史意义，而其创作主题又与华人在英国的流散处境、与中英两国的历史现实息息相关。这些作品为我们管窥英国华人真实的生存状态提供了珍贵史料，而不管在海外华人文学研究还是海外华人研究领域，英国华人史料一直十分匮乏。因此，《聚言集》诗歌对英国华人文学学科建构乃至海外华人研究都有独特而重要的意义，值得学界广泛关注和充分研究。

**关键词：**《聚言集》；英国华人文学刊物；诗歌主题；文史价值

**作者简介：**肖淳端，暨南大学外国语学院教授，主要研究方向为英国华人文学和海外华人诗学。本文为国家社会科学基金一般项目“前殖民地缘英国华人作家作品研究”【项目批号：20BWW068】、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”【项目批号：GD19CWW06】、中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金【项目批号：19JNQM03】、2019 年广东省普通高校特色创新类项目【项目批号：2019WTSCX003】阶段性成果。

**Title:** A Thematic Study of the Poetry in *Brushstrokes*

**Abstract:** *Brushstrokes* is a British Chinese bilingual literary magazine started up in the mid-1990s. Launching from 1995 to 2004, it has published 28 issues with nearly 1,000 pages and more than 900,000 words in content. *Brushstrokes* has a wide range of themes, genres and authorship. This article deliberates on more than 150 Chinese and English poems published in *Brushstrokes*, inquiring their major themes, literary value and historical significance. It finds that these poems shared themes of diaspora adversity, racial discrimination, and Chinese identification, and the poets are mainly grassroots Chinese diasporas; the poets' identity background, writing language and diaspora situation endow their poetry with a unique style to represent history, and such realistic-poetic writings are closely interlinked with the historical situations of

China and Britain as well as the relation between the two countries in history. These poems provide us with precious historical materials to understand the real living conditions of the British Chinese. Due to the scant output of research on the British Chinese in the field of either Overseas Chinese Literature or Overseas Chinese Studies, *Brushstrokes* poetry deserves extensive attention and full research with its unique and important significance in both literature and history.

**Keywords:** *Brushstrokes*; British Chinese literary magazine; themes of poetry; values in literature and history

**Author:** **Xiao Chunduan** is 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).

《聚言集》(*Brushstrokes*)是一份创办于20世纪90年代中期的英国华人双语文学杂志<sup>1</sup>。从1995年创刊至2004年停刊,《聚言集》一年三期,历时10年,形成了28期近千页的档案,共约90余万字,其中约三分之二内容是英文,三分之一是中文。《聚言集》刊载的主题广泛,涵盖了身份问题、种族问题、移民代际问题、中国(文化)认同等。同时,《聚言集》的体裁也十分多样,有小说、散文、诗歌、书评等。其作者群也多元,除了第一代移民,还有第二、第三代土生华人,且多数是不知名的“草根”作家,这比现有英国华人文学研究关注的作家群要广泛得多。

早在18世纪末,随着大英帝国在东亚海上贸易的发展,华人就以东印度公司海员的身份随船到英国上岸留居,由此开启了英国华人的早期移民史。但是,英国华人文学刊物的历史却滞后得多。抗日战争时期,以爱国救国为主旨的华人报刊如《据日旬刊》《中华周报》《再生》《民主阵线》等开始在英国出现。<sup>2</sup>随后至今英国华人刊物一直十分鲜见。20世纪80年代开始,随着留英华人学生的增加,出现了一些学联主办的中文刊物。据笔者搜寻统计,有曼城学联的《新竹》、牛津学联的《牛津学子》、全英学联的会刊《留英春秋》、剑桥学联的《剑河畔》《剑河风》等。这些刊物大都属于内部刊物,没有ISSN号,且经常随着主创人员的毕业离开而停刊,多数只有寥寥几期。<sup>3</sup>以中文和英文双语创作的英国华人纯文学刊物更加罕见,而其作者群既有知识精英又有其他各阶层华人,既有第一代华人移民又有土生华人,这样的文学刊物寥

1 首刊时该杂志中文名为《华笔》,后因编辑部主持的英国华人写作组定期举办“聚言坊”写作会而更名为《聚言集》。

2 参见 Gregor Benton and Edmund Terence Gomez, *The Chinese in Britain, 1800-Present: Economy, Transnationalism, Identity*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008, 240-243.

3 目前只有《剑河风》在办。



若星辰。《聚言集》作品以真情实感的华人心声见长，为我们管窥英国华人真实的生存状态提供了珍贵史料。在海外华人研究领域，英国华侨华人史料十分匮乏，甚至可以说是“长期空缺”（陈鸿超 杨祥银 28），更别提在海外华人文学研究领域。因此，《聚言集》对英国华人文学乃至海外华人研究都有独特而重要的意义。然而长期以来国内外有关《聚言集》的研究屈指可数，更未有人对《聚言集》诗歌进行整理和专题研究。本文拟聚焦《聚言集》诗歌，探索其典型主题、文学价值和现实意义。

在28期杂志中，《聚言集》共刊载了54首英文诗歌、104首中文诗歌，其中中文古（近）体诗25首。这150余首诗歌涉及多个主题，有移民困厄、种族歧视、中国认同、女性抗争、情感经验等。下面就其最为典型的三个主题分别展开讨论。

### 一、移民困厄

《聚言集》很多诗歌描写了第一代华人移民颠沛流离、艰难生存的生活。除了从中国大陆，不少华人是从东南亚等英国（前）殖民地迁入英国。有些人不止经历过单次流散，甚至多次多地流散。近代中国饱受列强割据、战乱和饥荒的历史也使英国华人的流散行途愈发坎坷。这些历史在《聚言集》诗歌中得到了充分的展现。其中，“难民”一诗写道：“美好家园早摧残，饥寒交迫宿荒郊，南奔北走归何处？那处为家不是家”（曾耀星 4）。这一首何处是家的悲叹曲再现了历史上早期华人移民迫于饥荒、战争不得不越洋谋生的苦难史。

另一首题为“老华侨”的诗中，诗人亚兴智开篇写道：“肩荷扁担，两头竹篮，一边旧米袋，一边破纸箱”，刻画了一位在国外靠收破烂为生、孤苦无依的老华侨形象。“住不起陋屋，夜夜露宿街头”是他常年的缩影，而如今“年老多病，三餐难维持，身穿破衣服，疑是要饭人”的凄凉晚景更是让人唏嘘，他不免问自己“为何不回去”，只因“家乡遥远，七十年的岁月，剩下老病一身”（30）。显然，背井离乡却没能衣锦还乡成为移民不敢回乡的心魔，尽管一心想叶落归根，家却想回而不敢回，只能继续在异国他乡“肩挑一副重担，一篮病痛，一篮乡愁”（30）中了此残生。

这两首诗的作者显然没受太多教育，他们既是华人移民，也是民间诗人，其创作语言朴实，字里行间皆流露真情实感，使其诗歌彰显了民风、民歌特质。如果说这两首诗是早期华人移民流离失所的再现，那么下面这首诗则是英国当代华人移民凄苦现状的写照。很长一段时间里，华人移民在英国从事的工种以餐馆饮食为主。据英国下议院内政遴选委员会20世纪80年代有关英国华人的报告，约有90%的华人从事饮食或相关的行业。而英国20世纪90年代的人口普查数据也显示，53.8%的华人男性与36.8%的华人女性工作



都与饮食业相关。<sup>1</sup>《聚言集》中文诗“PALACE”正是书写这一境况的一首诗，不过，其展现的餐馆华工不是教育程度低下的劳工，而是受过高等教育的知识分子。“PALACE”是英国乃至世界各地常见的餐馆名，在这组以此为题的现代诗中，诗人玉峤描写了一个移居英国的当代华人知识分子的流散心境。“在PALACE，一个英国的中国餐馆，我用拖把写诗”（38），诗歌开篇，一个迫于生计却曾满怀理想的华人知识分子形象跃然纸上。而“PALACE”的意义繁复多重：

PALACE，不仅仅是一个中餐馆的名字  
她还是一种记忆  
一种情绪  
一份无望的憧憬  
一声无奈的叹息

它是一种挣扎  
一种沉溺  
一个永远没有结果的梦  
一场永远没有主题的戏（38）

这里，诗人用连续的排比表现自己移居英国后接连遭受到的现实打击，以及他在希望落空之后的狼狈之相。移民境遇与理想预期落差巨大，使诗人失望至极。“没有结果的梦”、“没有主题的戏”揭示了华人知识分子在英国实现阶层越界的艰难，而“永远”二字更是道尽诗人对黯淡前程的无奈与感伤。面对残酷的现实，诗人借助想象，将象征着窘迫生活的“拖把”化身为笔，使一地鸡毛化为凄迷的梦境：

洗洁精的泡沫  
是诗的韵脚  
印出又被抹掉脚印  
隐含着主题

粗粗长长的句子  
逶迤着绵绵的思绪  
凌凌乱乱的痕迹  
营造着那纯纯东方的意境（38）

1 参见 潘翎：《海外华人百科全书》，中国香港：三联书店（香港）有限公司，1998年，第307页。

“洗洁精的泡沫”、“拖把”、地上的“脚印”与“诗”形成强烈对比，这种对比昭示着现实与理想的剧烈反差，诗人的落魄之态也在“粗粗长长”、“凌乱乱乱”的拖迹中尽显无疑。尽管诗人不忘心中的理想，但这一理想的“主题”隐隐绰绰，不清不楚，更是无从触及。而现实与理想之间无法逾越的鸿沟使我不禁“思绪”绵长，“纯纯东方的意境”无不象征着诗人对祖国、对他移居前生活的眷恋。诗人接着写道：

几只未被杀虫剂杀死的爬虫  
总是在严肃地阅读  
当然，读者中还有我  
在黯红的异乡的地板上  
阅读自己（38）

在这种只为糊口而没有多少价值感的苦力劳作中，诗人曾经的豪情壮志早已消失殆尽，诗人曾经的理想追求一再遭受暴击，只剩下几只“爬虫”和“我”在“异乡的地板”上“阅读自己”。把“我”和爬虫做类比，一方面体现了自我身份的卑微，暗示华人移民就犹如低贱的爬虫一样，没人喜欢甚至任人践踏喷杀。同时，也表达了华人移民的孤独，因为除了“我”和爬虫，没有人会来陪伴自己，更别提了解自己、欣赏自己。而“阅读自己”，实际上也是对自己的移民身份、移民前景的审视和叩问。难道这样的身份和生活，就是自己一直梦寐以求的吗？这也寓示着诗人对自己的身份和追求的迷惘和痛苦。

中国古代有诗歌“感于事”“动于情”之说，《聚言集》这些诗歌恰也是“情动于中而形于言”。这些诗歌抒发的真情实感，来源于诗人对现实生活的真实感受。这些穷困潦倒的移民诗人，或受过教育，或知识平平，但他们的文字都真实地记录了一代代华人在英国花果飘零的困厄。

## 二、种族歧视

《聚言集》诗歌另一典型主题是种族歧视，这些诗歌大多是用英文写就，尤其是出自在英国出生、长大的土生华人笔下。在一首题名为“脸”（“Faces”）的英文短诗中，诗人彭家明（Ka-Ming Pang）写道：

看我的世界  
透过眯缝眼  
把我禁锢在后面  
如此狭窄的限阈  
睁开你的眼睛

我想你是瞎了 (28)<sup>1</sup>

全诗只有六行，却用“我”和“你”营造了两个截然对立的阵营。“我”需要透过“眯缝眼”来看世界，很显然，“我”是一名东方人，尤其是西方人眼中的“东方人”，而“你”则是与我泾渭分明的西方人。“眯缝眼”是西方对东方人尤其是中国人的一个典型的刻板印象，其中不乏西方对中国人的狭长眼的嘲笑和戏弄。诗歌虽然以“脸”做题，却只谈及眼睛一处，可见“眯缝眼”代表着西方人眼中东方人的全部脸部特征，这实则是诗人对西方人以偏概全刻板看待华人的巧妙戏仿，更是对这一刻板印象的强烈讽刺。“把我禁锢在后面/如此狭窄的限阈”表面看是“我”对自己身体特征、思维模式及人生困境的一种体认——眼睛小、见识窄，实则通过重复西方人对东方人眯缝眼的偏见，揭示英国土生华人在英国饱受歧视的历史，更影射了种族歧视对华人造成的伤害。正是因为西方人的种族歧视，华人才会处处如此受限。随后两行从“我”的视角突然转向“你”，看似突兀，却异常有力，“睁开你的眼睛/我想你是瞎了”体现了诗人不甘被歧视，而以其道还治其身，用睁眼瞎子的意象来回击西方人。这既代表了诗人对西方人以眯缝眼作东方人刻板印象的强烈反抗，也体现了英国华人对此郁积多年的愤怒不满。

诗人在另一首诗“诅咒与祝福”（“Curses and Blessings”）中，将对英国人种族歧视的厌恶和反击表现得更加明显却又隐秘。这首诗如下：

愿你全家富贵  
 “冚家富贵”  
 直译如此  
 它们意思一样  
 安全于你的忽视  
 当你被诅咒却以为被祝福 (28)<sup>2</sup>

这首诗是对粤语“冚家富贵”的文字游戏，熟悉粤语的读者读来忍俊不禁。“冚家富贵”虽然字面上意思是祝你全家富贵，但是在日常使用中，更多是用来咒骂对方，诅咒对方全家死光。这是因为古人用棺材谐音升官发财寓意富贵，“冚家富贵”也即是诅咒对方全家进棺材的意思。然而这么毒辣的诅咒，在“你”长期以来对“我”的“忽视”中却是“安全”的，不仅不

1 原诗是：See my world/ through slits for eyes/ imprisoning me behind/ such narrow confines/ open your eyes/ I think you're going blind. 本文所有英文诗的中文译文皆为笔者所译，下不赘述。

2 原诗是：fortune for your entire family/ “hum gar foo gwai”/ literal translation would say/ they mean the same thing/ safe in your ignorance/ feel blessed when you're cursed.

易被察觉，甚至通过字面翻译还会被误以为是一种祝福。于是，因咒骂不通粤语的西方人而窃窃自喜的华人形象呼之欲出。但是这一出闹剧背后却折射出西方主流对华人长期的忽视和歧视，以少数族裔语言来以小伎俩，以便发泄华人心中的厌恶和不满，实际上指向的还是华人的边缘化和弱小无助。

在另一首诗“小小中国妞”（“Little chinky girl”）中，彭家明同样表现了华人反击种族歧视的主题。这首叙事诗共48行，以第三人称的视角描写了一个中国女孩在遭受白人欺辱后的复仇故事。诗歌开篇，就写道：“小小中国妞/找来一把枪”。“中国妞”是白人嘲弄中国女性的一个不礼貌的称呼，与“中国佬”一样，饱含歧视之意。诗歌接着写道：

她为这宝贝上膛  
只为一些耍玩。  
她思绪四下乱串，  
当她开车上档：  
他们在地脑子萦绕，  
她必须把他们干掉。（18）<sup>1</sup>

“他们”是谁？跟随诗人的叙述，我们知道了他们是吉米（Jimmy）、卡特（Carter）、克里斯（Chris）、珍妮（Jenny）等一干白人。首先出场的是吉米：

吉米见她走来  
以为游戏一场。  
他摆出李小龙姿态；  
她却认为太菜。  
她眯着中国眼，  
柔声语不吼叫。  
“但凡你有点头脑。  
我也不会开枪。”  
她拉动扳机二遍；  
子弹射进他脑瓜里面。  
“噢我不必费心思索，  
他肯定死人一个。”（18）<sup>2</sup>

1 原诗是：She loaded up that baby/ To have a bit of fun./ Her thoughts, they came a' tumbling/ As she commenced to drive./ They'd been screwing with her mind./ She's gonna fix their lives.

2 原诗是：Jimmy saw her coming/ And thought it was a game./ He pulled a Bruce Lee stance./ She thought it very lame./ She screwed her Chinese eyes./ Spoke soft and did not shout./ “Now if you'd had more brains./ I wouldn't blast them out.”/ She pulled the trigger twice./ They hit him in the head./ “Well there I shouldn't wonder./ I think he's rather dead.”

文学伦理学批评认为，“每一个人都需要通过自我选择完成人生的伦理选择”（聂珍钊 王松林 9），每个人的行为、思想、情感、道德等，都是个人进行伦理选择的结果。那么，“中国妞”选择杀人这一伦理犯罪的原因是什么？诗歌逐个交代：杀卡特是“因为叫我贱人”；克里斯是因为“为人不善”，以“炒虱子”（18）来戏弄华人<sup>1</sup>；珍妮是因为羞辱她是“黄脸怪”，而被杀者无一例外都是白人，他们除了名字是典型白人，还具有典型的白人特征，如“珍妮金色的长发”（18）等。用如此赤裸裸的暴力来击毙白人宿敌，这首诗彻底表达了华人对白人种族歧视的仇恨，更将华人内心深处的无助写得入木三分。萨特提炼法农的思想时曾一针见血指出，“被殖民者无能为力时，他们的集体无意识就只有杀人这一蠢念头”（Sartre 18）。长期遭受白人歧视的华人的情形与此是极其相似的，也正是这首诗所揭露的。从诗歌中我们看到的不仅是一个华人义愤填膺、报仇雪耻的故事，其背后更耐人寻味的是华人在异族手中所蒙受的羞辱和遭受的虐待。

报复主题在华人文学中其实并不鲜见，早在华裔美国文学中的天使岛诗歌，就有类似的诗篇，如“韩信受袴为大将，勾践忍辱终报仇。（……）自古英雄多如是，否极泰来待复仇”（qtd. in Lai et al. 125）等。然而与天使岛诗歌不同的是，《聚言集》诗人用英文而非中文，把臆想于将来的复仇梦直接用已经完成的过去式来实现。在《聚言集》诗人笔下，种族仇恨得到更大程度的宣泄。按理说，天使岛华人所遭受的不公对待是严酷的，而随着历史和社会的发展，不管是在美国还是英国，会熟练使用英文的“中国妞”所面临的种族形势要宽松得多。但从这首诗所展现的来看，事实似乎不尽其然。《聚言集》许多作品，不管是诗歌、散文还是短篇故事，都描写了土生华人在英国成长过程中遭受到的歧视和侮辱，如果将它们与这首诗对读，就不难理解诗作主人公为何如此气愤甚至不惜行凶。有趣的是，诗歌继续写道：

瘫倒的尸体堆积如山；  
看起来她不会就此罢手：  
神志清醒她越杀越多  
直到有人叫来了警车。  
新闻记者全部到齐；  
她枪扔一旁让他们看清。  
她说，只有这个代价，

1 “fried lice”发音与华人餐馆的常见菜式炒饭（fried rice）接近，白人用此来嘲笑华人以炒虱子为主食。

电视黄金时段才有黄种人脸蛋。(18)<sup>1</sup>

诗人这里强调的是，行凶人并非丧心病狂，而是理智冷静。“伦理选择在本质上是做人还是做兽的伦理身份的选择（……）如果兽性因子得不到约束，人就会在兽性因子引导下选择做兽（……）人就会做出错误的伦理选择”（聂珍钊 王松林 7）。此时，行凶者“清醒”地选择杀人，说明她宁可做兽，也不做人，这越发凸显她曾经遭受的血海深仇。然而就当她要接受记者采访准备将隐情公诸于世时：

“我是被逼无奈；  
让我把事实说个明白。”  
她却没能解释多少：  
该死的警察在身后把她击倒。(18)<sup>2</sup>

尽管“她”已经弃械投降，“她”在接受媒体采访中却突遭警察击毙。这极大地讽刺了华人在西方主流社会没有任何话语权，揭示了边缘与中心之间没有任何有效沟通的渠道，同时也控诉了少数族裔被主流社会消音这一血淋淋的现实。对哑言族裔来说，现实当中其实很难有真正报仇雪恨的时刻。华人只能借助文学想象，在想象的世界里诗性重构正义。这样的文字，在主流媒介中，是很难得以出现的。华裔美国诗人李立扬曾说他的作品犯了主流社会的禁忌，因为“他们期待我们克服书写种族歧视的欲望”（qtd. in Wang 125）。他说出了种族歧视题材在西方社会出版的困难。由此看来，《聚言集》诗歌刊发的种族歧视题材尤其是复仇主题的书写，是非常难能可贵的。这种异于主流书写的另类书写，也只有借助华人自己主办的另类杂志才得以成功出版。

### 三、中国认同

《聚言集》多首诗歌表达了英国华人对家国历史、中国文化的深厚的认同和热爱。不少英国华人时刻关心祖国命运，经常用诗歌记录他们纯朴自然而又热血澎湃的拳拳赤子心。比如，一位英国老华侨在回国看到圆明新园后，写下这首诗：

1 原诗是：The crumpled bodies mounted, / It seemed she wouldn't stop:/ Cold sanity drove her on and on/ Till someone called the cops./ The news reporters all arrived:/ She dropped the gun for them to see./ So this is what it takes, she said, / To get a yellow face on prime-time TV.

2 原诗是：Right there on the spot/ They asked for an interview./ "I didn't want to do this:/ Let me put across some facts."/ She didn't get too far though:/ Damn FBI shot her in the back. 《聚言集》在刊载时说明，该诗最初在英国土生华人网站发表。末行使用“FBI”指代警察，可见该诗指的是整个西方社会对华人的歧视。



玲珑官馆遍山邱，  
 潋滟湖光石渡浮。  
 首善名园昔毁劫，  
 南天殿阁复盈眸。  
 方壶胜景仙踪在，  
 曲院风荷气韵幽。  
 时值升平兴国运，  
 当惊奇迹赞弘猷。（罗永安 30）

鸦片战争是英国华人文学一个常见的创作题材，《聚言集》诗歌也不例外，这首七言律诗的创作灵感同样与鸦片战争紧密相连。诗歌抒发了英国华人不忘鸦片战争、不忘外国列强侵毁圆明园这一国耻的强烈情感。同时，也表达了当代英国华人对祖国强大不再受外族欺侮的民族自豪感。相似的诗歌还有诗人另一诗作“过虎门大桥”：

玉龙天半驾江穿，  
 越海跨山过虎门。  
 铁索高悬驰道稳，  
 飞车疾驶轴轮繁。  
 俯看巨舶疑飘叶，  
 前眺通途入彩云。  
 改革频歌新建树，  
 千船突破利泽民。（30）

诗人同样用七律表达了英国华人看到祖国强盛之后内心难以抑制的欣喜和自豪，而虎门也与鸦片战争历史、与英国侵略中国的历史密切相关。这同样是以鸦片战争为题材的民族主义抒情诗。这些诗歌反映了海外华人在国外的命运无时不与祖国的强大或衰败息息相关。祖国的繁荣昌盛，甚至使漂泊异乡的英国华人萌生了“倦鸟归巢”、“叶落归根”的念头，如另一首诗“寄迹英伦春复秋，初登归翼逐云浮。欣瞻故里小康世，恋栈犹思作久留”（叶黄绮云 27），诗人借“寄”字表达了自己在英国只是短暂寄居而非久留，“寄”字也饱含了诗人“寄人篱下”的凄凉无奈。“春复秋”岁月流转，游子终于踏上回国旅途，内心五味杂陈：既有久别家园的感慨、归心似箭的盼望，又有颠沛流离的辛酸、无根漂泊的戚悲。看到家乡故人的小康生活，更是依恋着不想走，不愿再离家去国。这既说明了华人对家国的眷恋，又揭露了移民的艰难。

除了回国时对祖国新貌的自豪和依恋，英国华人在国外也常怀着深厚的

家国情怀，常怀有华人团结起来发扬民族精神、努力拼搏扬我国威的华夏壮志。比如，在看到英国华人自发进行文艺创作并结集出版的作品后，诗人罗永安用七律表达他内心的欣悦，他写道：“天涯赤子未忘根，浩气长存民族魂。巧趁暇时挥颖笔，锦思成帙颂昆仑”（27）。诗人身体力行，在国外用中文写作就是“未忘根”的实证，同时诗人认为华人日常的言行举止，以及他们作品字里行间散发出的中华气节便是“民族魂”的最好展示。他在另一首七律中写道：

万里侨居展壮道，  
艰辛创业几春秋。  
经纶已遂陶朱愿，  
意志还萦赤县酬。  
伟论纵横评宇宙，  
清商抒发颂神州。  
天涯赤子存宏愿，  
华胄根基重九邱。（29）

诗中可见，海外华人艰辛创业，即使扎根海外已有所成，心中未曾忘记自己是炎黄子孙。相反地，他们依然怀着高昂的爱国热情，追求正直有道的儒商思想，努力弘扬中华民族精神。诗人通晓陶朱典故，更有强烈的中华文化认同和民族意识，对华人如何在异国生存、发展也有通透、深刻的认识。从诗中也可看出，文化自信是华人在海外生存、发展的一个重要的立足点，而中华文化与哲学思想，也给予了海外华人丰富的生活智慧和精神力量。该诗是英国华侨华人对中国传统文化的充分肯定，它表达了华人对自身身份的定位，也寄托了华人渴望营建一个励志图强、团结一致弘扬国魂的海外华人共同体的宏愿。采用中国传统律诗的形式进行创作，也彰显了英国华人在异域立足民族文化之根，传承中国文学传统，参与形塑英国华人诗歌艺术的民族性和独特性而做出的努力。

### 结语

莎士比亚借哈姆雷特之口说出艺术的真谛是向自然举起一面镜子<sup>1</sup>，意即艺术反映社会历史现实。《聚言集》诗歌恰是如此。上述三个典型主题，因为诗人身份的特殊而具有特殊且重要的意义。这些华人诗人来自于英国各阶层，他们并非职业作家：他们或是穷困潦倒的拾荒老人，或是苦尽甘来的成功华商；他们既有颠沛流离的首代移民，又有生长于斯的土生华人。正因诗人身份的特殊，他们笔下的诗歌更贴近英国华人的历史现实，其创作最典型

1 参见 William Shakespeare, et al. *Hamlet*, New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2003, 106.

的特征就是真情实感的表达。可以说，这些诗歌作品是各领域、各时代的英国华人面对历史真相，面对自身苦难的内心直白，也是对华人在英国遭受种族歧视、阶级压迫等问题的切实见证。长期以来，英国华侨华人史料非常匮乏。正因如此，《聚言集》诗歌有重要的史料价值，对相关领域研究者或决策者准确把握英国华人的真实境遇、身份追寻和文化认同也有重要的现实意义。

诗人身份的平民性决定其创作特征的民歌特质，这些诗歌自有质朴、天然的一面，与其他英国华人诗人如蒋彝、李元佳、金美玲、罗汉娜、王咏思、杨炼等的作品形成截然不同的风格。对比这一类受过良好（精英）教育的成名诗人诗作，《聚言集》诗歌在创作风格、题材选择、艺术手法方面别具特色，更接近民歌传统。因此，除了拓宽英国华人诗歌的作者群身份，以及蕴涵其中的史料价值，《聚言集》诗歌对形塑英国华人诗歌的民族性和民歌性也有深远的意义。另外，除了这三类典型主题，《聚言集》诗歌也涉及女性抗争、情感经验等主题，还有大量童话诗及一定数量的双语先锋诗歌<sup>1</sup>。因此，《聚言集》诗歌不管是内容还是形式，皆充实、形塑了英国华人诗歌传统。而从文学史的角度来说，英国华人文学报刊是英国华人文学学科的重要基石，所以《聚言集》诗歌对英国华人文学学科构建举足轻重。

总而言之，作者身份、创作语言、流散境遇赋予《聚言集》诗歌独特的文学风格和重要的文学史意义，而其创作主题又与华人在英国的流散处境、与中英两国的历史现实息息相关。不管是在内容还是形式上，《聚言集》诗歌都独树一帜，具有重要的文献价值、文学价值和现实意义，值得学界广泛关注和充分研究。

## Works Cited

- Benton, Gregor and Edmund Terence Gomez. *The Chinese in Britain, 1800-Present: Economy, Transnationalism, Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.
- 陈鸿超、杨祥银：“口述史在华侨华人研究中的实践——以英国华侨华人口述史为例”，《华侨华人历史研究》3（2022）：21-30。
- [Chen Hongchao and Yang Xiangyin. “Oral History in Overseas Chinese Studies: The Case of Research on Chinese in Britain.” *Journal of Overseas Chinese History Studies* 3 (2022): 21-30.]
- Lai, Him Mark et al. *Island: Poetry and History of Chinese Immigrants on Angel Island, 1910-1940*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1991.
- 罗永安：“珠海市圆明新园”，《聚言集》9（1998）：30。
- [Luo Yong'an. “The New Summer Palace in Zhuhai.” *Brushstrokes* 9 (1998): 30.]

1 童话诗主要出自儿童文学作家林奇梅笔下，先锋诗歌代表诗人是李岩，后者是90年代至今活跃于英国华人诗歌创作圈的双语诗人，其倡导诗歌形式革命，创作了大量形式新颖、意象清奇的中英文诗歌，其中多首刊发在《聚言集》。这些诗歌主题不一，形式多样，意象新奇，当另文讨论。

- : “过虎门大桥”，《聚言集》9（1998）：30。
- [—: “Passing through the Humen Bridge.” *Brushstrokes* 9 (1998): 30.]
- : “欣闻旅英同胞有诗词结集”，《聚言集》8（1997）：27。
- [—: “Pleasure at the Poetry Collection by the Chinese in Britain.” *Brushstrokes* 8 (1997): 27.]
- : “寄赠英伦华人季刊《聚言集》诸君子”，《聚言集》10（1998）：29。
- [—: “To the Colleagues of the British Chinese Quarterly *Brushstrokes*.” *Brushstrokes* 10 (1998): 29.]
- 聂珍钊、王松林主编：《文学伦理学批评理论研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020年。
- [Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin, eds. *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]
- 潘翎：《海外华人百科全书》。中国香港：三联书店（香港）有限公司，1998年。
- [Pan, Lynn. *Encyclopedia of the Chinese Overseas*. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing, 1998.]
- Pang, Ka-Ming. “Curses and Blessings.” *Brushstrokes* 24 (2003): 28.
- : “Faces.” *Brushstrokes* 24 (2003): 28.
- : “Little Chinky Girl.” *Brushstrokes* 25 (2003): 18.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. “Preface.” *The Wretched of the Earth*, translated by Constance Farrington. New York: Grove, 1963. 7-31.
- Shakespeare, William, et al. *Hamlet*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 2003.
- Wang, L. Ling-chi and Henry Yiheng Zhao. *Chinese American Poetry: An Anthology*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1991.
- 亚兴智：“老华侨”，《聚言集》15（2000）：30。
- [Ya Xingzhi. “Old Overseas Chinese.” *Brushstrokes* 15 (2000): 30.]
- 叶黄绮云：“回乡有感”，《聚言集》8（1997）：27。
- [Ye Huangqiyn. “On Returning My Hometown.” *Brushstrokes* 8 (1997): 27.]
- 玉峤：“PALACE”，《聚言集》12（1999）：38。
- [Yu Qiao. “PALACE.” *Brushstrokes* 12 (1999): 38.]
- 曾耀星：“难民”，《聚言集》1（1995）：4。
- [Zeng Yaoping. “Refugees.” *Brushstrokes* 1 (1995): 4.]

# 琦君“故家故事”的道德焦虑与伦理选择：以《髻》与《橘子红了》为例

## Moral Anxiety and Ethical Choices in Qi Jun's Family Stories: A Comparative Study of *The Chignon* and *The Orange Turns Red*

陈力君 (Chen Lijun)

**内容摘要：**琦君的小说《髻》和《橘子红了》体现了传统家庭的伦理秩序和伦理观念，以及在静止而封闭的家庭环境中的道德焦虑与伦理困境。叙述者“我”一方面怀恋镌刻着时代印记的已逝家园，另一方面又以现代理性意识洞察其间的矛盾和危机。随着情节的发展和叙事者的“成长”，质疑和反思的叙述声音越来越大，叙述层面的伦理冲突越来越明显。琦君的身世加大了她在作品中伦理选择的困难。首先，作者认识中的伦理选择完全符合传统家庭的道德规范；其次，身份意识产生的道德压力在作品中转化为个人伦理选择的动力；最后，叙述者对应的“女儿”和“侄女”的复杂角色，隐含着对身份问题的伦理思考。道德焦虑和试图摆脱焦虑的渴望成为琦君书写“故家故事”的情感基础和创作动力。

**关键词：**《橘子红了》；《髻》；琦君；故家故事；伦理选择

**作者简介：**陈力君，浙江大学文学院副教授，主要从事中国现当代文学与影视文化研究。

**Title:** Moral Anxiety and Ethical Choices in Qi Jun's Family Stories: A Comparative Study of *The Chignon* and *The Orange Turns Red*

**Abstract:** Qi Jun's novels, *The Chignon* and *The Orange Turns Red*, illustrate the ethical order and concepts of traditional family life and the moral anxiety and ethical dilemmas that arise within static and enclosed family environments. The narrator, "I" deeply cherishes the bygone family home with its imprints of the era. However, with a modern rational consciousness, the narrator also perceives the contradictions and crises within. The voice of questioning and reflection becomes more prominent, and the ethical conflicts at the narrative level become increasingly apparent. Qi Jun's background further complicates the ethical choices depicted in her works. Firstly, the author's ethical choices, under her awareness, align perfectly

with the moral norms of traditional families. Secondly, her sense of identity generates moral pressure, leading to sharp contradictions between individual ethical choices and societal ethical standards. Thirdly, the roles of “daughter” and “niece” that the narrator corresponds to imply deeper ethical dilemmas under the sense of identity. Moral anxiety and the yearning to break free from it become the emotional foundation and creative driving force of Qi Jun’s family stories.

**Keywords:** *The Orange Turns Red*; *The Chignon*; family stories; moral anxiety; ethical choice

**Author:** **Chen Lijun** is Associate Professor of School of Literature, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China) Specializing in Modern Chinese Literature and Film and Television Culture (Email: chenlijun2@zju.edu.cn).

琦君（原名潘希真）作为大陆迁居台湾的乡愁文学的代表作家，创作了30多部散文集、7部小说集，以及若干儿童文学作品，海内外影响深广。1969年的《髻》和1987年的《橘子红了》以怀旧感人的文学主题，揭示了故家故去的深层原因。时代冲击固然造成家庭动荡，但最让人痛心的是家庭内部矛盾冲突造成的情感撕裂。两部作品表现出的道德焦虑，扩展了琦君“故家故事”的思想深度。

### 一、故事：传统家庭的伦理困境

《髻》和《橘子红了》都是书写故家伦理困境的小说。《髻》讲述了“男尊女卑”的旧家庭中的惨痛家事：“父亲”娶“姨娘”后，“母亲”每天通过梳理不同发式表达心中不满，与“姨娘”竞争。“母亲”向“姨娘”示威和挑战表达的既是“母亲”的隐痛和辛酸，也是“我”的童年创伤。《橘子红了》讲述了旧家庭中因妻妾争宠而酿成的人间悲剧，延续和深化了《髻》的主题。长期滞留乡下的“大太太”为讨好丈夫、稳固家庭地位，以繁衍子息为借口，把乡下女孩秀芬娶为丈夫的三房。但她的行为并未改变自己的境遇，反而导致秀芬的人生悲剧。两部作品通过旧式婚姻制度造成的家庭悲剧，反映中国传统家庭的伦理困境，展开现代性反思。

“文学作品中的伦理是指人与人、人与社会以及人与自然之间形成的被接受和认可的伦理秩序，以及在这种秩序上形成的道德观念和维护这种秩序的各种规范”（Nie, “*Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory*” 190）<sup>1</sup>。《髻》和《橘子红了》中让人痛心的“故家故事”体现的是传统家庭的伦理秩序和道德观念。道德规范决定个体处境，人物身份决定伦理选择，不同的伦理选择形成不同的情感态度和行为方式。所有的个人行为 and 动机、人与人之间的

1 外文引文均出自笔者译。



关系和社会矛盾，都是伦理选择的结果。两部小说通过主人公的人生悲剧，展现了近现代中国江南文化区的伦理观念，以及因伦理观念变化而导致的情感焦虑和伦理困惑。在中国社会由传统向现代的转型期，现代文明的思想观念逐渐扩展，但传统观念仍根深蒂固，家庭环境依旧封闭守旧。不论城市还是乡村，家庭成员的言行举止都遵循传统伦理观念，“男尊女卑”是传统夫妻关系的基本特征。上层社会的富裕家庭大多沿用妻妾制的婚姻制度。在这种婚姻传统中，形成了与妻妾制相对应的伦理秩序：女性在家庭中地位低下，在身份上从属于丈夫，处于被支配的家庭地位。在妻妾制的家庭中，女性生存竞争和权力倾轧现象普遍。

琦君通过传统家庭日常生活描述，展现了传统家庭的伦理秩序，揭示了家庭成员因伦理身份的变化而造成的沉重道德负累。《髻》和《橘子红了》中的家庭成员相互间的对立和矛盾，都是根据各自伦理身份进行选择的结果。在两部小说中，代表传统道德又受困于传统道德的人物“大太太”成为传统伦理秩序的牺牲品。“大太太”是传统家庭的道德典范，她在家中日夜操劳，埋头于家务，谨遵妇德，绝对服从丈夫意志，但她的付出往往被忽略，得不到应有的尊重。《橘子红了》中的“大太太”愁的是在外做官的丈夫长久没寄信回家，即便寄来了，也“只有三言两语，回回都是那几个文言文字眼”，但她总是“双手捧着一遍又一遍的看，嘴角笑咪咪的”（琦君，《橘子红了》17）。不识字的“大太太”仅得到丈夫简单的家信就感到满足，这隐含着她卑微的心态，也体现了旧式婚姻中夫妻的不平等地位和情感不对等。同样，《髻》中的“母亲”也经历了类似的人生境遇。作为传统家庭中的主妇，她们不仅完全接受传统家庭道德规范，还以道德规范为人生圭臬。她们极力掩饰对丈夫的想念和克制情感的曲折心理，是大家庭中“大太太”身份长期被约束和压抑的结果。

如果没有外部力量的冲击，传统的家庭模式就会保留下来，家庭中偶而出现的矛盾或意见分歧也会被忽略。在《髻》和《橘子红了》中，作者设置了导致婚姻关系变化的关键人物“姨太太”。“姨太太”的到来带来家庭环境变化，导致家庭成员矛盾。《髻》中的“姨娘”一出现就抢了“母亲”的风头，构成了与“母亲”间的竞争关系。作品中叙述了“我”感受到的两人间的令人窒息的较量：“母亲”引以为傲的头发，陡然失色；“姨娘”“一头如云的柔发比母亲的还要乌，还要亮”（琦君，《髻》34）。面对年轻的竞争对手，“母亲”表现出强烈的危机感。尽管如此，“母亲”还是选择与其身份匹配的发式，这注定了她在争宠中落败。同样，《橘子红了》中的“大太太”也面临“姨太太”的竞争威胁。

伦理关系决定身份意识，只有身份的改变才会带来变动和选择。<sup>1</sup>《髻》

1 关于伦理身份与伦理选择的关系，参见 查尔斯·罗斯、杨革新：“文学伦理学批评的理论建构：聂珍钊访谈录”，《外语与外语教学》4（2015）：75-78。

中的“母亲”和《橘子红了》中的“大太太”，她们的伦理身份决定了只能选择与身份相符的行为，即使在激烈的竞争中也不会变通。在《髻》中，“母亲”心里清楚古板的发式让丈夫讨厌和嫌弃，但其身份决定了她只能选择保守的旧式发髻。同样，《橘子红了》中的“大太太”完全根据其身份进行选择，不仅不敢要求丈夫回家，还表现出识大体的样子，安排丈夫迎娶三房。而面对二房“姨太太”的挑衅，她同样选择委曲求全、不公开对抗。琦君两部小说中“大太太”的复杂心理以及克制与隐忍，都是她们按照其身份进行选择的结果。

在旧家庭中，与“大太太”争宠的“姨太太”也加入身份选择的竞争中。《髻》和《橘子红了》中的“姨太太”，凭借年轻貌美暂时获得丈夫的宠爱，但随着时间流逝、美貌消失，她们也会像“大太太”一样，愈来愈受困于传统家庭的伦理秩序，无法避免遭遇其他家庭成员的抵触和排挤。旧时代婚姻关系决定了女性的人生处境，处于被支配地位的女性间的竞争，注定只能是一种争宠和自我消耗。在旧家庭这一伦理环境中，女性间的争宠是她们不得不做出的伦理选择，但弱者间的争斗又进一步强化了她们的身份意识。不论她们如何竞争都只能屈服于夫权，不能改变她们被动和屈从的地位。

中国传统社会家庭制度历史悠久，形成了一套严格的道德规范，不仅女性按照身份进行选择，男性同样按照身份进行选择。《髻》中的“父亲”被“母亲”崇拜，在“母亲”面前拥有绝对权威。即便如此，“父亲”也只能在家庭伦理秩序中按照身份进行活动，无法自由地做出选择。面对妻妾间的矛盾冲突，“父亲”既不参与也不评判，而是选择无视。同样，《橘子红了》中的“丈夫”在家庭中拥有无上权力，但也不能进行自由选择。面对妻妾们的明争暗斗，他同样选择置身事外。家庭关系中具有绝对权威的丈夫对待妻妾的态度表明：传统家庭伦理观念下的男性容易丧失鲜活的生命力，成为空洞能指的象征符号。男性在现实家庭关系中的缺位，加深了中国传统家庭伦理秩序中女性的不幸。

《髻》和《橘子红了》对旧家庭中人物的伦理选择的书写，呈现了中国传统家庭的伦理困境：稳固、静止和封闭的旧家庭受家庭权力结构的限制，男尊女卑、夫为妻纲的伦理观念成为主导，决定着家庭成员的人生选择。在传统家庭的伦理秩序中，家庭成员都有强烈的身份意识，只能按照传统的道德观念进行选择。

## 二、叙事：新旧伦理冲突

小说作为叙事艺术，叙事策略的运用体现了作者的主体意识和文化观念。<sup>1</sup>“文学伦理批评主要是为了解读文学文本，将几乎所有的文学文本视为

1 有关小说叙事策略与主体意识、文化观念的关系，参见 杨义：《中国叙事学》，北京：商务印书馆，2019年，第260-261页。

人类道德的记录，以各种方式将伦理结串在一起的伦理排列结构或伦理线，构成了文学文本的主要伦理结构”（Nie, *Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory* 191）。在《髻》和《橘子红了》这两部作品中，旧的伦理观念认可传统家族制度和婚姻制度，遵循传统伦理秩序和传统道德规范；新的伦理观念接受西方现代价值观念，强调个体价值和精神自由，包含对旧的伦理观念的反思。新旧伦理观念的冲突通过作品叙述声音的变化得以体现。这两部作品设置了经历成长过程的叙述者“我”，而“我”的认知随着不同的人生阶段发生变化。儿时的“我”接受的旧伦理观念与长大后接受的新伦理观念发生冲突，叙述者“我”在不同人生阶段的伦理倾向，构成了作品的叙述逻辑。

两部小说通过“我”叙述孩童时期的人生经验，体现出强烈的维护旧伦理观念、称颂传统道德规范的情感立场。叙述者“我”在作品中表现出偏向母亲和大妈的情感倾向。如《髻》中年幼的“我”面对“母亲”和“姨娘”的竞争，选择站在“母亲”一边，为“母亲”抱屈；而《橘子红了》中的“我”坚决站在“大妈”一边，在听说“大伯”娶了二房“姨太太”之后，感到“心都发抖”（琦君，《橘子红了》16）。“我”伦理立场的形成是身份意识的深层作用和家庭长期教导的结果。“我”选择与“守家”的“大妈”保持一致，符合基本人性和情感逻辑。与此叙述立场一致，“我”难以避免主观情感的影响，也会据此对人物进行道德评判。因此，作品中的“姨太太”被塑造成有违传统道德规范的女性形象。如《髻》中与忙碌家事的“母亲”不同，“姨太太”只顾打扮，追求安乐享受。“我”虽然深知敬爱的长辈的自私和冷漠造成了秀芬的悲惨结局，却不愿直接指摘长辈，认为秀芬“是被摆布着进入一个陌生的家，却意外地享受到家的温暖的”（琦君，《橘子红了》35）。这一叙述的转折，既表露了“我”同情秀芬，不愿直陈其不幸和痛苦人生的曲折心理，又通过偏向于秀芬的安慰表述，缓解了“我”作为家庭成员的道德压力，避开了直接指责长辈、批判旧家庭的情感困境。

接受现代思想的成年后的“我”的思考则体现了新的伦理观念。如《橘子红了》中的“我”面对秀芬不幸死亡时，不再局限于孩童经验，超越了“我”的情感立场，以反思旧家庭无视底层女性生命和尊严的落后观念，质疑传统伦理观念：“究竟是谁的罪过呢？是大妈吗？是大伯吗？还是那个交际花姨太呢？无论如何，秀芬是沒有一丝罪过的，但是秀芬却承担了一切”（琦君，《橘子红了》96）。“我”长大后，回想发生在旧家庭中的不幸和悲剧，不禁反诘长辈的观念和行为，为承受屈辱和不幸的女性鸣不平，体现了“我”的现代意识的觉醒。“我”甚至直至指出其过错：“大伯真的会把秀芬放在心上，说自己‘至为哀痛’，但‘待我归来’，究竟是哪一天呢？难道让秀芬死后还要无年无月的等待吗？”（琦君，《橘子红了》103）

“我”以充满激愤的口吻和理性态度质疑家庭权威、传统伦理观念，谴责其冷漠和敷衍的态度才是导致秀芬不幸和悲剧的根源。与之相类似，《髻》中的“我”长大后也开始反思传统家庭的伦理观念，在“母亲”和“姨娘”过世后，逐渐洞悉了人情、人性，能够客观地理解“母亲”和“姨娘”之间的较量和仇视，这赋予作品更多历史内涵和文化厚度。

孩童时期和成年后的“我”的伦理意识的变化，不仅使叙述倾向的新旧伦理冲突日益激烈，还造成作品中的叙事立场的矛盾和犹疑。但作为旧家庭抚育成长的“我”，最终也难以舍弃维护家庭的情感立场，努力挖掘传统家庭伦理秩序下的善和美。“叙述者评论的内容，是已经经过叙述加工的内容。叙述者加工与叙述者评论，同样是道德行为”（赵毅衡 55）。作品中的叙述者围绕传统道德规范确立伦理定位，淡化旧式家庭对立和危机，营造故家的温馨氛围和美好印象。琦君坦言，虽然觉得“大半生中所遭遇的许多事，许多人物，并不个个都像我回忆童年文中的人物那么纯朴善良”（琦君，《与我同车》210），“可是我觉得，社会上坏事情已经很多了，所以为什么不把好的一面表现出来呢（……）写好的写惯了，一写，心里想到的都是温馨的”（廖玉惠39）。琦君意识到，她无法化解其内心的伦理冲突，在作品中选择了倾向于传统伦理的叙述立场。这一叙述立场表明她不能超脱刻骨的故家思念和眷恋，只能选择正视故家所处的历史语境，探寻故家伦理秩序具有合理性的叙述逻辑。在她看来，故家的传统伦理观念以及所体现出的新旧伦理冲突有其深厚的历史基础。

《髻》和《橘子红了》隐含着叙述伦理的内在冲突。叙述者“我”面对“故家故事”体现出激烈的伦理冲突：情感维度的旧伦理观念与理智层面的新伦理观念产生激烈碰撞。一方面，“我”深深怀恋已经逝去的故家，那是镌刻着时代印记的家园；另一方面，又以现代思想和理性意识洞察其间的矛盾和危机。

### 三、本事：作者伦理选择的两难

《髻》和《橘子红了》的伦理观念和伦理冲突不仅表现在故事和叙事层面，同时也因作者身世而愈加复杂。勒文森在阐释中国近现代文化嬗变时，发现由传统向现代转换的知识分子存在“历史与价值的张力”（勒文森 3-4）的普遍心态。琦君通过书写“故家故事”体现其个体经验、社会道德压力及其复杂身世。

首先，在《髻》和《橘子红了》两部作品中，传统家庭的道德规范带来的伦理选择体现了作者的身份意识。《髻》中的“我”是女儿身份，当她以女儿身份目睹“母亲”和“姨太太”内闱争斗时，“我”选择与“母亲”一致的情感立场，认同“母亲”的情感，较少反思；《橘子红了》中的“我”是收养的侄女身份。相较于《髻》中的“我”，《橘子红了》中的“我”面



对家长表现出客观和理性的情感立场。“我”不会一味偏袒“大妈”，会对其不合理的行为提出异议，对其无条件服从丈夫的行为表示不满。两部关于“故家故事”的小说分别以“女儿”和“侄女”的不同叙述视角表达不同伦理情感。

不管是“女儿”还是“侄女”，琦君深受传统伦理观念影响，对哺育和培养她的旧家庭充满感激。在《髻》和《橘子红了》中，作者历数了在旧家庭中受到的呵护和关爱，这也决定了作者的身份意识。《髻》中的“我”，对“父亲”的想念溢于言表，通过语言和细节体现了父女间深厚情感。这份亲情在《橘子红了》中也得以充分表达。而在现实中，琦君的伯父伯母（养父母）不仅在其丧失双亲的幼年时期收养她，还视同己出地抚育她长大成人。在教育培养上，琦君的大伯表现出的现代教育理念和超前意识<sup>1</sup>，使琦君终身受益。琦君以亲身经历展示了在充满关爱的家庭中长大、对伯父伯母有着深厚感情的故家情结。

琦君有着明确的身份意识，她不仅在作品中不断流露对旧家庭的感恩之情，也在作品中称颂传统家庭的日常生活和伦理秩序。即使意识到传统伦理观念下的家庭会不断产生矛盾，甚至危机，她还是表现出强烈的传统伦理意识：渴望家庭的完整和美满、认同传统家庭观念、为传统伦理观念辩护。

《髻》中的“我”长大后离家求学，一直无改对“母亲”的爱和依恋；而《橘子红了》中“我”听说“大伯”在外面娶了“二太太”，立即生出“大伯怎么可以这样对待糟糠之妻？这是欺骗，这是不忠实”（琦君，《橘子红了》16）的气愤情绪，但又不忍心责备大伯，认为“大伯是为了子息，等生了一男半女以后，再告诉大妈，她是贤德女人，没有不肯的”（琦君，《橘子红了》16）。在《髻》和《橘子红了》中以男性家长为尊的家庭伦理秩序，充分体现了琦君强烈的传统家庭观念。面对家中长辈之间的冲突和矛盾，尤其当作为家庭权威的“大伯”伤害其他家庭成员时，作为晚辈的“我”只能委婉地为“大伯”的行为辩护，这体现出琦君维护传统家庭伦理观念的努力。

其次，琦君在《髻》和《橘子红了》中的身份意识，也体现了琦君个人伦理选择和社会伦理观念之间的矛盾。琦君虽然在旧家庭中成长，却接受了现代教育，接触到平等自由等现代思想。但琦君深刻意识到：传统伦理观念依然强大，女性在旧家庭中处于不平等地位仍是普遍现象。琦君理解特定历史时期的伦理环境和道德要求，同情旧家庭中受苦和挣扎的人。虽然琦君个人受到旧家庭的厚待，但她无法忽视传统家庭伦理观念对人性的压抑和扭曲。她立足于现代理性质疑她所思念的故家故人，不得不承受强大的道德压力。这种两难的伦理选择使琦君深陷困惑。她在极力赞颂传统家庭伦理典范的母亲形象、肯定女性无私奉献的精神品质的同时，又同情女性在家中的不

1 参见琦君：《桂花雨》，中国台北：尔雅出版社，1976年，第8-11页。

平等地位。琦君面对故家的无奈情感、酸楚情绪和困惑心态，削弱了理性反思的力度。琦君的情理分裂正是其身份意识下不同伦理选择导致的困境。

最后，琦君在《髻》和《橘子红了》中书写的伦理困境，不仅是普遍意义上的作者身份意识造成的，更是她复杂身世带来的深度牵绊。伯父伯母兼养父母的双重身份，以及领养抚育这一极具道德高度的行为，令琦君在反思旧家庭传统伦理观念时，须承担抚养恩情带来的沉重情感压力。但是当作品中的故家形象日渐丰富，但现实故家却不复存在时，琦君痛感不能回报养育之恩。对故家的渴念使逝去的故家形象在琦君内心幻化成童年的伊甸园。但作为作家，她又在理性上意识到：不能只凭着对故家的怀念和依恋，塑造完美的故家形象，而无视旧家庭伦理观念带来的伤害和痛苦。创作行为使她深陷于伦理悖论。特别是面对旧家庭中不容质疑的权威者“父亲”和“大伯父”时，琦君的情感和理智背离分裂就更明显了。作为养女身份和作为作家身份的琦君，在作品创作时产生了情感对立。深受传统家庭伦理观念影响的琦君的内心深处难以回避这一伦理冲突，难以弥合感情认同和价值判断。也正因为深陷于深情和困惑形成的缠结情绪，琦君才写出如此绵长伤痛又无限隽永的“故家故事”。这不仅是琦君的伦理困境，也是中国近现代历史转型和文化嬗递中成长起来的现代作家的普遍伦理困境。

“在文学作品中，狮身人面像因素的概念体现在人物的自然意志、自由意志和理性意志的结合上（……）文学的功能是通过赞扬美德和惩罚罪恶来教导道德价值观，它的最终目的是回答如何将自然意志和自由意志置于理性意志的控制之下的问题”（Nie, “*Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection*” 392）。《髻》和《橘子红了》通过文本内部、文本和世界、作家和读者等诸多关系，展示了伦理观念于作家的影响和作品的深层作用。无论是人物，还是叙述者，抑或作者，他们的伦理意识和伦理选择，都在探讨中国近现代历史转型期的伦理观念。琦君的“故家故事”从不同层面揭示出：作者的伦理身份形成伦理观念，伦理观念也反过来强化伦理身份，形成作品的伦理定位；伦理身份的改变带来了态度的改变，产生新的伦理实践。琦君的“故家故事”在传统与现代、个人与社会的多重伦理关系中进行选择和定位，并将其人生经验转化为创作素材，而道德焦虑成为琦君书写“故家故事”的创作动力。

## Works Cited

约瑟夫·阿·勒文森：《梁启超与中国近代思想》，刘伟、刘丽、姜铁军译。成都：四川人民出版社，1986年。

[Levenson, Joseph R. *Liang Chi-chao and the Mind of Modern China*, translated by Liu Wei, Liu Li and Jiang Tiejun. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Publishing House, 1986.]

廖玉惠：“在彩色与黑白的网点之间”，《自由时报》2001年11月9-10日，第39版。



[Liao Yuhui. "Between Color and Black and White Dots." *The Liberty Times* 9-10 November 2001, late ed.: C39.]

Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 2 (2021): 189-207.

—. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Sphinx Factor and Ethical Selection." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 3 (2021): 383-398.

琦君:《永是有情人》。中国台北:九歌出版社有限公司,1998年。

[Qi Jun. *Being a Lover Forever*. Taipei (China): Chiu Ko Publishing Co., Ltd, 1998.]

——:“髻”,《红纱灯》。中国台北:三民书局股份有限公司,1969年,第33-38页。

[—."The Chignon," *Red Gauze Lamp*. Taipei (China): Sanmin Book Co., Ltd, 1969. 33-38.]

——:“橘子红了”,《橘子红了》。中国台北:洪范书店,1991年,第11-108页。

[—."Orange is Red," *Orange is Red*. Taipei (China): Hongfan Bookstore Co., Ltd, 1991. 11-108.]

——:《与我同车》。中国台北:九歌出版社有限公司,1979年。

[—."Take a Car With Me. Taipei (China): Chiu Ko Publishing Co., Ltd, 1979.]

赵毅衡:《当说者被说的时候:比较叙述学导论》。成都:四川文艺出版社,2013年。

[Zhao Yiheng. *When the Teller is Told About*. Chengdu: Sichuan Literature and Art Publishing House, 2013.]



Published by  
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited  
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920



9 772520 49 2238 03