

ISSN 2520-4920 (Print)

ISSN 2616-4566 (Online)

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 5, Number 3
September 2021



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

**Volume 5, Number 3
September 2021**

Editor

Nie Zhenzhao, Zhejiang University

Associate Editors

Wu Di, Zhejiang University

Wang Yong, Zhejiang University

Director of Editorial Office

Yang Gexin, Zhejiang University

Published by

Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited

Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

Contact information: Editorial office, *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*, 6 East Building, Zijingang Campus, Zhejiang University, 866 Yuhangtang Rd, Hangzhou 310058, P.R. China. Tel:+86-571-8898-2010

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

Advisory Board

Massimo Bacigalupo / Università di Genova, ITA

Michael Bell / University of Warwick, UK

Charles Bernstein / University of Pennsylvania, USA

Vladimir Biti / University of Vienna, AT

Shang Biwu / Shanghai Jiaotong University, CHN

Marshall Brown / University of Washington, USA

Galin Tihanov / Queen Mary University of London, UK

Knut Brynhildsvoll / University of Oslo, NOR

Stefan Collini / University of Cambridge, UK

Khairy Douma / Cairo University, EGY

Barbara Foley / Rutgers University, USA

Su Hui / Central China Normal University, CHN

Luo Lianggong / Central China Normal University, CHN

Byeongho Jung / Korea University, KOR

Anne-Marie Mai / University of Southern Denmark, DEN

Wolfgang Müller / Friedrich-Schiller University Jena, GER

Marjorie Perloff / Stanford University, USA

John Rathmell / University of Cambridge, UK

Claude Rawson / Yale University, USA

Joshua Scodel / University of Chicago, USA

Igor Shaytanov / *Problems of Literature*, RUS

Inseop Shin / Konkuk University, KOR

Wang Songlin / Ningbo University, CHN

Contents

- 379-396 Interdisciplinary Literary Studies: Text, Print, Medium: An Interview with
Sandro Jung
Sandro Jung
Xiao Yang
- 397-419 Positional Outsiders and the Performance of Sacrifice: The Case of Franz
Kafka
Vladimir Biti
- 420-431 Han Suyin's *Picnic in Malaya: A Story*: A Lament on the Unending
Misery of Womanhood in the Newly Independent Malaya by a Chinese
Doctor
Danny Wong Tze Ken
Florence Kuek
Fan Pik Wah
- 432-442 Self-fashioning and Moral Maturity in *Evelina*
Li Silan
Chen Lizhen
- 443-457 Brain Text, Quotation, and the Writing of American Cultural Identity in
Marianne Moore's Poetry
He Qingji
- 458-471 Christian Public Interpretation and Socio-Religion Reformism: Martin
Luther's Choice of Ethical Identity
Chen Kaiju
- 472-482 The Allegory of "Folding" Death: The Scientific and Technological Ethics
in *Solid Geometry*
Guo Yingjian
Liu Xianghui
- 483-497 Ethics and Politics in *Underworld*: Ethical Choice of Nuclear Arms Race
and the Reconstruction of the Memory of Cold War Paranoia
Chen Junsong

- 498-508 On Possible Lives: The Ethical Choices of Modern Crusoes
Ren Haiyan
- 509-523 On Ethical Issues in Cao Yu's Drama Productions
Liu Jiasi
Liu Can
- 524-535 The Utopia of Eros: On Aristophanes' Encomium in Plato's *Symposium*
Wang Yunxia
- 536-549 On the Academic Path of Building Chinese Narratology: Taking Fu
Xiuyan's *A Study of Auditory Narratology* as an Example
Liu Yalu
- 550-557 Canonical Blend of Ethical Debate and Aesthetic Appreciation: *Moral
Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's
Novels*
Wang Shuang

目 录

379-396 跨学科文学研究：文本、印刷、媒介

桑德罗·荣格

杨 肖

397-419 局外人状态与献祭的展示：以弗兰兹·卡夫卡为例

弗拉基米尔·比提

420-431 韩素音的《马来亚野餐》：一位华裔女医生看马来西亚独立初期的
妇女困境

黄子坚

郭紫薇

潘碧华

432-442 《伊芙莱娜》中的自我形塑与道德成熟

李思兰

陈礼珍

443-457 脑文本、引文与玛丽安·摩尔诗歌的美国文化身份书写

何庆机

458-471 基督教公共阐释与社会改良：马丁·路德的身份与选择研究

陈开举

472-482 “折叠”死亡的寓言：《立体几何》中的科技伦理

郭英剑

刘向辉

483-497 《地下世界》中的伦理与政治：核竞赛的伦理选择与冷战妄想狂的
记忆重构

陈俊松

498-508 何为可能生活：现代鲁滨逊们的伦理选择

任海燕

509-523 论曹禺戏剧创作中的伦理问题

刘家思

刘 璨

524-535 爱欲的乌托邦：论《会饮》中阿里斯托芬的讲辞

汪云霞

536-549 论建设中国叙事学的学术路径问题：以傅修延“听觉叙事研究”为例

刘亚律

550-557 伦理之辩与艺术审美的典范融合：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》

王 爽

Interdisciplinary Literary Studies: Text, Print, Medium

Sandro Jung & Yang Xiao

Abstract: In this interview conducted by Dr. Yang Xiao in June 2021, Sandro Jung, Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, talks about his research on textuality broadly defined as well as about how the adoption of the concept of the medium can complicate and amplify our modern understanding of historical processes involving the production, reading, and reception of literary works. Complementing the literary scholar's almost exclusive focus on typographical textuality with other kinds of printed (not necessarily paper-based) media, he points out that reading (and apprehending the meaning of) literature often occurred intermedially and that frequently different kinds of literacy, including visual literacy, allowed readers and consumers to understand objects inscribed with literary meaning (or epitexts) as iterations of what Jerome McGann's terms the "textual condition." A work is shown to exist in a virtual realm of appropriation where it can be given shape and manifested as an object that—to a modern reader *unfamiliar with historical object and media cultures*—may not have any connection with the literary work itself. To the historical reader this would have been far from the truth, however, since the print economy and consumer market capitalising on the currency and popularity of literary works ensured that the literary meaning transferred to an object such as a fan or a ceramic jug was recognisable and advertised as such.

Keywords: textuality; historical media cultures; reception; history of reading; print media; typographical/visual literacy

Authors: **Sandro Jung** is Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, where he also serves as Director of the Centre for the Study of Text and Print Culture and the Head of the Literature team. He has published more than 100 A&HCI journal articles and 9 monographs, as well as many book chapters and edited volumes/special journal issues. For the past decade, he has been the Editor-in-Chief of the Taylor & Francis A&HCI-listed journal, *ANQ*, and, since 2015, he has served as the General Editor of the Studies in Text and Print Culture book series (Lehigh University Press). His areas of research include textual studies, book history/print culture studies, eighteenth- and nineteenth-century English, German, and French

literature, text-image studies, historical media studies, and reception studies (Email: Sandro.Jung@mail.shufe.edu.cn). **Yang Xiao** is Associate Professor of English and Comparative Literature at the Shanghai University of Finance and Economics. His recent areas of research include the translation of English literature in China in the 18th century and the overseas communication history of Chinese folk art. (Email: yangxiaoworld@163.com).

标题：跨学科文学研究：文本、印刷、媒介

内容摘要：在 2021 年 6 月杨肖博士对上海财经大学英语和比较文学讲席教授桑德罗·荣格 (Sandro Jung) 进行的访谈中。桑德罗·荣格谈到他对广义文本性的研究，以及媒介概念的采用如何使我们对文学作品的生产、阅读和接受等历史过程的现代理解复杂化和扩大化。作为文学学者几乎完全专注于排版的文本性和其他印刷（不一定是纸质）媒介的补充，他指出文学阅读（和意思的理解）往往是中间过程，而常常不同类型的读写能力，包括视觉读写能力，能够使读者和消费者理解带有文学意义（或外延）的东西，就像杰罗姆·麦甘 (Jerome McGann) 所说的“文本条件”的新的阐释。一部作品被证明存在于一个虚拟的挪用领域，在那里它可以被赋予形状并表现为一个物体——对于一个不熟悉历史物件和媒体文化的现代读者来说——可能与文学作品本身没有任何联系。然而，对于历史读者来说这可能与事实相去甚远，因为印刷经济和消费市场利用文学作品的流通性和流行性，确保了像扇子或陶瓷壶之类的物体的文学意义是可以识别的并以此做广告。

关键词：文本性；历史媒体文化；接受；阅读史；印刷媒体；印刷/视觉读写能力

作者简介：桑德罗·荣格，上海财经大学英语和比较文学讲席教授，文本与印刷文化研究中心主任和文学团队负责人。过去十年，他一直担任 Taylor & Francis A&HCI 期刊 ANQ 的主编，自 2015 年以来，一直任文本与印刷文化研究丛书（理海大学出版社）的总编辑。已发表 A&HCI 收录学术论文 100 多篇，出版专著 9 部和大量书籍章节和编辑卷宗/特刊。他的研究领域包括文本研究、书记历史/印刷文化研究、十八和十九世纪英语、德语和发育文学研究、文本图像研究、历史媒体研究和接受研究。杨肖，上海财经大学英语和比较文学副教授，主要研究方向是英美文学、比较文学和艺术传播学。近年来的研究重心是十八世纪英国文学在中国的翻译与流布，以及中国民间艺术的海外传播史。

Yang: Since your arrival at SUFE, you have founded a specialist research Centre for the Study of Text and Print Culture to promote a range of new research areas in China. You also seek to establish international collaboration with Chinese

scholars. Would you be able to explain what you regard as your particular contribution to the interdisciplinary study of literature in China?

Jung: When I set up the Centre for the Study of Text and Print Culture in November 2020, I intended that this centre would build on the work that I had previously undertaken in Belgium, where—in 2011—I had founded a centre of the same name; like the SUFE centre, it tried to explore those areas that literary history has not usually examined: the material forms of meaning. I am thus not thinking about literary meaning as abstract only, but as shaped by the material conditions that produce literature, that make literature accessible to the masses, and that shape the very way in which literature is being consumed, read, and handled. So, it is a material approach to literature that embraces the media of literature as its subject. My interests are focused on the medium of print, but also other media. When I moved to Shanghai, following a visiting position in China, which I had held since 2017, I realized that these media-centred approaches are quite well established in the discipline of Chinese literary studies, especially those that examine text-image relationships in such intermedial constructs as Chinese poetry and characters on porcelain, for instance, or how images and Chinese characters operate on fans or even on screens. By contrast, foreign studies or international studies departments have not yet embraced these methodologies that already exist in China when applied to Chinese literature. So, there is huge potential in broadening the field of foreign literary studies through methodologies already used in China and those that have been developed abroad.

What I am trying to do is to bring trends in foreign literary studies from the west to China, but also to combine them with expertise that already exists in China, especially in Chinese literature departments: my interest is, fundamentally, in the recovery of literary experience across the ages. It is focused on literary history and how we can address some of the blind spots that previous historians have not studied. What do I mean by this? The blind spots that nowadays are being recovered and given central significance are those that relate to minor poets, minor authors, but also what we might call unconventional forms of textual transmission. Usually literary scholars think about textual transmission in terms of manuscripts and printed texts. My approach is to look far more broadly at how literature was being mediated and transmitted through all cultural forms of expression: as a result, I study media and textual manifestations that range from paintings to performance and that help us to understand how real readers encountered literature—not just as an abstract form of mental engagement in materialized form in the printed text, but how this text was brought to life through stage performance, for instance. These

material forms of literature and mediation also comprise literary-interpretive visual images transferred onto material culture that was used in day-to-day settings and that encouraged an active engagement with the literary text through the medium that was being contemplated.

My Centre's interdisciplinary remit in terms of the study of literature, then, concentrates on how alternative media of textual construction, such as material culture with textual inscription, can help us to understand the particular ways in which readers of the past made sense of literature. This research does not necessarily confine itself to high-end and very expensive books which the general reading public could not afford. Rather, it takes a decentred perspective and pays attention, among others, to spectacular media of literature such as waxworks. If we think about the eighteenth-century novel, *Pamela*, by Samuel Richardson, one of the most popular ways in which readers in the London of the year 1740 or 1745 would have become familiar with *Pamela* would have been to visit a waxwork museum where all the characters and stories were being embodied by moulded figures. These figures were affordable to look at and experience because the entrance fee to the exhibit was only six pence. Yet the impact of the display was pervasive: the wax-work was an attraction and talking point through which knowledge of literature could be gleaned. By contrast, the actual book edition, especially the 1742 illustrated one, was not affordable to the masses. It was exclusive and facilitated access to the work in an elite medium. Nevertheless, *Pamela* became a media phenomenon. For that reason, it is trying to negotiate how the masses read literature and how literary studies in China and in the west have usually elevated literature as a particular medium of cultural production (that is read by very few highly skilled readers) that needs to be addressed in a future, corrective literary history of reading.

Previously, highly skilled academic readers have advanced theories of reading that are detached from the reality of actual reading. My interdisciplinary work aims to offer an alternative to this traditional reading history by recovering the reality of readers' experience of texts through all kinds of textual media.

Yang: Could you talk about the definition of "text" and the relationship between text and other media? That is, how does text use other media to transform its meaning?

Jung: Not even in the west is it considered a standard conception that the text can also have different iterations. For example, my work on ceramics has demonstrated that ceramics with illustrations of literary texts can advance literary meaning to those who know how to interpret the images, and to those who know

that these images work as mnemonic devices. These images on porcelain and other ceramic wares serve as devices of memory, recording previous reading experience or capturing textual situations that are now given visual shape.

My work draws fundamentally on the critical work of Jerome McGann, who—in *The Textual Condition* (1991)—defines the spectrum of different iterations of text. He amplifies the conventional notion that texts materialize either as manuscript or typescript by adopting an inclusive position from which different media such as images, image-texts, which translate the verbal construction of the text into a spatio-temporal setting, are part of a text's life and reception. My work has focused extensively on images as mirrors of reception, but also how these images and how texts travel from medium to medium.

In the seventeenth century, it was common to see drinking glasses engraved with poems. These were special glasses for festive occasions: they could have been for a birthday or for a jubilee; the poems on the glasses could have been produced by the poet laureate in commemoration of a particular event or the monarch's birthday. You would drink out of the glass and, while drinking, you would focus your attention on the engraved writing on the glass. This reading, making sense of a literary text on a glass and linking it with a particular commemorative occasion, enabled you to consume literature in a way that is distinct from reading the planar text of the printed book. It is still very much the medium, the glass that you are holding, a brittle material, but a very expensive material nevertheless, now enriched and paratextually inscribed with additional meaning, which you have to decipher. In addition, a third element, the occasion itself, the context in which you use this glass, needs to be taken into account to gain a holistic understanding of both the mediality of the object and the intermediality of its constituent components.

What I am interested in are those media that are not usually studied—sometimes because they are very far removed from what literary scholars consider literature as such. Trained professionals of literary studies do not commonly consider objects ranging from vases to fans to reconstruct literary reception. But fan production, in the eighteenth century, catered to a mass market in both China and Europe: frequently fans contained stories that had printed and engraved text underneath them and images above them. As you unfolded the fan, you would, simultaneously, see the unfolding of a story. In terms of narrative, you begin from the left of the fan, and then you open it to the right. With the unfolding, the physical unfolding of the medium, a tactile relationship conditions the unfolding of a mental process as part of which you look at the image. You read the text, and you cognitively combine the two: you establish a connection, and this connection can

be highly personalized. At the same time, this connection brings about a particular understanding of the planar surface and the literary inscription of the fan. Again, we must not leave the medium out of the equation because while the narrative is very important, not only decorative, the very fact that you hold a fan in your hand meant that you are of sufficient cultural status to be affiliated with a certain social class. As such, your rank is being underpinned by this emblem of culture, not only this material signifier of culture itself—the fan as an object—but by what is printed on the fan. The medium possessing a background story, a history of social practices underpinning it, complicates textual understanding. In the foreground, the images and the text are the most prominent literary mechanisms affecting reader-consumers. But they are part of an intermedial condition as part of which they need to be related to one another.

Another example may be in order, especially since lower-class objects are not usually at the centre of scholarly investigation because our literary history is still very much focused on the middle and upper classes. We usually leave out considerations of the mass market and the dissemination of literary knowledge via this market. Nevertheless, in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, we find objects of use such as jugs, pitchers, or mugs, some of them quite costly, which not infrequently had text on them—at times biblical text, at others excerpts from popular works such as James Thomson's *The Seasons*, but also images accompanying and illustrating them. These images commonly originate in the high culture of visual art, but they travel across the classes and are being adapted.

Recently, I have been thinking especially about William Lawrenson's painting of Palemon and Lavinia, two lovers in Thomson's *The Seasons*, who are redacted in such a way from the upper-class painting, which was meant for display and exhibition, to then become a working-class story. The characters from the original painting are transvalued, they travel from medium to medium, and in the process, they are adapted for lower-class readers—reducing their upper-class habitus—so as not to cause offence to their new target audience. The new readers or reader-viewers, as I call them, of a lower social class would of course have objected if they had been instructed—via the visually mediated story—to regard upper-class individuals as a role model for themselves. What is now being advanced is a notion that they can identify themselves with.

We clearly see Lavinia as a working-class individual who has not got the aspirations of the upper classes that were part of the original painting. It is the fundamentally same design but changed in such a way that it becomes palatable and consumable without any ideological friction by the lower classes. In the process,

there is a different reading experience, of course. The upper classes saw the same image, supported by the Thomsonian text as a confirmation of their high-class status. The lower classes, similarly, with a redaction of the original image, had the image appropriated and revised in such a way that it cohered with their social and their status identities: so, a different reading experience altogether, class-specifically oriented towards generating a nuanced understanding of texts for different reading groups. And this kind of differentiated reading experience has not been studied at all previously. My argument, then, is that if we look at these objects themselves, we see not only how particular texts or images travel across objects, but how these images can be changed in such a way as to appeal to specific social groupings in particular. We must not leave out, either, the actual objects themselves, which have cultural meanings, for these meanings again affect the way in which we understand literature.

We should also bear in mind that these materialised forms of literature reflecting and inscribed with textual knowledge are the products of translation processes—transforming mental endeavour into morphologically meaningful entities that convey literary signification. To use Zhenzhao Nie’s concept of the “brain text,” they are the materially manifested interpretive concretisations of a “brain text [which] consists of brain terms stored in memories”¹ and are contained by a brain-external medium. This brain text originates in a “mother text” that needs to be communicated through expression. Once reader-viewers encounter objects such as a jug featuring Palemon and Lavinia, however, this text object triggers reflections and associations that, in turn, generate new versions of the original brain text. These versions of the brain text—depending on the level of literacy on the part of the individual contemplating the image-text construct in the form of the physical object—need not be identical with or even close to the original brain text, knowledge of which is communicated verbally or through other cognate forms such as material culture. Signifying through a range of complex mechanisms, including symbolism and the medial materiality and modality of objects, literary material culture is not only evocative and generative in that it inspires further reflection but it potentially also breaks the feedback loop of reinforcing the meaning of the original work by giving rise to new and distinct brain texts.

Yang: I have noticed two characteristics of your research. One of them relates to the role of illustrations as mediations of literary works, and the other is

1 Zhenzhao Nie, “Literature and the Formation Mechanism of Brain Text.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2017): 26-34. p.30.

that you attach great importance to the relationship between literary works and publishing. Your research thus not only focuses on the work itself, but also on the chain of literary production. In the study of the literary works of the 18th century, such as *Robinson Crusoe*, your focus is not only on works and writers, but also on the relationship between illustrations and the work. You have charted the medial migration of designs of illustrations as part of a work's dynamic and mobile reception. What is the process of this kind of travel?

Jung: You have mentioned that my work has been trying to chart the various interrelationships not only between authors and texts, but also the producers, the actual physical manufacturers of those texts, the publishers, the printers. It is important for my argument to focus on the entire chain of production in the sense that those involved in the making of the physical books are also usually directly or indirectly involved in bringing those books to people. Authors write. They do not have any significant part in the marketing of their own books, but the marketing is exactly what affects individual readers. It induces particular reading groups to buy one edition of the work as opposed to another. And manufacturers of books increasingly, once a text has reached canonic status, attempt to create competitive marketing models. So, they equip particular works with illustrations, for instance, with prefaces, with memoirs, with autobiographies, with notes, with cover art, to make their edition appealing, but above anything else to make that edition stand out from the whole mass of other illustrated or otherwise paratextually enhanced editions.

At the same time, you refer to migration—the migration of image material. My argument ultimately has been that illustrated texts are illustrated for a particular reason. The basic assumption is that illustrations in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are still expensive. If you can save yourself the cost of producing illustrations, you will do so. From an economic perspective, then, it is important to understand that any publisher who could have saved money would have done so—if there were not a particular usefulness in including images. Images naturally enhance the actual, physical appearance of a book by making it more aesthetically appealing. But I am more interested in the paratextual, interpretive function of illustrations, and how illustrations, seen diachronically over time, can give you an indication of how different visual interpreters, artists, promote different understanding, different readings of texts. My work has always been systematic and diachronic, focusing on a range of illustrated editions over time. I have done this in the case of *Robeson Crusoe*, for instance, limiting it to the eighteenth century, with *The Seasons*, covering the eighteenth and nineteenth, and most recently with Salomon Gessner's

Death of Abel over a period of about 90 years, to see how different attitudes towards the subjects depicted vary and how representational conventions change. In terms of the migration of images, what I am arguing is that current approaches in comparative literary studies neglect the function of illustration, even though illustrations, especially if seen in a transnational cross-border context, have the ability to reflect particular interpretive patterns and readings.

My work on *Robinson Crusoe*, in particular, is not dialectical in focus. I do not focus on how one illustrated edition differs from another. Rather, I am interested in how the publishing mechanisms of a particular period affected the ways in which books were being produced: specifically, how in the year 1720 different responses on the continent of Europe—in the Netherlands, Germany and France—engaged with one another, how publishers reprinted illustrations, and altered them to incorporate some more local characteristic features. I stress that publishers devised their illustrated ventures in dialogue with the English illustrations that had been produced at the time.

The standard British narrative of how *Robinson Crusoe* was being perceived in the eighteenth century is that the illustrated edition of 1719 set the paradigmatic pattern; my empirical, publishing- and media-focused interpretation of different contexts, such as publishing, competitive marketing, and, above all, interpretation through the visual medium in editions published on the continent, contradicts the paradigmatic assumptions that have usually been made. In fact, in the year 1720, it was not the British edition that defined the way in which *Robinson Crusoe* was visualized. But it was the illustrations published on the continent, especially in Amsterdam, that did. For Amsterdam publishers produced two editions, one of a French translation, the other of a Dutch translation, which were equipped with different illustrations. We are not thinking about a single plate or two illustrations, as in the 1719 edition published in England. Rather, cumulatively, these publishers commissioned almost 40 different illustrations, a huge financial investment that was warranted by the ways in which those continental publishers that reprinted them and published them in the first place wanted to mediate and advance interpretations of this text for European reading communities.

Adding these illustrations to the study of the work's reception results in a new history of reading that gives us a much more complicated sense of how *Robinson Crusoe* was understood in the year 1720. It represents a micro-analysis of a single year, but it is part of a macro-analysis of how the publishing trade affected the way in which a reputation was being built for *Robinson Crusoe*. In terms of comparative literature studies, this focus on the mobile image and the image's transnational,

interpretive power is something that I would like to develop in China. Again, I do not privilege any particular medium, but I understand images as central components of the text and its meaning-making. These images are capable of shaping texts' national and transnational reputations. Because it is through these images that readers gained a visual, an imagined sense of what characters looked like, of what the island of Robinson Crusoe looked like, of what a character such as Friday looked like. Man Friday is of particular interest in this respect, for even though we might nowadays associate him as an Africo-American, he was not consistently depicted as black in the eighteenth century. Sometimes we have foreign features, but never in that period is his skin colour definitively black. And that is something that reflects the cultural ambiguity of the eighteenth century, which we nowadays—looking only at selected modern editions from Britain or from America—tend to forget because this selective consideration simplifies the situation historically; but the historical situation, especially the dynamism, the exchange, between Britain and Europe at that stage, and then more widely with America as well, and subsequently globally, shows us that there was not one single interpretation.

What happened in Europe in the year 1720, and what the images did in the year 1720 anticipates already what will happen, in editions of Defoe's novel, in Britain and the world more widely in the nineteenth century: with new technologies, the cost of printed images is significantly reduced, which, in turn, culminates in an explosion of images, including editions of *Robinson Crusoe* that boast up to 300 illustrations. Once a reader is confronted with 300 illustrations, they will be able to glean a much more differentiated, diversified and intermedially constructed reading experience than eighteenth-century readers. The book becomes a picture book; it is completely identified with the visual medium. By contrast, a picture book in the eighteenth century would have been a book like the two illustrated translations of *Robinson Crusoe* issued in Amsterdam in 1720. For the engraving and printing technologies required to produce copper-plate printed illustration then was so expensive that the inclusion of 25 images, such as in the French edition, was already an exclusive venture that transformed the book. This edition is one of the very few instances in 1720 when a work was hyper-mediated through 25 illustrations—a huge number of illustrations for an eighteenth-century reader, but not for us. We are now part of an image age, an age where we are so immersed in image culture that they are common to us. But they were not in the eighteenth century. That is why the particularity and special status of illustrations in the eighteenth century needs to be recovered as part of reading history.

Yang: The originator of the illustration and the author of the work are usually not the same person. The design of the illustration sometimes is inconsistent with the content of the text. For example, the four illustrations in the translated version of *Gulliver's Travels* published in *Tapestry Portrait Novel* are different from the plot of the original work. What do you think of the split phenomenon between the illustrations and the text?

Jung: This is a very good point. It is not generally acknowledged that there can be a disparity between the illustration and the text because scholars of illustration and scholars of literature usually want to read for coherence: they seek to establish a relationship of alignment, where the visual text, the illustration, does pretty much the same as the typographic or printed text, just in a different medium. However, Gérard Genette in his important work *Paratexts* talks about the function of illustrations very briefly as the function of “reinforcement.” Reinforcement does not mean that the media need to be equivalent in terms of semiotic value. It does not mean that they have to be aligned completely, so that one has an equivalent meaning as the other; in many cases, in literary illustrations, you find instances where the images introduce details that are not part of the actual verbal description or the typographical narrative. And this is done for a particular reason of emphasis, trying to offer local inscription and characteristics, especially if you are thinking about a particular, geographical setting.

Imagine, as in the case of *Tapestry Portrait Novel*, a text from abroad, a canonic work published in the eighteenth century, illustrated numerous times, now introduced to a Chinese audience. If these Chinese readers were now confronted with a western image, including western conventions of iconography, including dress and objects, for instance, they might have considered it alien. They might have mentally emphasised only the difference to their own manner of visualising text through illustration, in the process misreading the image. For that reason, *Tapestry Portrait Novel* commissioned wood-cut illustrations that are fundamentally non-western in design conventions. As a result, the original readers of the Chinese translation in *Tapestry Portrait Novel*, in examining the illustrations, would not have felt that they were reading an alien work. They will have tried to make sense of some iconic features which they did not know, including the transportation device built to move Gulliver into the city. The four illustrations that accompanied the translations helped Chinese readers at the beginning of the twentieth century to understand *Gulliver's Travels* not as an English work, but as a work of world literature, with Chinese characteristics.

Compared to western illustrations of *Gulliver's Travels*, the woodcuts in the

Chinese translation follow a special temporal framework—they are a micro-series, capturing moments that succeed one another quickly. To a western reader with cursory knowledge of Jonathan Swift’s work, the images—despite their Chinese representational characteristics—will still be intelligible: for Gulliver lying on the ground, being pinned down with ropes, has been an iconic rendering of the protagonist since the eighteenth century. The western reader would, however, also have recognised that a process of translation has been at work: Gulliver’s facial features, the landscape, the built environment, and the trees all have a Chinese cast, and the action has been transplanted into a Chinese setting. There is no longer an exotic, vaguely defined western setting that is usually framed—in the early illustrations—as imagologically British. In the Chinese series of illustrations, the settings are naturalized as Chinese so as to overcome cultural-imagological difference: this is a Chinese version of *Gulliver’s Travels*. So, is there actual alignment with the details of the text? No, there is no actual alignment; but, then, in terms of representational conventions, Gulliver never clearly specifies what the environment looks like. This openness in terms of the text, not providing details on the surroundings, helps the Chinese artist thoughtfully to engage with the text. Here, then, is not a case of a phenomenon that occurs frequently in Europe: the recycling and copying of a pre-existing composition of western origin. Here, the early twentieth-century Chinese illustrator invents a new way of reading and seeing Swift’s protagonist: Gulliver within the representational conventions of China. He introduces Gulliver as a character who was so well known that he does not appear alien any more to a far-away eastern reading public, where efforts are being made to render him as familiarly as possible. To western reader-viewers, however, he would have been highly unfamiliar in this casting.

Yang: You pay great attention to the study of different versions of illustrations. In “Book Illustration and the Transnational Mediation of *Robinson Crusoe* in 1720,” you sorted out the illustrations of different versions of *Robinson Crusoe*. The content of the text is constant, but the illustrations can have countless versions. What do you think of the relationship between the single text and the numerous illustrations?

Jung: This goes back to what I have already said about the transnational migration of images, but also of texts. The text, as you understand it, is still the typographical text only. The first image-text of *Robinson Crusoe* was produced in the year 1719, but now the text is no longer the property of Defoe—the copyright has been assigned to William Taylor, the work’s publisher. It becomes a marketable

commodity sold by Taylor as part of his editions and illustrations. Publishers in the Netherlands, Germany, and France shortly after translated Defoe's text into their own languages, and they constructed a hybrid text, one that was illustrated, the illustrations offering visual interpretations of hitherto non-illustrated scenes from the novel. The hybrid text, including the intermedial construct of text and image, has a special dynamic of meaning-making, a dynamic of functioning simultaneously. It is fundamentally different from the English version of 1719, for the very fact that there are different illustrations included, but the French and Dutch translations also alter the original work through paraphrase and connotative meanings.

In my diachronic and systematic research on *Robinson Crusoe*, I have examined all editions issued within a period of 100 years. I have studied the significance of illustrations as part of a responsive archive and how illustrators looked to earlier illustrators' work and the ways in which these artists visualized particular moments from the novel. Each illustrated edition is a hybrid text. The typographical text should always be the same. However, illustrations, especially differing illustrations, import additional meanings: so, if you are looking at an illustration produced in France, in the 1810 edition, as well as at one produced in America in the same year, you will, of course, find different motivations that inform the illustrators' work. The publishers might have instructed them to focus on a particular scene, on a particular character, on a particular action. It is thus the selection of the scene or the character or the situation that is being selected, as well as how, artistically, it has been rendered that creates an emphasis.

Illustrations are synoptic nodes. They are cognitive clusters. We look at them: we open the book, we leaf through the book, we encounter illustrations. We recognize immediately that this is a different kind of text, a visual text, that we cannot read with the cognitive tools of our script literacy. What we need is visual literacy. As a result, we do not read illustrations from left to right, but we have to read according to a special temporal framework: it is the reader who has to establish what the subject is. They need to identify the setting and the spatial organization of the illustration, as well as its temporal order. What is the action? And which particular components of the action are being introduced? This is a complicated process that differs in its reading strategy fundamentally from what you call the constant text, the printed and supposedly static text that can be changed ever more through the addition of illustrations: Removing illustrations or adding new illustrations alters the text's overall meaning because the change not only affects the text-image ratio, but also the text-image relationship. If there are more illustrations, these illustrations function differently in relation not only to the whole

book but also in relation to the typographical text that goes before and comes immediately after the illustration, physically speaking. Because illustrations were still fairly uncommon in the eighteenth century, this relative rarity also added to their meaningful status. For they complicated reading procedures: however much typographic text there is in a book, whenever you see an image in the codex of the typographically printed pages, you have to adopt a new image-defined strategy to make sense of it. You switch from the script literacy of printed type to visual literacy, and this switching of reading modes characterises the intermedial nature of the illustrated book.

Images also are not read sequentially only, but readers return to them. Readers might return to a part of the typographic text, too. But images do have special appeal in that they concentrate meaning. And this meaning attracts the reader to look at them again, and to discover further meaning: images are thus media of return. You revisit them in order to reinforce associations that you have arrived at as part of your own reading, but also meanings that you think might not have been clearly articulated in the text. So, if we are thinking about *Gulliver's Travels* again, the environment is not very concretely depicted in the text. That is why it was possible for the Chinese illustrator to make a concrete version of that landscape available through his own illustrations. Thus spaces and gaps of meaning that are present within the typographical text are often supplied within the illustrations. Rather than having a reinforcing function at that stage, we have a supplementary or even an explanatory function within the illustration.

Yang: In our recent research on the Chinese translations of *Tapestry Portrait Novel*, you have paid close attention to the issues of publishing and the economic processes of book production and marketing. What do you think is the relationship between textuality and print culture?

Jung: The term “print culture” is very important here because scholars very frequently ask me, what do I see as the fundamental difference between “print culture” and “book history.” Apart from researching print culture, I am certainly also a book historian: I study books’ meanings, I examine at the actual codex, the bound book, but I also look as part of my charting of an alternative history of literature at texts that do not appear in book form.

If we take *Tapestry Portrait Novel* as an example, we have a magazine. The question is one of definition: is a magazine a book? Not initially, when it is published because it does not have any hard covers or book binding. It is usually presented in a temporary binding. It might be a stitched binding, not any binding

that is supposed to be durable. Because once readers had the complete run of issues for a single year collected, they had them bound into the shape of a book. But what we usually amateurishly call “book” might be a novel; it might be a play or a collection of poems or a gathering of separately published pamphlets bound together. The “book” does not provide any information on the print genre. For that reason, I prefer the term “print culture” because it is much more comprehensive. “Print culture” also covers individually issued prints, while comprising many other print objects—chapbooks, for instance.

Chapbooks often were redactions of longer literary works, of between 8 and 32 pages. They were common in terms of their promoting of popular knowledge of texts. In the year 1722, for instance, a chapbook of *Robinson Crusoe*, 28 pages long, was published. The typographical text of the novel has been compressed significantly through redaction but it has also been amplified by the inclusion of 14 small woodcut illustrations. In these short texts, which usually have not been studied, the ratio of the text to image is one in which the images are far more prominent. As a result, the woodcuts the reader saw are much more central to the reading experience than they would have been in the full-text edition of 1719. That edition featured only one frontispiece illustration and one map. Compare that with the 14 illustrations of the chapbook: the later illustrations were meant for a particular book-buying clientele, who did not have the ability to read long texts or who might have belonged to the lower social classes and who did not have the time to do much reading. For them, the illustrations would have had a central role in helping them to make sense of the printed text.

I have also worked on other forms of print, particularly media of print that were not supposed to last: calendars and diaries. The *Royal Engagement Pocket Atlas* is one of those titles I have been working on for about 10 years, focusing specifically on how these book-like objects—copies look like books but are sometimes bound in wallets or contained within slipcases—had a particular functionality attached to them. They were supposed to be used for one year only, after which time they were usually discarded. As a result of their ephemerality, they are very rare nowadays. They are of particular interest to me, however, because each number of the *Royal Engagement Pocket Atlas* included 24 miniature illustrations of literature. So, a user of the diary did not need to read a literary edition of a text to gain knowledge of the work. For the vignette illustrations, with their accompanying lines of text, mediated fashionable literature. In this respect, the *Pocket Atlas* was able to convey a sense of the meaning of the text. It would infer the work illustrated by recalling actual reading experience or by inducing users of the diary to imagine meaning through

the image because the entire text was not available.

“Print culture” encompasses both books and book-like print products such as chapbooks and diaries. Print culture also allows us to understand the impact and wide use of printing—not only on paper, but on other media such as ceramics and textiles. Printing processes were not only developed for application on paper but also for use on other surfaces and materials, so that printed images could be reproduced on a range of objects such as jugs, cups, mugs, and coffee pots. “Print culture” thus does not mean that the book needs to be central, as any medium that can be printed on can count as belonging to this field of print culture. The only requirement is that the object is planar, that it is smooth, and that it has a surface that can be printed on. Many furniture fabrics in the eighteenth century were printed on with particular dyes with copper plates: literary illustrations proved popular on furniture fabrics, and examples survive that feature illustrations of *The Seasons*, Oliver Goldsmith’s *The Deserted Village*, and even *Robinson Crusoe*. You could thus sit on an arm chair and the medium around you would facilitate a “reading” experience of literature (via illustration). It was an immersive experience. In the nineteenth century, literary wall paper, depicting *Robinson Crusoe*, for instance, was occasionally used in children’s nurseries. Looking at the wallpaper, the child would not only be able to see the adventures of this protagonist but also to reconstitute and imagine its narrative.

Textuality broadly defined, then, allows scholars to look beyond the book. It helps us to understand that the text has emerged from a virtual realm of consumption in which practically any object can be textually inscribed; it can carry meaning. And just to give you another example of how print culture promotes the dissemination, mediation, and experience of textuality: playing cards and advertising cards of *Robinson Crusoe* featured centrally in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century European children’s understanding of Defoe’s story. They became popular in the 1880s. By 1960, thousands of cards featuring literary works, including fairy tales, had been produced worldwide. They were produced in European countries, in Britain, France, Italy, and Germany, but also in America. German companies, including supermarkets, issued over 30 different series of these cards. And they were collectible, to be assembled in an album. The album itself is not a “book,” as in an “edition” of Defoe’s text. But it enabled children—by collecting the individual advertising card—not only to fill the blanks in the album, but also to complete the visual narrative of *Robinson Crusoe* and to learn about the story in the process. These albums were also issued by publishers, including one German publisher who, instead of the cards, issued much smaller advertising stamps, telling the story of

Robinson Crusoe in six images. In the 1930s, if you had a full stamp album, you could return it to the publisher, who would then reward you for your collecting with the publisher's edition of *Robinson Crusoe*. This edition included large versions of the stamps—book illustrations proper, which now functioned as part of the typographical text.

This is an area that I am working on at the moment. It has never been studied before. Taking into account the large numbers of these various artifacts, their presence in children's apprehension of literature cannot be doubted. But previous scholarship has not acknowledged their impact. There were many other media that capitalised on, and featured illustrations of, *Robinson Crusoe*, enabling reader-consumers to be immersed in knowledge of the work in a way that we cannot possibly imagine. It is this culture of reading through non-book media that my work tries to recover.

Yang: You wrote an article titled "Packaging, Design and Color: From Fine-Printed to small-format Editions of Thomson's *The Season*, 1793-1802." What is the relationship between printing, design, color, the interpretation and communication of the text? What is the role of media studies for an understanding of the processes that translate abstract texts into material forms such as books?

Jung: I shall focus on the issue of colour first. We have to bear in mind that we are thinking about a period before colour-printing for the masses. To see anything printed in colour would have been highly unusual. Recognising how special colour-printed books were in the 1790s, for instance, gives us an indication that a new market was developing, one in which illustrations that could be produced in colour were highly desirable, especially if they were also framed and displayed.

These colour-printed illustrations were much cheaper than the real paintings, but they were still expensive. They brought life to the image in a way a monochrome print did not. Colour is also linked to cultural status and fashion—but it was reserved for the financial elite. In the 1790s, it was still difficult to execute colour printing, and not many works were being produced. Colour, in general terms, was desirable as part of the new design culture of the eighteenth century. And literary illustrations were frequently translated into coloured media such as painted panels on furniture or designs on large pieces of porcelain such as vases to allow owners and viewers to contemplate the literary subject in the context of the luxury object of which it was a part. Illustrations—mostly printed but also painted or sewn—of *The Seasons*, Shakespeare's plays, Sterne's *Sentimental Journey*, and many other literary works were part of the modern furniture of polite households. Consumer

culture utilised the latest development in design and technology to create ever new opportunities for visual interpreters to engage with the fashionable textuality and literature of the period. Widespread interest in cultural fashions promoted the production of a multifarious material culture of literature. Even mourning rings—jewellery purchased on the occasion of someone’s passing—feature illustrations from the bestselling German novel by J. W. Goethe, the *Sorrows of Werther*.

Especially my work on design and the transmedial uses of literary illustration has led me into finding many different objects that you would not normally associate with literature; these objects are, in fact, grounded in literary experience and used literary works very concretely. It would have been part of the marketing of these very expensive objects to emphasize their literary character and that literary works were fundamentally objects of culture within the household: they needed to be seen, to be held, to be looked at, and to be engaged with cognitively.

Yang: You have published many articles over the past 20 years but you have also edited a number of scholarly journals and book series. What does your work as Editor-in-Chief of the A&HCI journal ANQ entail and how do you promote Chinese scholars’ research abroad?

Jung: I have been editing ANQ for the past 9 years; the journal was founded more than one hundred years ago, and it is published in its third series now. What I have been doing since I became editor is to broaden the range of the journal: it used to be a journal very much like *Notes & Queries*, focusing on the documentary history of literature, trying to fill gaps by publishing authors’ correspondence, for instance, or adding hitherto unknown details to an author’s biography. Part of the journal’s mission is to continue to publish documentary sources, even though this is not frequently done now. The remit of the journal has changed in that I have broadened the coverage of ANQ.

Even though it is a journal focusing on short articles, “short” is now relative in the sense that submissions range between 3000 and 7000 words. We are also now opening ourselves up—and have done so for the past five years—to all historical periods. A strong focus of the journal in the past used to be old and middle English. We have still publish on old and middle English, but all other periods are represented now, especially the literature of the twentieth century. In fact, the majority of submissions I receive from Chinese colleagues are on twentieth-century literature.

Since my arrival in Shanghai, I have tried to help Chinese scholars in producing work that can be accepted in ANQ. I have sought to promote knowledge

of western journal article structure—a subject that is often flagged in peer-reviewers' reports. I am keen to give concrete feedback on how a western journal such as ANQ can help Chinese scholars to find a platform for their own work.

I receive many submissions each year, and Chinese colleagues regularly publish in the journal now. There have also been special issues involving Chinese scholars. What I generally find is that the work that passes through the peer review is theoretically astute; once there has been positive feedback on the part of the editorial readers, the authors can take that into account in order to produce a stronger and focused submission—one that formulates a research question, boasts a moderately detailed framework, and, above anything else, offers interpretation that is fundamentally new.

In terms of promoting Chinese scholars' research areas abroad, I try to showcase the kind of comparative literature research that is being done in China. I also try to demonstrate that there are particular innovative approaches that are being applied, such as ethical criticism, for instance. But I am also considering ANQ as a platform to report on developments (especially in terms of the criticism of postmodern fiction and how these works have been approached in China) and to facilitate discussion of what dialogue between China and western critical traditions can bring to the interdisciplinary field of literary studies.

One of our forthcoming special issues will be dedicated to literature and quarantine. In this special issue, we will have perspectives from the east and the west to reflect on how individual authors' experiences of the pandemic and other health crises can contribute not only to the medical turn in literary studies but also facilitate understanding of a transhistorical and transnational phenomenon. The contributions will address how texts deal with a pandemic, with epidemics, more generally, with illness and with global crises of health; how different approaches can be synergized, how this kind of cultural contact that I would like to establish between China and Europe can prove productive, and how it can shape the future.

Next year will be my tenth year as editor of the journal. We are thinking about celebrations and an ANQ symposium, bringing together Chinese scholars, in particular, to help them to formulate research questions that can address literature both historically and synchronously. What I would certainly like to encourage is a greater historical awareness of the great resources that China has: resources in the field of literary theory that offer new perspectives on how individual texts can be read. China has huge potential in terms of using its own impressive resources—such as the Shanghai Library and the National Library in Beijing—in order to recover material that has been in these repositories for many years, but that has not been

studied.

The recovery of empirical data, as you discovered in the case of *Tapestry Portrait Novel*, was made possible through a physical visit to the Shanghai Library. Furthermore, to mine archives of publishing-related information tells us much about how the marketing of a particular text occurred. But it also tells us a great deal about how readers would have encountered this particular form of magazine publishing. And this is what I see as an area that can still develop very forcefully in China: the history of reading, the actual reading of texts, which involves the study of material artifacts, ideally accompanied with the digitalization of these materials. The material that surrounds us everywhere in Chinese museums is wonderful. We need to (re)turn to this material, not only digitally: we need to look at the actual copies of works. And this turn to foreign literary materials in China is something I would like to develop in the next few years with a special issue about Chinese resources or Chinese collections of western works. I would, furthermore, like to probe how new models can be advanced with a focus on images and transnational, textual mobility to chart cultural exchange.

ANQ has come a long way. It has developed from an early twentieth-century journal that was fundamentally documentary into a strong international journal that is open to different perspectives and certainly open to Chinese contributions. At this stage, we have a journal that publishes contributions from many different countries, not only China, not only Europe, but we have many other countries that make a significant contribution to shaping ANQ and to making it ready for the future.

Positional Outsiders and the Performance of Sacrifice: The Case of Franz Kafka

Vladimir Biti

Abstract: After the First World War, state of exception became the dominant paradigm of government in Europe, reducing many distinct identities to bare life. Without having done anything wrong, they were calmly eliminated from their states' citizen rights, bereft of human status, and forced into a subhuman existence. Some prominent post-imperial writers turned these "positional outsiders" into the sources of their ethical commitment. They derived their literature from these outsiders' "zones of indistinction" (Agamben), i.e. the containers of subalterns whom the historical world has pushed into oblivion. Franz Kafka's authorial commitment to them is well-known. However, at the same time, he was aware of the insidious character of their literary redemption because the author who seemingly sacrifices himself for them, in fact enjoys the comfort of detachment that is withheld to both his or her characters and readers. Unlike their real sacrifice, his is merely performed. By exposing through his or her performance their fragility, the author betrays them. "I am not really striving to be good," writes Kafka, "but very much the contrary," to become "the only sinner who won't be roasted." I will explore the consequences of this political contamination of his narrative ethics.

Keywords: positional outsiders; sacrifice; narrative authority; subversive mimicry; commonality

Author: Vladimir Biti, Chair Professor Emeritus of the University of Vienna. Co-editor of *arcadia: Journal of Literary Culture*; Chair of the Academy of Europe's Literary and Theatrical Section. Most recent books: *Tracing Global Democracy: Literature, Theory, and the Politics of Trauma* (2016) and *Attached to Dispossession: Sacrificial Narratives in Post-imperial Europe* (2018). Upcoming: *Post-imperial Literature: Translatio imperii in Kafka and Coetzee*.

标题: 局外人状态与献祭的展示：以弗兰兹·卡夫卡为例

摘要: 第一次世界大战后，异常状态成为欧洲政府的主导范式，许多具有不同身份的人沦为“赤裸生命”。这些无辜之人没有做错任何事情，却悄然丧失了基本公民权利，被剥夺了人的地位，被迫过着非人的生活。这种“局外人状态”成为一些著名的后帝国时代作家在创作中体现伦理责任的来源。他

们的作品关注这些局外人所处的“无区分地带”（阿甘本），即那些被历史强行抹去的“下等人”的生存空间。弗兰兹·卡夫卡在文学创作中对这类人物的关注广为人知，但他并没有忽视这种文学上的补偿潜在的危害。作家表面上为这些“下等人”做出了自我牺牲，实际上却享受与其作品人物和读者保持距离的超脱之境。“下等人”的献祭真实存在，而作家的献祭不过是一种展示。作家通过展示暴露了“下等人”的脆弱，同时也背叛了这些人。卡夫卡写道：“我并非一心向善”，“恰恰相反”，“要成为唯一一个不受惩罚的罪人”。本文将探究这种政治干扰对其叙事伦理造成的影响。

关键词：局外人状态；祭祀；叙事权威；颠覆性模拟；共性

作者简介：弗拉基米尔·比提现为维也纳大学荣休首席教授，《阿卡迪亚：国际文学与文化学刊》主编，欧洲科学院文学与戏剧分部主任。其最新著作有《探寻全球民主：文学、理论和创伤政治》（2016年）和《关于剥夺：后帝国时期欧洲的献祭叙事》（2018年），即将出版的著作是《后帝国时代文学在卡夫卡和库切作品中的变迁》。

The Unprocessed Residues of European Modernity: Ferments of Alternative Commonalities

The project of European modernity as launched by the Enlightenment appears to have been, from its very outset, accompanied by a traumatic re-emergence of “animality” within the envisaged “humanity.” Already one of the Enlightenment’s chief engineers, Immanuel Kant was at pains to emancipate man from his “animal” habits. In his treatise “Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose” (1784), he states that if history were delivered to man’s naturally inborn selfish goals, it would amount to a “senseless course” of devastation, upheavals and the complete exhaustion of human powers (Kant 42, 47). Since his natural disposition is constructed out of “warped wood,” man needs mankind “to break his self-will and force him to obey a universally valid will under which everyone can be free” (46). However, by forcing man to overcome his selfishness under the custody of mankind, Kant involuntarily introduced a new discrimination between the improvable and incorrigible humans who doggedly adhere to their base passions. The former enter progressive history, the latter a regressive myth. In the outcome, mankind establishes an asymmetry between its active and passive constituents. To these passive ones, as Dipesh Chakrabarty remarks, imperial centers allocated a pre-modern place “elsewhere” and an outdated “not yet” time, relegating them to an enduring “waiting room of history” (Chakrabarty 7). Although he primarily addresses Europe’s relationship toward its *external* outsiders, his description also perfectly fits Europe’s at-

titude to its *internal* outsiders. Ever since the age of Enlightenment, the production of both has accompanied the project of modernization as a dark shadow.

Even after the national reconfiguration of Europe's imperial space in the aftermath of the First World War, the asymmetry was not abolished. The envisaged political unification reclaimed the mobility of people and goods as its chief objective, declaring people free to reshape the modes of their commonality. However, if modernity has something to teach us, then it is that "one man's imagined community is another man's political prison" (Appadurai 32). As mobility divided people into its subjects and objects, not everybody in Europe benefited from it. As soon as it entered East Central Europe after the dissolution of empires, it replaced its West European liberating face with a coercive one, initiating huge and hitherto unimaginable migrations of populations. "By 1890 close to 40 percent of all Austro-Hungarians had left their original place of *Heimat* and migrated to their current homes from another part of the monarchy" (Judson 334). Almost four million men and women moved overseas, but hundreds of thousands would then return after a few years, enormously increasing the populations of imperial cities and thus spawning harsh consequences after the empire's dissolution (335). "The Fall of the Habsburgs automatically turned the 25 percent of the Viennese population born outside the frontiers of the new Austria into foreigners, unless they chose to opt for citizenship" (Hobsbawm 15). By extending its 'egalitarian discrimination', the process of European modernization multiplied its unprocessed residues.

The response of these residues to their dispossession was, to engage Bhabha's vocabulary, "subversive mimicry" (Bhabha 94-132). The railways that were built to enable the centers' economic expansion gradually turned into the periphery's instruments of resistance to it (Schenk). Provincial elites, who were educated in the imperially established provincial schools or in the imperial centers themselves, engaged this knowledge for their opposition to them (Barkey 110). If the idea of this education was to differentiate imperial *societies*, provincial elites engaged it to homogenize their *communities*. The modern invention of society thus inadvertently became "the condition for the more exact profiling of the concept of community, inasmuch as it could now advance into a collective name for all that which cannot be subsumed in the concept of society" (Rosa et al. 2010, 37-38). The delineated operation of re-signifying by adoption, which was already germane of imperial peripheries, re-emerged in the new nation-states after the breakdown of the empires. However, if in the late empires it had been carried by the national elites, as the victims of imperial centers, in the new nation-states the carriers became these elites' subalterns, situated in the new nation states' "zones of indistinction." These zones were reservoirs of

suppressed possibilities that distributed their potentiality into the social aggregate of which they were (an unacknowledged) part, setting in motion this aggregate's disarticulation (Povinelli 3–4; 11–13). A series of contemporary political theorists such as Giorgio Agamben, Roberto Esposito, and Judith Butler interpret them as the direct outcomes of modernization. In their view, the collateral effect of the production of a homogeneous human world are the would-be humans, the spectral humans, and the non-humans who are prevented from becoming legible within the established space of humanity (Agamben, *Homo Sacer* 121; Esposito 209; Butler 92).

Indeed, the geopolitically reconfigured East Central Europe became a harsh political prison for many of its constituencies, which is why their sense of belonging to their newly formed nation-states was replaced with a sense of longing for that which these states excluded from their constitutions and official memories. New state nationalisms befell and impoverished these constituencies, pinned them to the wall of dominating nations, stripped them of choice, silenced their alternatives, and nullified their complex identity with an imposed demonization of the “other” (Brubaker 20–21). Since they longed for a different way to cohabit the political spaces to which they were affiliated, they forged alliances with “spectral humans” elsewhere who also felt “stranded in the present” (Fritzsche). This was now suddenly possible because, while post-imperial Europe's modernization seriously endangered some of its constituencies' material survival, it simultaneously immensely increased the mobility of their imagination (Appadurai 6). Thanks to the substantially improved institutional, traffic and communicational networks, “[e]ven the meanest and most hopeless of lives, the most brutal and dehumanizing of circumstances, the harshest of lived inequalities” became “open to the play of the imagination” (54). Unexpectedly, these positional outsiders got the opportunity to connect to outsiders from other shores who had hitherto been barely known to them, paving the way for alternative, imaginary kinds of human togetherness, resilient to those that were imposed. However, deprived of resources and thus prevented from materializing themselves in given political circumstances, they were projected as commonalities yet-to-come.

Those who felt “stranded in the present” of post-imperial European states engaged fiction as one of the media for establishing their alternative commonalities. Unlike mass media, myths or discursive prose that, by their very nature, address collective audiences, fiction introduces indistinct patterns of affiliation, which through their non-appropriative identification disregard differences among the affiliates. By attending to “the connective tissues and membranes, that animate each case even while enabling the discovery of shared motivations and shared tropes” (Hirsch 206), its authors try to escape their historically and politically established identities.

Following their “appetite for alterity” (Silverman 181), they leave behind their inherited selves and cultural norms in order to align themselves with those who have compulsively lost their “human” face.

Kafka’s Narrative Authority: Commitment to Subhuman Creatures

Such authorial self-displacement into the radical otherness of positional outsiders adopted a peculiar form in the works of Franz Kafka, who consistently dispossessed his narrative authority of established “human” attributes. It is worth recalling that his contemporary Hugo von Hofmannsthal, whom Kafka greatly admired (Wanberg; Gray 127; Blanchot 183), described the writer as

living in the house of time, under the stairs, where everyone must pass him and no one respects him [...] an undetected beggar in the place of the dogs [...] without a job in this house, without service, without rights, without duty. (Hofmannsthal 66)

In the state of exception that ruled the European political space of his time by making its “givens” dizzy, ambiguous and indeterminate (60), Hofmannsthal sees myriad readers feverishly searching for “the enchantment of the poetry” (62), which is in his opinion only capable of ordering the chaos of the contemporary world (78). In order to rescue them, he entrusts the poet with the mission of sacrificing his human self by creating “every second, with each pulse, under a pressure as if an ocean lays above him, lit by no lamp, not even a mine lamp, surrounded by mocking, confusing voices” (75). Hofmannsthal expects him to act as “a spider, spinning the yarn from his own body, to carry him over the abyss of existence” (75).

Kafka is the epitome of Hofmannsthal’s author who, in the house of his time, withdraws into the disregarded place of the dogs by accepting responsibility for *all* inhabitants of the house including its outsiders:

Each of them is an open wound on his soul. [...] he suffers from all them, and by suffering from them, he enjoys them [...] he suffers by sensing them so intense [...] as if they were human. [...] He can leave nothing out. He must not close his eyes to any creature, to any thing, to any phantom, to any spectral product of a human brain. (67)

As the true inheritor of this legacy, Kafka’s authorial agency makes itself highly attentive to and respectful of the outsiders that inhabit its fictional ‘houses’. His work

teems with creatures that neither completely belong to humankind nor to the animal world. Consider the peculiar figure of Odradek from “The Cares of a Family Man” who, as Benjamin remarks, epitomizes the “distorted” “form which things assume in oblivion” (Benjamin 133). Nevertheless, the narrator allocates to this subhuman creature some superhuman traits, thus making his inferiority superior to his surroundings. Portrayed as being permanently on the move and with an “indeterminate residence,” he “stays alternately in the attic, on the staircase, in the corridors, and in the hall.” He is so “extraordinarily nimble and can never be laid hold of” that the “family father” is concerned he will, as his family’s most shameful representative, finally outlive it (“The Cares” 469-470). Another case in point is Red Peter, the narrator of “A Report to an Academy,” an ape who was forced by his hunters to learn human language but through whose words an ape-like voice still reverberates. Deleuze and Guattari argue that his coughing forms a refrain that turns his “syntax into a cry” (Deleuze and Guattari 13, 26). This cry has the force of an apostrophe, which human language lacks. Developing out of the material body rather than human personality, it deeply disturbs the humans who mistakenly assumed to have put it behind them. Red Peter is thus another positional outsider from one of the innumerable “zones of indistinction,” simultaneously inferior and superior to his human surroundings.

In his seminal essay on Kafka, Benjamin pointed out the writer’s enduring fascination with such figures that are “neither members of, nor strangers to, any [...] groups of figures, but, rather, messengers from one to another” (Benjamin 117). Inhabiting “intermediate worlds,” they break out from the restricted mythic space of distinct human history into the unlimited indistinct areas of prehistorical times. This “swampy ground of fluctuating experiences,” as Benjamin puts it, “forms countless, uncertain, changing compounds, yielding a constant flow of new, strange products” (131). By incessantly creating such messengers of prehistorical time, Kafka cannot but reveal his own tendency to leap out of the determined course of development as characteristic of human history. Indeed, in his diary entry of 24 January 1922 he notes:

I want to change my place in the world entirely, which actually means that I want to go to another planet; it would be enough if I could exist alongside myself, it would even be enough if I could consider the spot on which I stand as some other spot. (*The Diaries* 210)

This is precisely what happens in the so-called “he” series of his 1920 diaries in

which he, standing on “some other spot” or “another planet,” speaks of himself in the third person. By creating such “higher type of observation” (211), he leaps out of the continuity of his self by opening a gap between its acting and observing parts: the second part now becoming *exterior* to the first, yet without ceasing to be its *constituent*. This “internal exterior” only belongs to the world of human action through its exemption from it. In the same way, the divine world, forever lost to human beings, only belongs to their world through its absence from it, or the sovereign, in the political state of exemption, only participates in its juridical order through his *ecstasy* (i.e. ex-stasis; Agamben, *State of Exception* 35). What we testify to in all these cases is “the topological structure of the state of exception”: “*being outside, and yet belonging*” (35). However, unlike his characters that, condemned to the prehistorical “zones of indistinction,” live the vulnerable extraterritoriality of subhuman creatures, Kafka pulls his author out, as we will come to see, into the ex-historical and extraterritorial ‘state of exception’ of superhuman agencies.

The Enforced Prehistorical and the Self-appointed Ex-historical Outsiders: Cross-Breeding

This means that we have to distinguish between two kinds of positional outsiders, the *enforced prehistorical* ones and the *self-appointed ex-historical* ones, although Kafka is at constant pains to melt one into another by way of their cross-breeding. The moral extraterritoriality of the first that exposes them to others, and the political ex-territoriality of the second that imposes them upon others, paradoxically support each other. On the one hand, Kafka systematically entitles animal figures or objects by raising them to the status of narrators or focalizers. Besides the humanized ape Red Peter, the cases in point are the verminous bug Gregor Samsa from “The Metamorphosis,” the ant from “Josephine the Singer,” the presumptive mole from “The Burrow,” the dog from “The Investigations of a Dog,” and the bridge from “The Bridge.” Kafka also entitles human outsiders by transforming them into interrogators: consider the stonemason from “The Great Wall of China,” the provincials from “The Refusal” and “The Problem of Our Laws,” the hungry “Bucket Rider,” the businessman from “The Married Couple,” the unexpected prisoner from “The Knock at the Manor Gate,” the man from the country in “Before the Law,” and the land surveyor in *The Castle*. As unexpected victims of certain political, legal, or

economic configurations of forces, all of them are “positional outsiders.”¹

On the other hand, Kafka lets his author, as the self-appointed outsider, unre-servedly commit himself to the characters as the enforced outsiders, as if searching for the ethical justification for his political exemption from their world. It has been noted that Kafka’s passionate attachment to enforced outsiders grew out of his personal experience of multiple dispossession. (Litowitz 104) He was a German-speaking secular Jew in the Czech capital Prague who, as such, was accepted neither by the Jews nor Germans nor Czechs; besides, he was an outsider to his family that was dominated by his father’s despotic rule; also, he was an attorney at the Workers’ Insurance Corporation who fought for injured Czech workers, themselves outsiders in the face of Austrian law; and, after the First World War, his generation fell outside of the law too. In a diary entry from the turbulent 1920, he remarks:

Until now we had our noses stuck into the tide of the times, now we step back, former swimmers, present walkers, and are lost. We are outside the law, no one knows it and yet everyone treats us accordingly. (*The Diaries* 27)

Ultimately, considering that the Austrians in Prague, who administered the city, blamed their Jewish co-citizens for having stolen and misused their language, Kafka likewise became a stranger to his German mother tongue. Terrified by this series of dispossessions, he withdrew into a corner of existence, reduced to bare life. “What have I in common with Jews? I have hardly anything in common with myself and should stand very quietly in a corner, content that I can breathe.” (8) Under the circumstances of a permanent state of exception, it appears, no group-belonging offered protection from the sudden deprivation.

This experience of constant threat and crisis of public space accounts for Kafka’s relinquishment of human attributes, relationships, and connections. He and humans parted ways, replacing mutual belonging with a powerful longing for one another from both his and his fellow beings’ side:

Without forebears, without marriage, without heirs, with a fierce longing for forebears, marriage and heirs. They all of them stretch out their hands to me: forebears, marriage and heirs, but too far away for me. (207)

¹ Douglas Litowicz proposes “situational outsiders”, defining them as “outsiders by virtue of their situation” (105), but I prefer the attribute “positional” considering these outsiders’ structural banishment into the political and social indistinction. As a result, “Kafka depicts outsiders who never win their battle for justice, instead remaining forever confused, paranoid, ignorant, submissive, alienated, and self-defeating” (105).

If he is together with someone, this second person reaches out for him and he is helplessly delivered into his hand. If he is alone, all mankind reaches out for him—but the innumerable outstretched arms become entangled with one another and no one reaches to him. (229)

I am away from home and must write home always again, even if all my home had long ago swum into eternity. All my writing is nothing but the banner of Robinson on the highest point of the island. (*Briefe an Felice* 392, my trans.)

Kafka transferred this unrealizable longing for fellow beings from his life's reality into the relationships between the author and characters in his fictions. Both relationships, those in his life's reality as well as those in his fictions, are thus ruled by the same principle: Only after both sides are forever prevented from physically reaching one another does the possibility for their dreaming identification with the other become wide open. The failure of *belonging* to one another releases the energy of *longing* for one another. Consider the "You" at the end of "An Imperial Message" who sits at the window, when the evening arrives that separates him or her from the daylight reality, and dreams to himself or herself about the will of the dead man. Many of Kafka's characters dream to themselves of such authorial exemption from their frustrating present by attaching themselves to a lost past, but, cut off from the possibility to reach such exemption, compensatorily oblige their selected trustees to provide it in the future. This is how their subhuman prehistorical condition strives to transform itself into a superhuman ex-historical one. Scenes of such goal-oriented entrustment are abundant in Kafka's fiction: In "The Penal Colony" the officer twice screams in the traveling explorer's ear ("In the Penal Colony" 174, 184), in "An Imperial Message" the emperor whispers in the ear of his messenger, demanding that the messenger whispers it back into his ear ("An Imperial Message" 24), in "A Hunger Artist" the protagonist speaks "with his lips pursed, as if for a kiss, right into the overseer's ear" ("A Hunger Artist" 309), in "Before the Law" the man from the country poses his last question right into the ear of the doorkeeper ("Before the Law" 23), in "A Country Doctor" the ill boy whispers "Let me die" into the doctor's ear ("A Country Doctor" 251), in "The Great Wall of China" an unknown boatman whispers his imperial message into the ear of the narrator's father ("The News of the Building of the Wall: A Fragment" 280).

Now consider the opposite perspective of the author. Being safely exempted

from history, he dreams that the characters who suffer amidst its turmoil will forget about his comfortable ex-historical shelter. But, bereft of the possibility to approach them directly and check whether they really did so, he turns to the reader, seeking to seduce the latter into ignoring his privilege in the same smooth way. As the characters are in another world, the reader is the only available trustee. However, as he or she nevertheless belongs to a different life history than the author, he or she cannot but be distrustful of the author's manipulative act of entrustment. As Kafka spells out (*The Diaries* 321), to win the reader's trust under such unfavorable conditions, he calculatingly attaches him or her to a character who faces an impending death. As the lamenting reader concentrates on the dying character, s/he embraces the author's insidious self-exemption from human death with approval and love. The author thus wins favor in the reader's eyes by apparently *adopting* the latter's "basic predilections, desires, moral ideals," while he is in fact *subverting* them, i.e. outfoxing the reader.

The Political "Selection of Mercies": Kafka Read through His Descendants

Hence in authoring his works, Kafka engages the same method of subversive mimicry against the reader that the outsiders in his fictions apply against the characters in power. If we recall Bhabha's analysis of this technology of (de-)identification as the main *political instrument* of postcolonial selves (Bhabha 94-132), we will not be astonished to find Kafka's postcolonial admirer J. M. Coetzee stating about his own technique of authoring:

[T]he last thing I want to do is to *defiantly* embrace the ethical as against the political. [...] [I]f I speak from the [...] negative pole, it is because I am drawn or pushed there by force, even a violence, operating over the whole of the discursive field that at this moment (April 1990) we inhabit, you and I. (*Doubling the Point* 200)

After all, Coetzee was born into the white minority which, on behalf of two European empires, the Dutch and British, settled, ruled and exploited South Africa from the early 17th century deep into the 20th century by dispossessing, discriminating, and mistreating its native population. The deep entanglement of the whites in imperial violence is the main issue of his first novel *Dusklands* (1974), with regard to whose 'Vietnam' part he remarks:

I would regard it as morally questionable to write something like the second

part of *Dusklands*—a *fiction*, note—from a position that is not historically complicit. (343)

The same holds for Kafka whose post-imperial discursive field was equally deeply divided, which is why his authorial gesture of protecting positional outsiders could not avoid complicity with their executors. There is no representation of victims that, in its turn, does not repeat victimization. Induced by the consciousness-raising of the Holocaust in the aftermath of 1968, this disenchantment of literature's mission urges us to read Kafka's work anew. It is in following this thread that, for example, Derrida remarked: "You have to betray [i.e. the world you belong to] in order to be truthful [i.e. to the world 'elsewhere']" (Derrida 11). "There are ethics precisely because there is this contradiction... [...] I have to respond to two injunctions, different and incompatible. That's where responsibility starts" (32–33).

In this ambiguous context, it is worth noting that the British postmodern writer Ian McEwan, one of the prominent inheritors of Kafka's ethical sensibility in the last decades of the twentieth century, lets the chief protagonist of his novel *Saturday*, Henry Perowne, present the following train of thought:

This is the growing complication of the modern condition, the expanding circle of moral sympathy. Not only distant people are our brothers and sisters, but foxes too, and laboratory mice, and now the fish. Perowne goes on catching and eating them, and though he'd never drop a live lobster into boiling water, he's prepared to order one in a restaurant. The trick, as always, the key to human success and domination, is to be selective in your mercies. (*Saturday* 127)¹

As these are reflections of literary characters, we are of course not expected to take them at their word. They are operating within the whole network of opinions that relate to, oppose, contradict, and/or parenthesize one another. Nonetheless, in a world of unleashed competition for the truth, it is hard to see which authorial strategy ought to avoid such elimination of the 'dregs of society' for the benefit of

1 Considering the abovementioned euthanization of people like insects in Kafka's life and fictions, the "selection of mercies" as proposed by one of the protagonists of McEwan's *Black Dogs*, Bernard Tremaine, is even more interesting: "Most people, I told her, instinctively disliked the insect world and entomologists were the ones to take notice of it, study its ways and life-cycles and generally care about it. Naming insects, classifying them into groups and sub-groups was an important part of all that. If you learned to name a part of the world, you learned to love it. Killing a few insects was irrelevant against this larger fact" (*Black Dogs* 32).

its ultimate ‘truth’. As if anticipating these insights of his post-imperial descendants in the aftermath of the Holocaust, Kafka remarks,

[a]ny measure of goodness, however different opinions on it may be, will appear too great. One will realize that one is nothing but a rat hole of miserable ulterior motives. Not the slightest action will be free from these ulterior motives. (14 January 1920)

In the given permanent state of exception, ethics cannot figure as the last measure of human affairs.

[L]ife, because of its sheer power to convince has no room in it for right and wrong. As in the despairing hour of death you cannot meditate on right and wrong, so you cannot in the despairing course of life. It is enough that the arrows fit exactly in the wounds that they have made. (*The Diaries* 206; trans. modified)

This is how Kafka sees the writer’s task in the modern accelerated world of history: To make his or her remedial arrows fit exactly in the prehistorical wounds that he or she has cut open in the representative body of historical progress. Only through such a painful elimination of historical oblivion can the lost “life’s splendor” be restored that “lies in wait about each one of us in all its fullness, but veiled from view, deep down, invisible, far off” (195). Kafka’s authorial politics consist in ethically sacrificing himself and others for the revival of this prehistorical “splendor.”

The Point of View of The Wronged: A Refusal of Responsibility?

But considering that what is splendor for history’s losers is by no means splendor for its winners, his author’s ethical gesture ultimately presents itself as a retaliating political operation. This background “ulterior motive” compromises its foregrounded ethical profile. In fact, in his frequently discussed aphorism 82 from the ‘he’ series, dated 15 February 1920,¹ Kafka defines man’s “original sin” as a relentless claim for the status of victim, for victims are always innocent and so need not answer for their actions (*Aphorisms* 206). Does this ‘sin’ pertain to his own writing? As Benjamin aptly noted, this refusal of responsibility “applies to the sons more

1 The aphorism reads: “Original sin, the old injustice committed by man, consists in the complaint unceasingly made by man that he has been the victim of an injustice, the victim of original sin.” For the two most famous discussions, see Benjamin 123-27 and Agamben, “K.” 21-5.

than to anyone else” (Benjamin 123), at least from the point of view of their fathers. The sons, in their turn, experience their fatherly authorities as “lying on top of them like giant parasites. They not only prey upon their strength, but gnaw away at the sons’ right to exist” (123). The result of this clash of perspectives is a never-ending process of mutual blaming, an uneasy cohabitation of ‘executors’ and ‘victims’ that disquiets the world of humans, preventing them from establishing an impartial perspective “above the fray.”

As if being drawn into this vicious circle that leaves nobody’s truth uninvolved, some prominent moral thinkers of the so-called late modernity spontaneously identified with the point of view of the wronged, which was so close to Kafka. Their argument might be succinctly rendered as follows: “As we are bereft of our rights by the very structure of our societies, we cannot bear moral responsibility for our deeds; it is up to the wrongdoers to bear it.” Next to Friedrich Nietzsche and Walter Benjamin who, following this logic, attach themselves to the subalterns’ dispossession, consider for example their intellectual descendant Theodor Adorno who, opposing Kant’s universal ethics, formulates in his *Minima Moralia*: “Wrong life cannot be lived rightly” (Adorno, *Minima* 39). That is to say—echoing Kafka’s “despairing course of life” from the aforementioned quotation—one cannot expect moral behavior of subalterns whose life is irreparably damaged by their societies’ power distribution. These societies’ allegedly universal ethos, ignoring their inhuman conditions, exerts violent pressure on their ‘deviant’ members’ customs to obey it. “It is this violence and evil that brings these customs into conflict with morality,” spells out Adorno, “and not the decline of morals” for which the dominant morality blames the subalterns (Adorno *Problems* 17). Deprived both of the prerequisites to appropriate this morality and to resist it, they turn its violence, through self-blaming, self-humiliation and self-tormenting, upon themselves. Published in 1951, *Minima Moralia* develops its ethics out of the damaged life of social outsiders within Europe. Only a year thereafter, Frantz Fanon, in his *Black Skin, White Masks* (French original 1952), investigates the pathogenic consequences of the ruling morality’s pressure on the ‘weak subjects’ of European colonies who, due to this pressure become the abject objects of constant self-torment (Fanon 210-217).

As testified to by a series of his protagonists such as Gregor Samsa, Georg Bendemann, or the hunter Gracchus, Kafka associated the outsiders’ delineated self-victimizing attitude with the weak sons, i.e. “anxious, hesitant, restless persons” like he himself (Kafka, *Dearest Father* 7). They never stop complaining that they are victims of their fathers’ merciless violence: “you would simply trample me underfoot until nothing of me remained” (*Dearest Father* 21). Not only Kafka’s

“Letter to the Father” but also his many diary entries and letters demonstrate how much he is inclined to identify himself in these sacrificial filial terms as induced by the constant paternal oppression not only within his own family but also the whole disaggregating imperial society around him.¹ Yet in contradistinction to such pitying and compassionate self-perception that dominate his non-fiction works, he carefully kept himself aloof from the position of victim when shaping his fictional narrative authority, preferring to render it in ambiguous, almost indistinct terms.

The Vicissitudes of the Filial Perspective: The Perversion of Sacrifice

It deserves attention that such equivocal authoring, especially of his fictional works, is in accord with the retroactive intertwinement of the initially opposed paternal and filial capacities as elaborated in Freud’s roughly contemporary cultural-anthropological essays from *Totem and Taboo* (1914) onwards. In the last of these, *Moses and Monotheism* (1939), Freud remarks that while the Jewish religion grew out of paternal authority, Christianity responded to it from a weak filial perspective. Yet however humble the latter presents itself to be, it is guided by the “ulterior motive” of taking over the position of authority:

The old God the Father withdrew behind Christ, Christ, the Son, came in his place, just as every son had longed for in those prehistoric times. (Freud 536)

Kafka anticipates Freud’s thesis of the retroactive “inscription of the Jews” into “the history of the Christians” (Caruth 18) in his diary entry of 28 September 1917, pointing out that the ultimate idea of the literary performer of self-sacrifice is to “deceive” “the human tribunal,” albeit in a subterranean way, “without practicing any actual deception” (*The Diaries* 387). He manipulates others, so to say, through his very literary performance due to whose subterranean and deferred effects his filial sacrifice gradually adopts a paternal authority. In fact, according to Kafka’s argument, fictional sacrifices take place on two parallel stages. While on the visible stage of represented events an outsider character performs a sacrifice to the others upon which s/he is immediately dependent, on the invisible stage of representation, simultaneously, the author directs his or her sacrificial performance to the distant anonymous addressees. It is this mediated addressing that, through its mobilizing after-effects, retroactively establishes the author as the background ‘director’ of all relationships between his or her characters. In distinction to Freud who focuses on

¹ On the sufferings of Kafka’s ‘weak’ generation of intellectuals and artists as caused by their authoritative fathers’ generation, see Müller-Seidel 70-71.

this clandestine empowerment of the disempowered in *religious* sacrificial narratives, Kafka turns the *fictional* ones into its epitome.

Unlike religious narratives, they openly display their positional outsiders' efforts to benefit from their sacrificial performance for the present others. However, this uncovering of their envisioned empowerment is undertaken with the intention of covering another, authorial one. At the same time as the authors expose the perversion of their characters' sacrificial performances, they 'impartially' disperse themselves into the partiality of each of them, winning the sympathy of their readers for *this* detached sacrifice *of theirs*. When Kafka turns his fictions into the overt stages for compromising his various characters' sacrifices, he in fact targets the covert approval of his 'unselfish' self-othering by his readers. Whereas characters follow their petty interest as generated by their restrictive circumstances, he forges the 'disinterested' commonality of ultimate victims with his readers. In fact, as it is designed to compensate for his own victimhood, it is all but disinterested. On the contrary, it camouflages the benefit which the author draws from its establishment.

Although Kafka consistently performed sacrifices in his diaries¹ and letters,² he regarded these non-fiction genres as mere preparatory phases for the fictional ones which enable such camouflage. The entrapment of characters within their interdependence on the level of represented action conceals the simultaneous emancipation from this interdependence by the author's action of representation. While the characters cannot but reiterate their interdependence by involuntarily mirroring one another in their actions, the author exempts himself or herself from them by evenly distributing the aspects his or her own identity into the oppositions among them. His or her sneaking into their conflicting roles, transforming them into the constituents of one and the same 'scenario', silently deactivates the differences between them. That is to say, while the inhabitants of the visible level of represented action relentlessly reiterate these imparities, on the invisible level of the action of representation the author ameliorates them and melts them down. They act as the ferocious public

1 See, for instance, the diary entry of 4 July 1916 in which he performs in the first person: "I awoke to find myself imprisoned in a fenced enclosure which allowed no room for more than a step in either direction" (*The Diaries* 363). Or the one of 13 January 1920 in which he performs in the third person: "A prison he could have come to terms with. To end as a prisoner, that would be a goal for a life" (*Aphorisms* 202). And finally the one of 21 October 1921 in which he performs in the second person: "All is imaginary [...] but the closest reality (*nächste Wahrheit*) is only that you are beating your head against the wall of a windowless and doorless cell" (*The Diaries* 395; trans. modified).

2 See, for example, the following performance of the writer's sacrifice in a letter to Felice: "I need seclusion for my writing, not 'like a settler,' that would not be enough, but like a dead man. Writing in this sense is a deeper sleep, i.e. death, and just as you cannot and will not pull a dead person out of his grave, so you will not pull me off the desk at night" (*Briefe an Felice* 412).

activists of historical differentiation, he as the detached secret representative of an allegedly de-differentiating prehistory or posthistory.

Let us now, for the sake of illustration, reread the story “In the Penal Colony” in these terms. It introduces the character of the officer who, by force of allocated circumstances, performs sacrifice at the same time in the opposite capacities, i.e. the executor’s and the victim’s. In the first voluntary capacity, he wholeheartedly attaches himself to the public rituals of brutal execution that are, however, due to the progressing replacement of the ‘sovereign’ with the ‘disciplinary’ political regimes across the globe (Foucault *Discipline*), doomed to elimination even in the far remote colonies.¹ It is not only that their inhabitants, as the narrator remarks, no longer care for such cruel spectacles (“In the Penal Colony” 165) but the new commandant plans to abolish them completely (178). Such developments as necessitated both by the external historical and the internal story’s plot, transform the officer as the executor into the victim of the new political constellation. In this restricted, involuntary capacity he must take recourse in the opposite, i.e. private performance of sacrifice by transposing himself into the viewpoints of his recent superiors—the new commandant and traveling explorer—in order to outsmart them and materialize his agenda. He therefore guesses their responses, anticipates their reactions, and forges small ‘would-be scenarios’ (180-84), in short, engaging the subaltern strategy of the so-called subversive mimicry (Bhabha).

Although Homi Bhabha applied this concept to the performance of colonized selves, the range of subalterns who ‘stage’ their selves in their everyday communication with others exceeds just colonial circumstances. Each political regime forces its outsiders to simulating and amalgamating techniques of survival. One of the cases in point is the Underground Man from Dostoevsky’s *Notes from the Underground*, which, considering Dostoevsky’s influence on Kafka (Dodd 1992), must

1 Kafka carefully avoids locating his fictions, but the reader nevertheless learns that the colony is somewhere in the tropics (“In the Penal Colony” 166), where the officer speaks French (167). The story was inspired by the book *My Trip to the Penal Colonies* (Meine Reise nach den Strafkolonien, 1912) by the German criminologist Robert Heindl, who, among other colonies, describes the French penal island of New Caledonia, located about 20,000km from Metropolitan France (Müller-Seidel 82-84). As it functioned as the dumping ground for the ‘degenerate’ elements of French society, the explorer understands that it, in contradistinction to the democratic administration of European population, requires “extraordinary measures” and “military discipline” (“In the Penal Colony” 171). This is fully in line with the views that Heindl expresses in his own book (Müller-Seidel 84). Yet, as the reform of the European empires’ legislation was at that time more or less accomplished, it was underway in their colonies as well.

have left its imprints on his shaping of the officer.¹ Mikhail Bakhtin describes Dostoevsky's protagonist-narrator as an enflamed ideologue whose suddenly stranded position (he is a former civil servant)—very much like that of Kafka's officer—induces his embittered polemics with his society and the world (Bakhtin 236). Being in his indistinction both extremely dependent on and extremely hostile to the politically and socially distinct others (230), he invents a special kind of subversive mimicry, which Bakhtin dubs the “word with a loophole”:

A loophole is the retention for oneself of the possibility for altering the ultimate, final meaning of one's own words. If a word retains such a loophole this must inevitably be reflected in its structure [...] it is only the penultimate word and places after itself only a conditional, not a final, period. (233)

Yet Kafka's officer, who—in the footsteps of Dostoevsky's *Underground Man*—engages in his conditional speech a “thousand reservations, concessions, loopholes” (196) to pave the way for a “sincere refutation” (233) of his claims, ultimately fails to get it from the traveling explorer (“In the Penal Colony” 184) who thus turns into his potential executor.

Such development of their relationship that deepens the officer's humiliating position enforces the new reshaping of his performance, leading him from a ‘filial’ subversive mimicry back to a ‘paternal’ violence. In this reactivated capacity, he first “yell[s] in the explorer's ear [...] with the full force of his lungs” (174), thereafter presses into him, with a ‘strong insistence’ and ‘clenched fists’, the task of helping him against the acting commandant (182), and finally seizes his trustee by both arms, gazes into his face, and shouts loudly (184). In this way, his submissive plea transforms into verbal aggression. Walter Müller-Seidel compares his verbal and gestural attack on the explorer to the behavior of Kafka's father toward his son as described in “Letter to the Father,” which equally consisted of scolding, threatening, irony, evil laughter, and self-bemoaning. In the same way as the father's violence destroyed the son's capacities to reply, the officer's violence silences those of the

1 Dostoevsky was himself banished to a Siberian penal colony, whose brutal martial law and summary justice he painstakingly describes in *Notes from a Dead House* (1862). This experience was so decisive for his life that Kafka notes in his diary entry of 15 March 1914: “The students wanted to carry Dostoevsky's chains behind his coffin” (*The Diaries* 265-66). Although Russian Empire possessed no colonies, it had established Sakhalin as its penal island in 1875. Next to Dostoevsky's interest in such political zones of indistinction, as materialized also in his *Notes from the Underground* (1864), Kafka was also inspired by his critique of the Western modernization of the Russian judicial system (1865), as expressed in the first place in *The Brothers Karamazov* (1880). See Conti 469.

traveling explorer, who barely gets a word in (Müller-Seidel 123-4). Paradoxically, while this turnaround of the officer's behavior restores his capacity as the *executor*, it inadvertently merges him with the *victim*, i.e. a prisoner who had likewise replaced the doggish submission to his superior with an angry canine assault against him ("In the Penal Colony" 171). The officer's unwitting redoubling of his counterpart's behavior casts a light of the latter's helplessness upon him.

After he definitely fails to convince the traveling explorer, due to his undesired contamination with his counterpart's helplessness, the officer suddenly reinvigorates his victimhood by setting the condemned man free, taking his place, and letting the torture device execute him himself (185). Far from being a miracle, this substitution merely radicalizes the constant reinforcement of opposites in the officer's behavior. As it galvanizes the "nameless adherents" (192) to sanctify his figure in their memory, this ultimate self-sacrifice clandestinely targets an ultimate self-empowerment. It draws its inspiration from the adored old commandant whose political sacrifice had likewise attracted dock laborers to surreptitiously work in honor of his fame. But the force of altered circumstances repeatedly ruins the officer's design to walk in the footsteps of his great idol. Since the native addressees of his sacrificial performance, the soldier and the condemned man, do not understand "a word of French" (167) and are used to being instructed in their "native tongue" (185), they cannot possibly comprehend what is going on and remain baffled. The only difference between these two underdogs—who most of the time unconcernedly communicate with one another and grotesquely amuse one another despite their substantially different positions—is that the soldier is fully indifferent to the developments that he is obliged to attend whereas the condemned man invests a continuous effort to understand his situation and is definitely "the more animated of the two" (189). As if contaminated by his torturer's vivid curiosity, he is never tired of launching diverse hypotheses of others' actions, such as at the moment the officer releases him:

Was it true? Was it only a caprice of the officer's, that might change again? Had the foreign explorer begged him off? What was it? One could read these questions on his face. (185)

But linguistically and culturally disqualified as he is, he completely misinterprets the officer's action, attributing it to the explorer's decision and thus making it miss the target as envisioned by the officer:

What had happened to him was now going to happen to the officer. Perhaps

even to the very end. Apparently the foreign explorer had given the order for it. So this was revenge. Although he himself had not suffered to the end, he was to be revenged to the end. A broad, silent grin now appeared on his face and stayed there all the rest of the time. (188)

Thus the reason why the officer's sacrificial performances repeatedly fail to materialize their agenda is not merely the contaminating inscription of his antagonists' behavior into their outcome but also the contaminating inscription of his own behavior into that of his antagonists. Redoubling the officer's intellectual mobility, the condemned man not only frees himself from his radical immobility but also takes distance from his torturer and disobeys and ignores the explorer's orders (189-190). The same resilience is displayed by the explorer who despite the officer's praising of his tolerant worldview (180), in fact mirrors the officer's contempt for natives by rendering them as "poor, humble creatures" (191), "stupid-looking, wide-mouthed" "submissive dogs" (165) who "ridiculously" believe in the future resurrection of their old commandant (192). As opposed to the native prisoner who "was a complete stranger, not a fellow countryman or even at all sympathetic to him" (176), the explorer shows some empathy (184), supportiveness (190), and even admiration for the officer (167). Yet as the latter shares the natives' blind faith in their old commandant, he ultimately dismisses them both, especially after he recognizes the absence of the proclaimed ultimate redemption on the officer's dead face (190-91) and thus confirms the absurdity of his fanaticism.

If the opposed characters thus unwittingly 'intoxicate' each other's performances, making them miss their targets, this is because they unknowingly mirror the author's equivocal relationship to them that persistently fluctuates between victimhood and execution. What disconcerts Kafka's narrative authority from the very beginning to the end might be translated into Italo Calvino's much later question: "How much of the 'I' who shapes the characters is in fact an 'I' who has been shaped by the characters?" (Calvino 113) Calvino speaks of the "layers of subjectivity and feigning that we can discern underneath the author's name, and the various 'I's that go to make up the 'I' who is writing." (111). In this sense, the officer's and the condemned man's adoption of the others' points of view in order to outmaneuver them are mere replicas of the story's superior point of view that meanders between the characters' perspectives, countering one focalization through the other but without identifying with any of their optics. The superior point of view exempts itself from their blinded bias because they either filially sacrifice their present to the past (as does the backward officer) or paternally their past to the

present (as does the enlightened traveling explorer) without grasping (contrary to the author) the contamination of theirs with their counterpart's point of view.

So even if the author, as the victim of his characters, sacrifices his own view to assimilate theirs, he nevertheless, as their executor, exempts himself from their partiality and outsmarts it. Through this clandestine exemption, Kafka's narrative authority perverts the filial attitude as genuine of the officer who does not hesitate to sacrifice himself for the other into the paternal attitude as genuine of the traveling explorer who does not hesitate to sacrifice others for himself. Precisely *through this perversion*, it meets and articulates the longing of its addressees for the 'elevate commonality' of the humans who are defaced by their historical and political domiciles and eager to get rid of their humiliating belonging to them. In order to establish this commonality's historical and political in-difference and to shape it as an allegedly all-embracing meeting place for all earthly creatures, it invites and encourages its adherents to equally sacrifice their historically and politically particular identities. Yet how can this commonality be all-embracing if it is founded on the sacrifice of the fellow beings' distinct identities? This merciless sacrifice dismantles the establishment of its shaper's authority as its selfish background intention.

Thus, the institution of Kafka's narrative authority requires the double sacrifice of others, i.e. both characters and readers, for the benefit of its indiscriminate 'truth'. The readers who unreservedly adhere to this truth enable the substitution of its shaper's filial position for a paternal position. Those on the contrary who disclose its unwilling contamination with the appetite to patronize others—as we have tried to do here—help this authority emancipate itself from its compensatory fantasies. What initiates them is not a desire for the universally valid truth but their shaper's denied wound. However, although emancipation might be a better method of treating this wound than the passionate attachment to the fantasies which it generates, we should remind ourselves that Kafka's narrative authority emancipated itself from the fantasies of its characters in exactly the same way.

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor Wiesengrund. *Minima Moralia: Reflections on Damaged Life*. Trans. E. F. N. Jephcott. London: Verso, 1978.
- . *Problems of Moral Philosophy*. Trans. Rodney Livingstone. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2001.
- Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.
- . "K.." *Nudities*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010. 10-37.
- . *State of Exception*. Trans. Kevin Attell. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2005.

- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis and London: U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Trans. Caryl Emerson. Massachusetts: U of Minnesota P, 1984.
- Barkey, Karen. "Thinking about Consequences of Empire." *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building. The Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires*. Eds. Karen Barkey and Mark von Hagen. Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview Press, 1996. 99–114.
- Benjamin, Walter. "Franz Kafka: On the Tenth Anniversary of His Death." *Illuminations*. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 2007. 111–141.
- Bhabha, Homi. *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Blanchot, Maurice. *The Space of Literature*. Trans. Ann Smock. Lincoln, NE: U of Nebraska P, 1989.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Nationalism reframed: Nationhood and the national question in the New Europe*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge UP, 1996.
- Butler, Judith. *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London and New York: Verso, 2004.
- Calvino, Italo. "Levels of Reality in Literature." *The Uses of Literature*. Trans. Patrick Creagh. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1986. 101–24.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Coetzee, John Maxwell. *Doubling the Point: Essays and Interviews*. Ed. David Attwell. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 1992.
- Conti, Christopher. "The Trial of David Lurie: Kafka's Courtroom in Coetzee's *Disgrace*." *Textual Practice* 3.30 (2016): 469–92.
- Deleuze, Gilles and Guattari, Félix. *Kafka: Toward a Minor Literature*. Trans. D. Polan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986.
- Dodd, W. J. *Kafka and Dostoevsky: The Shaping of Influence*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1992.
- Esposito, Roberto. "The Person and Human Life." *Theory after 'Theory'*. Eds. Jane Elliott and Derek Attridge. London and New York: Routledge, 2011. 205–20.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1977.
- Freud, Sigmund. „Der Mann Moses und die monotheistische Religion.“ *Studienausgabe*. Vol. 9: *Fragen der Gesellschaft/ Ursprünge der Religion*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2003. 455–581.
- Fritzsche, Peter. *Stranded in the Present: Modern Time and the Melancholy of History*. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard UP, 2004.
- Gray, Richard T. et al. *A Franz Kafka Encyclopedia*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2005.

- Hirsch, Marianne. *The Generation of Postmemory. Writing and Visual Culture after the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia UP, 2012.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. "The End of Empires." *After Empire: Multiethnic Societies and Nation-Building. The Soviet Union and the Russian, Ottoman, and Habsburg Empires*. Eds. Karen Barkey and Mark von Hagen. Boulder, CO and Oxford: Westview Press, 1996. 12–16.
- Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. "Der Dichter und diese Zeit" (1906). *Reden und Aufsätze I (1891–1913). Gesammelte Werke in zehn Einzelbänden*. Ed. Bernd Schoeller. Vol. 8. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1979. 54–82.
- Judson, Pieter. *The Habsburg Empire: A New History*. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap P of Harvard UP, 2016.
- Kafka, Franz. "A Country Doctor." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 249–61.
- . "A Hunger Artist." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 300–10.
- . "An Imperial Message." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 24.
- . "Aphorisms." *A Hunger Artist and Other Stories*. Trans. Joyce Crick. Ed. Ritchie Robertson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. 188–209.
- . "Before the Law." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 22–23.
- . *Briefe an Felice*. Ed. Erich Heller und Jürgen Born. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1967.
- Kafka, Franz. *Dearest Father*. Trans. Hannah and Richard Stokes. London: Oneworld Classics, 2008.
- . "In the Penal Colony." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 165–92.
- . *The Diaries of Franz Kafka 1914–1923*. Ed. Max Brod. Trans. Martin Greenberg. London: Secker and Warburg, 1948.
- . "The Great Wall of China." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 266–79.
- . "The News of the Building of the Wall: A Fragment." *The Complete Stories*. Trans. W. and E. Muir. New York: Schocken Books, 1988. 280–82.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Political Writings*. Ed. H. S. Reiss. Trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Litowitz, Douglas E. "Franz Kafka's Outsider Jurisprudence." *Law and Social Inquiry* 27.1 (2002): 103–37.
- McEwan, Ian. *Black Dogs*. London: Vintage, 1992.
- . *Saturday*. London: Jonathan Cape, 2005.
- Müller-Seidel, Walter. *Die Deportation des Menschen. Kafkas Erzählung „In der Strafkolonie“ im*

europäischen Kontext. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1986.

Povinelli, Elisabeth. *Economies of Abandonment: Social Belonging and Endurance in Late Liberalism*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 2011.

Rosa, Hartmut et al. *Theorien der Gemeinschaft zur Einführung*. Hamburg: Junius, 2010.

Schenk, Frithjof Benjamin. "Travel, Railroads, and Identity Formation in the Russian Empire." *Shatterzone of Empires: Coexistence and Violence in the German, Habsburg, Russian and Ottoman Borderlands*. Eds. Bartov, Omer and Eric D. Weitz. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2013. 136–51.

Silverman, Kaja. *The Threshold of the Visible World*. New York and London: Routledge, 1986.

Wanberg, Kyle. "The writer's inadequate response: *Elizabeth Costello* and the influence of Kafka and Hofmannsthal." *European Journal of English Studies* 20.2 (2016): 152-65.

Han Suyin's *Picnic in Malaya: A Story*: A Lament on the Unending Misery of Womanhood in the Newly Independent Malaya by a Chinese Doctor

Danny Wong Tze Ken, Florence Kuek & Fan Pik Wah

Abstract: When Han Suyin passed away in 2012, the world remembered her for her description of life in China, the East-West dialogue found in her writings. Little is known of the thirteen years she spent in Malaya and Singapore. It was during this sojourn at the region that Han Suyin was able to spend more time on her medical practices. It was during this period that Han was able to produce some very distinctive writings including her creative writings but also most productive in addressing social ills during the era. It is in this light that this paper will examine 'Picnic in Malaya,' a short story by Han Suyin which focuses on the question of social inequity and ethical predicaments that shrouded the Malay community at a time when the country first claimed independence. The euphoria of the new-found freedom of a new nation is contrasted with the reality on the ground—the plights of the Malay women who found their condition remained unchanged. Through the pen of Han Suyin, a Chinese female medical doctor cum writer, the voice of a recognizable group of ladies cruelly abandoned by their husbands are heard. Nevertheless, 'Picnic in Malaya' brings one's attention to the necessary changes to the inner fabric of a new nation within which the old ethical order has yet to undergo reconstruction. All in all, the ethical choice of Han Suyin to boldly present such a critical story during the Malayan Independence reflects the didactic function of literature as propagated in Nie Zhenzhao's ethical literature criticism.

Keywords: Malaya; divorce; Han Suyin; ethical literary criticism; ethical choice

Authors: **Danny Wong Tze Ken** is Professor of History and Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Malaya (Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia). His research interests are Southeast Asia history and Malaysian Chinese studies (Email: dannyw@um.edu.my); **Florence Kuek** is Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, Languages and Psychology, SEGi (Petaling Jaya 47810, Malaysia). Her specializes in Malaysian literature and education (Email: florencekuekcw@segi.edu.my); **Fan Pikwah** is Associate Professor and Head of Department of Chinese Studies at University of Malaya (Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia). Her interests

are Chinese Literature and Malaysian Chinese studies (Email: fanpw@um.edu.my). (This article is sponsored by University Malaya Research Grant: UMRG 468-14HNE)

标题：韩素音的《马来亚野餐》：一位华裔女医生看马来西亚独立初期的妇女困境

内容摘要：韩素音于2012去世时，世人最有印象的是她对中国生活的描述和作品里中、西方文化的对话。很少人知道她在马来亚和新加坡生活和行医了13年（1948-1960），那段经历给她有很好的机缘创作出许多题材独特的作品，特别是含有针砭社会弊端的小说。本篇文章将讨论其短篇小说《马来亚野餐》所描述在1957年马来西亚独立后，在马来社会中出现不公平的现象和伦理困境。她的文字将大马独立之际有关自由的承诺与现实生活中马来妇女的窘境并没有得到改善的实况做了一个对比。韩素音以一个华裔女医生的视角，将马来社会中一群被她们的男人恶意抛弃的妇女勾画出来。无疑的，《马来亚野餐》清楚反映了一个新兴国家若非重建其伦理次序，社会的内在结构就会一如既往地不会有所改变。简言之，韩素音如斯大胆地将这篇小说写得这么具批判性，可说是她身为作家的一种伦理选择，让文学作品发挥其教诲作用，即中国学者聂珍钊的文学伦理学所提及的文学最核心的价值所在。

关键词：马来亚；离婚妇女；韩素音；文学伦理学批评；伦理选择

作者简介：黄子坚，马来亚大学文学院院长、历史系教授，研究兴趣为东南亚历史和马来西亚华人研究；郭紫薇，马来西亚世纪大学教育、语言与心理学学院高级讲师，研究专业为马来西亚文学和教育学；潘碧华，马来亚大学中文系副教授，研究兴趣为中国文学和马华文学。此文乃马来亚大学短期研究项目“马来西亚华人名人辞典”【项目编号：RG468-14HNE】部分成果。

Introduction

The celebrated author Han Suyin (1917-2012), famous for her novels (*Destination Chunking, A Many Splendoured Things, The Mountain is Young, Two Loves and Four Faces*, etc.) and her autobiographical series (*The Crippled Tree, A Mortal Flower, Birdless Summer, My House has Two Doors, Phoenix Harvest and Wind In My Sleeves*), actually spent 12 years of her life in British Malaya and the post-colonial Malaya which immediately ensued, from 1952 to 1964. This is one of the least known periods of her long life. Her connections with China as well as her celebrated novels and autobiographies have overshadowed her Malayan experience. Little has been written about her life there, but the most comprehensive biographical study on her sojourn in Malaya is by Ina Zhang whose Chinese name is Zhang

Xinhong.¹

This paper is an attempt to retrieve and reintroduce one of Han Suyin's least known short stories produced during her sojourn in Malaya. Entitled "Picnic in Malaya, A Story," this short but rather critical piece of literature was published in 1961. It gives an account of the ethical dilemma of Malay women at the threshold of the country's independence. Despite being part of a people who should have benefitted from the nation's transformation towards modernisation, a significantly large segment of this Malayan community was still being plagued by the miseries of old practices in a predetermined ethical environment. This paper will examine Han Suyin's writing style, the manner in which she brings her subjects of different ethical identities into the scene, and how these are consistent with her own account of her life in Malaya in *My House Has Two Doors* (1980). It also probes into the necessary changes to the inner fabric of a new nation within which the old ethical order has yet to undergo reconstruction, which again points to the value of this short story by Han Suyin.

Han Suyin in Malaya

Han Suyin, whose original name was Rosalie Mathilda Kuanghu Chou, was born in 1916 to a Chinese father and Belgian mother—her father had spent several years studying in Brussels before returning to China. Hence, she has had to embrace a bifurcated ethical identity since birth. Initially educated in China, she received a scholarship to pursue Western education in Brussels before finally completing a degree in medicine in London. In 1952, she moved to Malaya and practised medicine in the southern states of Johor and Singapore. During this time, she was married to Leon Comber, a colonial police officer with the Special Branch.

The period of her stay in Malaya coincided with the Malayan Emergency (1948-1960), during which the Malayan Communist Party (MCP) launched an armed insurrection against British Colonial rule. The majority of the MCP members were Chinese, and this was where Han Suyin's sympathies lay. Her most famous work from her sojourn in Malaya, *And the Rain My Drink* (1956), deals with the plight of the ethnic Chinese during the Malayan Emergency. It is a story of modern Malaya as seen through the eyes of Han Suyin, who was a largely impartial but nonetheless sympathetic observer. Her anti-Colonial stance led her to highlight the plight of the people who were caught up in the MCP struggle against the British, and who had to bear the brunt of British Colonial repression against members of

¹ See Zhang's monograph *Han Suyin in Malaya*, and the transcription of an interview with her about Han Suyin at NTU's alumni newsletter at the list of citation.

the MCP, their sympathisers as well as their family members, including detention and deportation. This did not endear her to the British Colonial establishment, who saw her as a radical writer, albeit whose feminist inclinations came at the cost of the ethical dilemma of instigating the authorities. Also, the Malayan society during that era was not ready for such views.

To make the situation worse, the publication of *And the Rain My Drink* cost Han Suyin's husband, Comber, his career in the Colonial police. He was obliged to resign from the Special Branch. Almost as if in consolation, Han Suyin, on the other hand, continued to gain popularity among English readers. She engaged in academic activities at Nanyang University, where she also worked as a medical officer in addition to teaching a course on Contemporary Asian Literature. Apart from giving lectures, Han Suyin also published some of her work in Nanyang University's earlier publications—one of them was the *Suloh Nantah*, or *Torch of Nantah* ("Nanyang University" in Chinese), through which "Picnic in Malaya" was published in 1961. It was also republished in the October 1961 issue of *Eastern Horizon Monthly Review*.

Ethical Literary Criticism

As a writer of great moral courage in offering perspectives different from her time, Han Suyin along with her propositions encountered frequent rebuff and repudiation. This article will examine the undertone of her "Picnic in Malaya" through the lens of ethical literary criticism as proposed by Prof Nie Zhenzhao, namely, "a critical theory that reads, analyses and interprets literature from the perspective of ethics so as to identify the ethical nature and moral teaching function (of literature per se)" (Nie 3). In an interview with Prof Charles Ross of Purdue University, Nie clarified that since a literary work is a "historically contingent presentation of ethic and morality, the mission of ethical literacy criticism is to uncover the ethical value of literature" (Ross 75-78).

In Nie's narrative, human society evolves from natural selection to ethical selection. Using the Sphinx, a creature with a human head and an animal's body as a literary analogy, Nie demonstrates that the ethical dilemma of yielding to one's animalistic nature or human nature will dictate one's decisions and ethical choices in life. The famous line in *Hamlet*, "To be or not to be" is not a dilemma between life and death, but an ethical choice (Ibid). Youngmin Kim, in an interview with Chen Lizhen, expresses his amazement with the analogy of the "Sphinx factor." He remarks that Nie's "idiosyncratic representations of the psychosomatic convergence of human body and the psyche" closely relates to, among others, the Freudian model

of the “aesthetics of sublimation” of the primary double tripartite id-ego-superego and conscious-preconscious-unconscious (Chen 389-414).

The key terms of the theory have been adapted for the discussion at hand, and the working definition of these terms are as follows: (a) ethical identity—referring to the objective identify of an individual in relation to other human beings under given circumstances within a society or relational context. It is a determinant of a certain individual as perceived and determined by his or her setting, e.g., what is expected of X as a member of the society of that time; (b) ethical choice—referring to the decision one makes out of all the considerable options in solving one’s problem. It is made out of one’s will and rational minds; (c) ethical dilemma—referring to the mental conflict whereby an individual is unable to resolve his or her problem without making an ethical choice, i.e., a choice between two mutually exclusive options. Such an unsettling circumstance occurs when both options are moral imperatives of some sort. To comply with one denotes the violation of the other; (d) taboo—referring to a prohibition that is guarded by cultural custodians of a certain community; (e) ethical reconstruction—referring to the reframing of the ethical order after a state of disorder or confusion due to ethical-related issues such as the dissonant states of taboo-breaking, or the social rejection of one’s legitimate identity.

“Picnic in Malaya”

Out of all her works, little is known of Han Suyin’s efforts in documenting the plight and ethical dilemma of Malay womenfolk as told in “Picnic in Malaya”. This is one of her least-known works because *Suloh Nantah*, the literary magazine in which the story was published, had a limited circulation that was too small to make an impact. It was largely unknown until it was included in a collection of essays in 1990 entitled *Tigers and Butterflies: Selected Writings on Politics, Culture and Society*. Although originally meant as an essay on social criticism, “Picnic in Malaya” is actually a short story, albeit a very short one. Nevertheless, because of the social issues raised in the story, it was treated as an opinion piece. Yet when read carefully, it can surely be ranked as one of Han Suyin’s finest short stories.

Han Suyin is known for her ability to produce vivid visualisations in her stories. In *A Many Splendored Thing*, her description of the view overlooking the old Hong Kong harbour from the hilltop at Queen Mary Hospital has been acknowledged as being even more cinematographic than its big screen portrayal in the Oscar-winning film adaptation of the same name (Craig-Bennett, 2010). Apart from that, her writing is always permeated with lively characterisations of people, as

well as down-to-earth language sprinkled with occasional humour and spontaneity. “Picnic in Malaya” definitely presents its Malayan characters, their ethical identities as well as the development of unanticipated events that the characters encounter in a very authentic manner:

“My eyes are not good,” she (Hasnah) said to Maimunah, “a devil sits in front of them. Please read this from Idris, my husband.”

“Allamah,” cried Maimunah, “he has given you the three *talaqs*! ¹ You are divorced. And you were not even present. Hasnah, what did you do wrong?”

... With the first sound of weeping automatically the women left the machines. The sewing girls, many of them married and divorced and remarried and redivorced again, and who knew without being told what had happened, crowded round Hasnah...” (49)

Writing style aside, this short story is among Han Suyin's most critical works on the plight of Malay women at the point of Malaya's independence. According to Zhang, the story was inspired by Han Suyin's interactions with Khatijun Nissa Siraj, the wife of Mohamed Siraj (Zhang, 165-166). Khatijun was a women's rights activist in Singapore and leader of the Muslim feminist movement at that time. She campaigned for the establishment of the Syariah court in 1958, and was the court's first case worker (Soin and Thomas 51-52).

One would reckon that “Picnic in Malaya” takes a unique approach to the genre, since it is written as the reflections of a Chinese female doctor on the social ills prevalent among the Malay community at that time, particularly in relation to the practice of polygamous marriage. The story depicts how the religious authorities colluded with erroneous and wayward husbands to abandon their existing wives for new ones by exploiting loopholes in the Syariah law. Hasnah and some other women in the story are unjustly divorced by their husbands, but are unable to seek redress in a satisfactory manner. There is outright ethical chaos and nonsensicality about the entire situation.

Nevertheless, the story is in many ways a representation of reality. It also highlights the changes that were taking place in Malaya at that time—the euphoria of the recently gained Independence, the hopefulness that this would bring about positive changes to society, and the despair at not seeing these dreams fulfilled.

¹ Talaq or talaq, in Islamic law, constitutes a formal repudiation of one's wife. When the husband pronounces the talaq three times, the divorce with his wife comes into effect.

“Picnic in Malaya” is told in the third person by Han Suyin, a Chinese doctor who gets to know Maimunah and her sister, Hasnah. Maimunah is a forward-looking woman who had taken part in the anti-British movement, while Hasnah, from Han Suyin’s point of view, is the constant victim of unjust treatment from her husband, Idris. Idris is portrayed as a civil servant who decides to issue Hasnah a pronouncement of divorce through a letter. When the women confront the religious authorities on the validity of such a pronouncement, their words are taken ironically given that Idris had registered his pronouncement of divorce on the basis of Hasnah’s alleged unfaithfulness. Han Suyin’s story goes on to reveal that the actual reason Idris divorces Hasnah, his second wife, is because he plans to marry a new wife. If he does not divorce Hasnah, he would not be able to marry another as he would have exceeded the quota of four wives as is permissible in Islam. “Picnic in Malaya” presents a chorus of many women in the same shoes as Hasnah. Uneducated, with insufficient skills to make a living and little financial resources, these women faced the ethical dilemma of either accepting or standing against the cruel treatment from their husbands. A majority of them, as delineated in Han Suyin’s story, choose to subject themselves to merciless abuse and abandonment by their men. After being divorced and left to fend for themselves and their children, they likely face the predicament and eventual pitfall of prostitution and jail (for being a prostitute). In this matter, Han Suyin was ahead of her time for advocating counselling and aid instead of punitive action. Her take appears to constitute a call for ethical reconstruction, in defiance of the conventions of the time.

In this respect, Maimunah, the protagonist of the story, is portrayed as a progressive woman who organises sewing classes for women, thereby giving them the skills to earn a living on their own. She is a freedom fighter who had been jailed for two years by the British. Unfortunately, despite Maimunah’s anti-British reputation, her prison sentence somehow causes her to be stigmatised even by fellow women, including the mother-in-law of her sister, Hasnah. Instead of seeking redress for the injustice done to her, Hasnah demonstrates an attitude of subservience which Han Suyin finds difficult to accept. In her ethical dilemma, Hasnah chooses not to have her own voice heard but to accept the wicked scheme of her husband. Along with that choice, Hasnah even begins to blame herself, thinking that maybe she had committed adultery without realising it, and that it was probably the work of the devil. In this way, Han Suyin highlights the ignorance of Hasnah and other women in similar circumstances. The story goes on to criticise those in official positions—civil servants and Syariah court officials who collude with errant husbands and block every avenue for seeking redress.

Women who are more hopeful place their trust in a new Malaysia,

“After *merdeka* (Independence in Malay), there will be schools for the women, then we shall be educated, and if our men divorce us we shall be able to work for ourselves. We shall not have to become prostitutes to feed ourselves and our children.” (44)

Maimunah even seeks the help of Che Marriamah, a female Member of the Parliament (MP). However, no help is forthcoming as the female MPs themselves are facing challenges in the male-dominated parliamentary hall, where their voices are largely ignored and made fun of by their male colleagues (50). It would seem that this overbearing male environment suffered little resistance.

In the end, Hasnah tries to commit suicide but does not succeed. She delivers the baby conceived before the divorce but dies ten days after childbirth due to an infection from a boil on her midwife's finger (*Ibid*). The story's title, “Picnic in Malaya”, appears towards the end, when Han Suyin the Chinese doctor brings the Malay women who work at Maimunah's sewing workshop and their children to the beach. There, they see some Europeans having a picnic, and the women decide to do likewise as a way of escaping from their harsh reality. In spite of the big gap between their ideals and their actual experience, their identity as a member of a newly independent nation might warrant the justification of their cases in subsequent social efforts in the days to come.

Three Chinese Elements

As “Picnic in Malaya” is written by Han Suyin, a Chinese, certain elements of Chineseness can be detected in the story. Firstly, Maimunah's adopted daughter Khalsom is of Chinese origin. The same goes for the mother of Hasnah's husband, Idris—she had been given over to a Malay family as a child. In this way, Han Suyin draws the readers' attention to a common occurrence at that time, especially during the trouble years of the Great Depression and the Malayan Emergency (1948-1960).

The second Chinese element in the story is the Malay perception of the Chinese as being astute in business and having an entrepreneurial spirit. Despite being brought up entirely as a Malay, Idris' mother's Chinese blood is believed by others in the Malay community to be infused with entrepreneurial qualities. Even with regards to Idris' business acumen in making money, Hasnah comments, “That's because his mother is a Chinese” (44). This common misconception among the Malays about the ethical identity of the Chinese prevails to this day.

The views expressed in these two points are consistent with similar sentiments expressed in Han Suyin's autobiography, *My House Has Two Doors*. She reports that during her early days in Malaya, "I would meet so many Malay families who adopted Chinese children, girls especially; so many Malays were proud of having a Chinese mother" (Han, *My House Has Two Doors*, 82).

The third point made by Han Suyin is the perception that the Chinese (and Indians) are well-to-do, and that they dominate the ranks of the professionals. As told in "Picnic in Malaya", the lawyers whom Hasnah and Maimunah approach to fight Hasnah's hopeless case are Chinese and Europeans (49-50). This is probably a reflection of the situation in Malaya at the time, in that the majority of the professionals in private practice were Chinese.

Women in Medical Services in Malaya

Probing into the changing landscape of female participation during the early years of nation-building, "Picnic in Malaya" highlights women's attempts to renegotiate their own social standing and welfare, namely, an ethical reconstruction of their identity and roles in society. As a medical practitioner herself, Han Suyin also takes note of the female presence in the medical profession during that era. In *My House Has Two Doors*, Han Suyin reports that there were no Malay female nurses at that time: "Nursing was not allowed for Malay women. No woman was allowed to 'touch' a man or to be in his proximity" (Han, *My House Has Two Doors* 69), as it was interpreted as committing *khalwat*.¹ Therefore, in order to prevent a contentious situation, it was a taboo in those days for Malay women to join the nursing profession. However, Chinese, Indian, Eurasian and even European nurses were already in service.

In fact, at the turn of the 20th century, there was a stereotypical perception within Asian society that women were not meant to be in the medical profession. Han Suyin went a long way to become "one of the first Chinese women physicians in Asia", and is notable for her medical career in Malaya which spanned over a decade (Windsor 91-92). She earned her Bachelor of Medicine & Surgery (MBBS) with Honours from the London School of Medicine for Women, and completed her housemanship at the Royal Free Hospital, United Kingdom. In 1952, after marrying her second husband Leon Comber, a Special Branch Officer in Malaya, Han Suyin settled down in Malaya and worked at the Johor Bahru General Hospital. She started

¹ Khalwat refers to a man or a woman found in close and suspicious proximity with a member of the opposite sex who is not his or her spouse. It is a violation of Islamic Law and carries a penalty similar to that of incontinuity, affinity, fosterage or unlawful conjugation. Kindly refer to Section 115 of Part XI—Offences under the Enactment No.3 of 1964, Administration of Muslim Law Enactment, 1963.

her private medical practice at Jalan Ibrahim, Johor Bahru in 1953, and opened her second clinic at Tanjong Pagar, Singapore in 1956.

On the day her first clinic launched, a Malay male doctor named Dr Ismail commented while examining her newly installed autoclave, “You won’t have any patients. People don’t like women doctors” (Han, *My House Has Two Doors* 100). Contrary to that remark, Han Suyin proved that female doctors were even more welcome, provided that they had what it took for the profession. She recalls, “By the end of the first month I had twenty patients a day and by the second forty to fifty a day, more than any other doctor in Johore Bahru” (Ibid). Some of her patients came from the new villages and rubber estates, telling her, “I’ve kept my disease for you to look at, Doctor” (Ibid). Her dedication to her work and some medical ‘miracles’ that she was able to perform earned her a plaque of appreciation as the “STAR OF SALVATION” (Ibid).

The literacy rate in Malaya at that time was rather low, and only 1% of the population made it to tertiary education (Educational Statistics of Malaysia 1938-1967, 6). Incredibly, some local women of great calibre managed to equip themselves professionally and served the Malayan community wholeheartedly as certified medical doctors. One of Malaya’s first Chinese female physicians was Dr Soo Kim Lan (1894-1981), who received her education at King Edward VII College of Medicine, Singapore. She began her medical practice locally in 1923 and established her private clinic in 1927. Besides her home base in Kuala Lumpur, she would even deliver medical aid on her own to remote villages in Terengganu on the east coast of Malaya.

By the time Dr Han Suyin was serving in Johor Bahru, Malaya, three Malay female doctors had already started their medical careers in Kedah, Perlis and Kuala Lumpur respectively. They were Dr Salma Ismail (Faridah Abdul Rashi 224-25), Dr Ruby Khaltom bt Abdul Majeed (*The Daily News*, 13 April 1948), and Dr Siti Hasmah bt Haji Mohamad Ali (Siti Hasmah Mohd Ali, 2016). The presence of these early female doctors during that era is quite phenomenal, considering that the majority of women were still hindered by their lack of education, marital autonomy, or a clear understanding of faith and religious matters.

Conclusion

The ethical choice of Han Suyin to boldly present such a critical story during Malayan Independence reflects the didactic function of literature as propagated in Nie Zhenzhao’s ethical literature criticism. Although the gender bias and religious malpractice portrayed in “Picnic in Malaya” has largely been addressed in a

practical sense over the decades, and the position of women in the region has seen considerable progress, one might argue that some of the issues faced by Malay women in 1961 have not disappeared completely. Han Suyin's concern for the plight and ethical dilemma of Malay women in the new nation-state of Malaya was likely to have been influenced by her friendship with Khatijun Siraj, but it is also consistent with the themes of ethical reconstruction that she championed by her all along in her public speeches and other writings. It is notable that this empathetic depiction of the social standing of the Malay women of that era is done through the lens of a Chinese female doctor. One might wonder whether the tone of the story would be as critical as it is had the author not been Han Suyin but a Malay woman from 1961. All in all, how writers deal with their ethical identity carries great weight to the construction of the characters under their pen.

In a nutshell, "Picnic in Malaya" presents a poignant view of the lives of the common Malay womenfolk in Malaya, set against the backdrop of a time of euphoria following Independence. Although resembling a feminist activist, Han's Chineseness remains visible as delineated in the previous section. Not represented in this short story is the rise of a few extraordinary female medical professionals including Malay female doctors, who were able to serve their generation during a critical time of nation-building. Nevertheless, "Picnic in Malaya" is still one of the must-reads among Han Suyin's many writings for its historical, cultural, and ethical reflections on the modernisation of Southeast Asia during the postcolonial era.

Works Cited

- Chen, Lizhen. "Rejuvenation and Innovation: The Past, Present and Future of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 3.3 (2019): 389-414.
- Craig-Bennett, Andrew. "A Short Excursion Into Cinema." *Gwulo: Hong Kong*. 12 July 2010. <https://gwulo.com/node/6188> accessed 31 March 2021.
- "Discovering Han Suyin in Malaya." *NTU Alumni Newsletter* [Interview] <https://www.ntu.edu.sg/Alumni/news/Documents/InaZhang.pdf> accessed 31 March 2021.
- Faridah Abdul Rashid. *Research on the Early Malay Doctors 1900–1957 Malaya and Singapore*. Bloomington. Indiana: Xlibris, 2012.
- Han, Suyin and Aamer Hussein, eds. *Tigers and Butterflies: Selected Writings on Politics, Culture and Society*. London: Earthscan, 1990.
- Han Suyin. "An Outline of Malayan-Chinese Literature." *Eastern Horizon* 3.6 (June 1964): 6.
- . *My House Has Two Doors*. London: Triad Grafton Books, 1980.
- . "Picnic in Malaya, A Story." *Eastern Horizon Monthly Review*, October 1961.
- . "Picnic in Malaya, A Story." *Suloh Nantah*. No. 18, August 1961.

- . Public speech at the Canada Association of Singapore's Nanyang University Alumni. *Lianhe Zaobao*. Singapore, 11 November 2021.
- . *The Crippled Tree*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1965.
- Hussain, Aamer. "A Hundred Years of Han Suyin", *Dawn, Books & Authors*. 15 January 2017. <https://www.dawn.com/news/1308574> accessed 31 September 2021.
- I Ruo-fen and Cui Feng. eds. *The Voice Of Han Suyin: Essay Collection Commemorating 100th Birthday of Han Suyin*. Singapore: Nanyang Technological University-Global Publishing, 2017.
- "Malay Girl Here To Become Doctor." *The Daily News*. (April 13 1948). Perth, WA: 1882-1950 <https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/80799117> accessed 28 Mar 2021.
- Malaysian Government. Section 115 of Part XI—Offences under the Enactment No.3 of 1964. *Administration of Muslim Law Enactment* 1963. Kuala Lumpur. http://www2.esyariah.gov.my/esyariah/mal/portalv1/enakmen/Eng_enactment_lib.nsf/100ae747c72508e748256faa00188094/3e7ad01824e8b532482573950029705c?OpenDocument accessed 31 March 2021.
- Malaysian Ministry of Education. *Educational Statistics of Malaysia 1938 to 1967*. Kuala Lumpur: Ministry of Education Malaysia. <https://www.fmm.org.my/upload/educational%20statistics%20of%20malaysia%201938-1967.pdf> accessed 28 March 2021, 1967.
- Nie, Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing Daxue Chubanshe, 2014.
- Ross, Charles. "A Conceptual Map of Ethical Literary Criticism: An Interview with Niew Zhenzhao." *Foreign Languages and Their Teaching* 4 (2015): 7-14.
- Shepherd, M. C. ed., Han Suyin. *Britannica Academic-Encyclopaedia Britannica*. 19 February 2021. <https://academic-eb-com.eres.qnl.qa/levels/collegiate/article/Han-Suyin/601831> accessed 28 Mar. 2021.
- Siti Hasmah Mohd Ali. *My Name is Hasmah*. Kuala Lumpur: Alaf 21, 2016.
- Soin, K. and Thomas, M. eds. *Our Lives to Live: Putting a Woman's Face to Change in Singapore*. Singapore: World Scientific, 2015.
- Windsor, L. L., *Encyclopedia of Women in Medicine*. Santa Barbara, California: ABC-CLIO Inc., 2002. <http://1.droppdf.com/files/pjMPf/encyclopedia-of-women-in-medicine.pdf> accessed 28 March 2021.
- Zhang, Xianhong. *Han Suyin in Malaya: Medical Career, Writing, and Society Participation*. Singapore: Global Publishing, 2016.

Self-fashioning and Moral Maturity in *Evelina*

Li Silan & Chen Lizhen

Abstract: *Evelina* can be taken as a literary event that reflects the social milieu in which it was written and published. As a literary action and social practice, this novel becomes an integrated part of the literary market and daily life in Frances Burney's age. There are complex and reciprocal relationships between the action of *Evelina*'s self-fashioning, the influence of ethical selection and the formation of moral maturity. This paper tries to address the important issues in the process of moral maturity to investigate the roles and limitations of self-fashioning in the growth of young women through fictional narratives in eighteenth-century England. In this way, the cognition and fulfilment of ethical identities can be explored in the due course.

Keywords: Burney; *Evelina*; self-fashioning; moral maturity; ethical identity

Authors: **Li Silan** is Lecturer at the School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University. Her area of research includes English culture and the eighteenth-century novel (Email: leesilan@163.com); **Chen Lizhen** is Professor of English at the School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University. His current research interests include ethical literary criticism, circulation of literary discourse and narrative theory (Email: lizhenchen@hznu.edu.cn).

标题: 《伊芙莱娜》中的自我形塑与道德成熟

内容摘要: 弗朗西斯·伯尼小说《伊芙莱娜》的写作和出版可被视为一个文学事件,反映了此过程中的社会情状与伦理环境。这种文学行为和社会实践是当时英国文学市场和日常生活的组成部分。女主角伊芙莱娜的自我形塑行为跟伦理选择和道德成熟之间形成了复杂的双向互动关系。本文试图讨论这部英国十八世纪后半期经典小说中关于道德成熟的话题,分析虚构叙事中的自我形塑在青年女子成长过程中的作用及其局限,以期研究伦理身份的认知与实现问题。

关键词: 伯尼; 《伊芙莱娜》; 自我形塑; 道德成熟; 伦理身份

作者简介: 李思兰,杭州师范大学外国语学院教师,主要研究英国文化与18世纪小说。陈礼珍,杭州师范大学外国语学院教授,主要研究文学伦理学批评、文学话语传播和叙事学理论。本文系浙江省哲学社会科学规划项目“英国18世纪女性作家情感叙事中的自我形塑研究”【项目批号:18NDJC062YB】和

国家社科基金青年项目“英国摄政时期历史小说叙事伦理研究”【项目批号：15CWW018】阶段性成果。

The success of Frances Burney (1752-1840), also known as Fanny Burney, was phenomenal in eighteenth-century England. She was a leading figure among a gallery of women writers including Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, Sarah Fielding, Charlotte Smith, Charlotte Lennox, Mary Wollstonecraft and many others. Her first novel *Evelina, or, The History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World* was published in the year of 1778. It is widely acclaimed for its delineation of the moral maturity of the heroine. Julia Epstein argues that “the comedy here comes from the heroine’s (and her creator’s) youthfully impetuous and sly inversion of powerlessness into power, as Evelina learns to manipulate social manners and fashion so that she gains the greatest possible control over her life without offending those who seek to ‘guide’ her” (Epstein, *The Iron Pen* 121). In this sense, *Evelina* is highly tactical in her own way of self-fashioning. *Evelina* involves the growth of a young lady, but it is not a Bildungsroman in the strict sense. Evelina is a clear-minded woman with a strong character. In her letters, she fashions herself as an innocent, obedient and docile young lady. However, critics like Marta Kvande have noticed her obstinacy and tactics: “Evelina uses this pose of obedience as a cover” (Kvande 170). Evelina’s maneuver with her guardians reflects her will of self-fashioning. This novel presents to readers the progress of her moral maturity through the fusion of self-fashioning and ethical selection.

Self-fashioning through Epistolary Narratives

Burney’s life was an epitome of self-fashioning as a young woman in eighteenth-century England: she was a “protégée of Samuel Johnson, lady-in-waiting at the Court of George III, later wife of an emigré aristocrat and stranded in France during the Napoleonic Wars, she lived on into the reign of Queen Victoria” (Sabor title page). These social identities cultivate the image of Frances Burney as a woman novelist and a member of the fashionable society. Burney was born into a family with high social status. As the other young ladies, when she grew up, she made her way into the fashionable society. She was popular with Samuel Johnson and the Court of George III. She began her five-year service to the Court as Keeper of the Robes to Queen Charlotte in the July of 1786. She gained recognition and approval from the royal family, which endowed her with a fame for the fashionable society of London.

In *Evelina*, Burney focuses on the theme of the moral maturity of womanhood,

the efforts of self-fashioning and matrimonial endeavors. Ian Watt, in his *The Rise of the Novel*, summarizes the contribution of Burney in a good way: she synthesizes two divergent styles of novel writing created by Samuel Richardson and Henry Fielding, and starts a new vision for women writers “with the advantages of the feminine point of view” (Watt 296-299). Burney depicts a vivid psychological and sentimental landscape on a broad canvas of the daily life in eighteenth-century England to present the process of Evelina’s maturity from adolescence to womanhood.

Even though the notion of “Angel in the House” was not coined until the year of 1854 by Coventry Patmore in his poem, the division of social space and personal role has been in existence for centuries. Burney was born into a middle-class family. Her father was a musician and man of letters. Burney behaved well with the manners of a “lady” in the eighteenth-century. Young women should obey many disciplines to shape their identity and model their action of respectability. In the first half of the eighteenth-century, novel-writing was not taken to be a decent profession. Susan Lanser points out that even for women writers of the 19th century like Susan Ferrier, Elizabeth Gaskell and George Eliot, they will use many quotations and aphorisms to achieve the effect of authority. Aphorism will prove that women writers “are profoundly knowledgeable” and give them “a sense of association which is a blending of the texts of women writers and men writers” (Lanser 109). For the time when Burney lived, it was far more difficult to be a professional writer. This profession put women writers in a vulnerable position on the social ladder. Burney wrote in her diary on the entries for September of 1778: “I am frightened out of my wits from the terror of being attacked as an author, and therefore shrink, instead of seeking, all occasions of being drawn into notice” (Burney, *Diary and Letters of Madame D’Arblay* 761). For many writers in eighteenth and nineteenth century England, writing letters was an important channel of self-fashioning. Some of them even wrote diaries and letters with a view of collecting and publishing them in the future, which was a common practice at that time.

It is notable that Burney chose to use the genre of epistolary novel to tell her story and organize the form of her novel. The novel consists of two volumes. The first volume is made up of 31 letters and the second volume 22 letters. Evelina is the deserted daughter of a debauched aristocrat. When the novel begins, she is already a seventeen-year-old young woman who has been living in the countryside. When Evelina leaves for London and lives there, she narrates her stories through the letters to her guardian Mr. Villars and other people. The success of *Evelina* paved a way for Burney to enter the fashionable society. Sometimes, people tend to track down the

autobiographical elements of Burney's fashioning of herself in her *Evelina*. Burney comes to meet this situation in her life time and seems to accept the correlation with calmness or even gladness. "Instances of the gross confections of Burney and her book product occurred when Dr. Johnson called her 'Evelina', (Come, —Evelina, —come and sit by me) and when two girls in a shop stared so intently at her, it was 'as if they expected to read in (her) face all the characters in (her) book'" (qtd. In Park 141). Julie Park's anecdote of Burney and Dr. Johnson testifies the success of her self-fashioning with her novel *Evelina*.

Urbanization is a dominant force in the history of England in the eighteenth-century. Burney delineates the impact of modernity on the daily life in London, which is one of the greatest cosmopolitan cities in the world then. For women living in cities, they undergo a significant change in their lifestyles when compared with a life in rural areas. Julia Epstein points out that "the heroines of Frances Burney's four novels embody a set of contradictions so paradigmatic of the later eighteenth century that they might be said to define the ideological tensions inhering in the period's complex demarcations of woman's social place" (Epstein, "Marginality in Frances Burney's Novels" 198). Through the letters of Evelina, Mr. Villars, Lady Howard and others, the image of Evelina is shaped in delicate details. As the preface of the novel says, "the following letters are presented to the public- for such by novel writers, novel readers will be called, -with a very singular mixture of timidity and confidence..." (*Evelina* xiv). The effects of the narrative and the process of self-fashioning are interconnected in a very complicated state in *Evelina*. Reading this novel in the specific historical milieu of the eighteenth-century, we will have a better understanding of the situation of Burney's action of narrating women's identity through daily life details and the fictional narrative of this novel.

With an exquisite touch of the pen, Burney depicts Evelina's moral maturity and ethical selection in a graceful and imperceptible way. Shortly after arriving in London with the Mirvans, Evelina writes to Mr. Villars to inform him of their situation. In that letter, she mentions an interesting incident that expressed the ladies' different attitude towards self-fashioning. The first thing they do in London is to go to Drury-Lane theatre and watch a performance by David Garrick, a famous actor of the time. Evelina writes:

I am quite in ecstasy. So is Miss Mirvan. How fortunate, that he should happen to play! We would not let Mrs. Mirvan rest till she consented to go; her chief objection was to our dress, for we have had no time to Londonize ourselves; but we teased her into compliance, and so we are to sit in some obscure place,

that she may not be seen. As to me, I should be alike unknown in the most conspicuous or most private part of the house. (30)

This is a animated depiction of the excitement of a young woman at the first moment of arriving in the capital. It testifies Evelina's innocence and naivety in the fashionable world. She was eager to enjoy the bustle and hustle of that cosmopolitan city. Harvie Ferguson argues that "in modern society identity is exteriorized as appearance, this is important in a society where a high proportion of interaction takes place among strangers" (Ferguson 185). Evelina and other ladies surely knew this and were ready to exteriorize their taste and class identity through their dress and other ways of life. The situation with Evelina is almost the same. She wrote letters to tell her stories. This action is also an important way of self-fashioning. The epistolary narratives in *Evelina* help readers form a moral judgment on the characters. Since most of stories in the novel are told by Evelina, she is the center of consciousness. In her letters, all the stories and other characters are tailored and filtered through her mind.

Selection of Ethical Identity by Self-fashioning

Self-fashioning is an active choice that is made through the mechanisms of subjectivity and the selection of ethical identity. Nie Zhenzhao holds that "moral behaviors and moral regulations are based on the premise of ethical identity, which restricts the subject of moral behaviors to the extent, sometimes, of mandatory degree through ethical taboos" (Nie, *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* 264). Even if Burney doesn't use this word in her novel, as most of her contemporary writers, the issue of ethical identity looms large in *Evelina*. Self-fashioning is an active action and an intentional endeavor to form an identity and shape subjectivity. Jeffrey R. Wigelsworth holds that "current scholarship suggests that individual identity is formed through an internal process of self-fashioning and through membership in particular groups" (Wigelsworth 59). Wigelsworth is insightful to associate the formation of identity with self-fashioning. This is also true to the formation of ethical identity, which is a social entity of responsibility and rights.

Stephan Greenblatt defines self-fashioning in this way: "of course, there is some absurdity in so bald a pronouncement of the obvious: after all, there are always selves—a sense of personal order, a characteristic mode of address to the world, a structure of bounded desires—and always some elements of deliberate shaping in the formation and expression of identity" (Greenblatt 1). Greenblatt takes the action of self-fashioning as a way of communication with the world, which requires an

ethical choice and deliberate endeavor to shape identity. As a common sense, most of the people would stick to the customs and habits of their class. They are willing to achieve a sense of identity by following social rules that are set for and obeyed by all the people of their class. Appropriateness, which means being suitable and correct in a particular situation, is one of the guiding rules for ladies living in the age of *Evelina*'s time. In letter XXI, the heroine of this novel experiences a certain type of cultural shock when she expresses her "astonishment" at the "rudeness" of Miss Mirvan and Miss Poly (*Evelina* 146) who deviates from the expectations of the fashionable society when they talk about and go to an opera house. They lose their self-control without knowing the etiquette there. *Evelina* presents a moral vision to its contemporary readers that an eighteenth-century English woman should have self-control to achieve an aimable identity, which is the inward curb of her desire and self-fashioning.

When Burney published her *Evelina* in the latter half of the eighteenth-century, the manners of self-fashioning was popular for the fashionable society of London. People living in and immediately after the early modern age believed that they could fashion their own self and identity by following certain social etiquettes and rules. The notions of self and identity in the mind of Burney's contemporaries were constructed under the influence of John Locke and David Hume. The two philosophers combined to create a current of empirical relativism for British people. Hume's theory of the self is quite empirical too. He holds that "the notion of self is a fiction that is imagined in accordance with ideas" and that "there is no such thing as a monolithic self but a stream of incessant and momentary perceptions" (Radcliffe 56, 59). This trend of empirical philosophy was extremely influential in the eighteenth-century. With the enlightenment of this philosophy, people came to believe that there was no absolute or invariable state for the existence of an identity. It gave rise to a belief that the self was fluid and the identity can be fashioned. The action of Burney's making her determination to be a writer and writing her novel *Evelina* can be considered as a measure of her self-fashioning.

The rise of the novel witnessed a fast-growing number of women writers. Aphra Behn and Sarah Fielding gained fame as women novelists, but their popularity and financial success were rather limited. Frances Burney came from a well-to-do family and her determination to become a professional writer was a deliberate endeavor of self-fashioning. She was a pioneer as a woman writer. It justifies her insistence on the anonymity of her authorship when she publishes her *Evelina*. There has been a bias that in the eighteenth-century women novelists were not as good as men writers. Andrew Varney summarizes the causes of this situation:

widely accepted bias toward women's competence as writers, their treatment of "lesser" topics, the legal status of women that limits their identity of an "author", the difficulty to receive payment out of their gender roles, social custom and prejudice that discipline women to stay in the field of domestic sphere, contemporary criticism to valorize "masculinity", association with loose sexual morality, their education that excludes them from the classical culture (Varney 117-118). Varney gives a reasonable explanation to this deep-rooted bias, which impeded Frances Burney when she started her writing career. Her selection of her identity as a woman novelist was a financial, social as well as an ethical action. She made use of her fictional narratives to take part in the great enterprise of eighteenth-century women novelists. They contributed to let their contemporary readers to have an imaginary experience of the moral maturity of a young woman in cosmopolitan London.

For young women coming from rural districts, the opera houses in London are very attractive. In a letter written on March 26, Evelina expresses her wish to go to London, she writes:

They tell me that London is now in full splendor. Two playhouses are open, the Opera-house, Ranelagh, and the Pantheon. You see I have learned all their names. However, pray don't suppose that I make any point of going, for I shall hardly sigh, to see them depart without me, though I shall probably never meet with such another opportunity. And, indeed, their domestic happiness will be so great, -it is natural to wish to partake of it. I believe I am bewitched! (27)

For Evelina and other ladies of the middle class or aristocratic families, going to an opera house is a way of entertainment as well as a way of self-fashioning in the fashionable society. They wear cosmetics and gorgeous clothes to show off the extravagance and affluence of their life style as fashionmongers. They take pains to cater to the fashionable culture and try to have an emotional identification with their class. It is their way of fashioning their identity in the public sphere. The opera house is also one of the few places that are suitable for young ladies at that time.

In letter X, Evelina and the ladies were preparing to go to the famous Dury Lane Theatre. Mrs. Mirvan was reluctant to go to the theatre, her excuse was that she worried about the dress of the young ladies because they "have had no time to Londonize" themselves (30). Evelina was in a great ecstasy when she went to the theatre. She wrote in her letter in a high spirit: "We sat in the pit, where every body was dressed in so high a style, that, if I had been less delighted with the performance, my eyes would have found me sufficient entertainment from

looking at the ladies” (55-56). Evelina spends her earlier years in the countryside. When she arrives in London, she is eager to fashion herself in accordance with the requirements of the fashionable society. She can’t wait to start her action of self-fashioning. She arrives in London on April 2. It is exactly on the same day that she goes to the theater to watch a play by David Garrick, the most popular actor of the time. The next day, she comes to St. James Park, a landmark of London. On April 4, she goes to a private ball given by a very fashionable lady. Before going to the ball, she goes to a barber’s shop for hairdressing. She feels uncomfortable with the new style of her hair by writing in the letter to Mr. Villars in this way: “You can’t think how oddly my head feels; full of power and black pins, and a great cushion on the top of it. I believe you would hardly know me, for my face looks quite different to what I did before my hair was dressed” (34). It shows that Evelina takes pains to comply with the customs of the fashionable society of London. She is anxious to gain recognition and be admitted into the circle of fashionable ladies. Karen Lipsedge points out: “In *Evelina* it is the dressing-room that Burney employs to signal the heroine’s transition from maiden to potential mistress. Equally central to Evelina’s transition, Burney suggests, is her heroine’s ability to acquire the ‘art of cosmetic transformation’” (Lipsedge 122). As a young woman bred in the countryside, Evelina has a natural feeling of admiration for cosmetics, consumption and fashion in the cosmopolitan city.

A Young Lady’s Entrance into the World: The Maturity of Moral Sentiments

As the subtitle suggests, this novel tells the story of Evelina’s entrance into the world. It testifies the features of Bildungsroman. Evelina, as a young lady from the countryside, feels the impact of different culture and customs in London. She has the moral guidance of Mr. Villars and Lady Howard. Lord Orville, observing a strict code of morality has an influence on Evelina too. Mr. Villars, Lady Howard and Lord Orville function as an external power to guide Evelina through the unsafe ground of moral issues. Their existence serves as a supporting power for the moral maturity of Evelina. She needs more guidance and suggestions at the beginning of the novel, which can be proved by the number of letters written by these people. The first seven letters of the novel are written by Lady Howard and Mr. Villars. These letters fulfil the tasks of introducing the background of the story, depicting the personality and history of Evelina as well as providing necessary information. The physical existence of the letters of Lady Howard and Mr. Villars works as a moral voice that protects Evelina as an unsophisticated young woman. Gradually, she enters the world and gains independence with her own way of exploration, which

is achieved with the force of self-fashioning. With the progress of the story, Lady Howard and Mr. Villars move to the background and the personality of Evelina comes to the foreground.

In the conventional and patriarchal notion of sexuality in the eighteenth-century, women were supposed to be more emotional, moody and benevolent than men. Their behaviors were thought to be governed by irrationality and sentiments. The spread of the moral theories of David Hume and Adam Smith made English people believe in the value of moral sentiments. It is possible that Burney read Hume's *The History of England*, for she modeled the despicable character of William as "violent, haughty, tyrannical" in her tragedy *The Siege of Pevensey* (Wallace 66). Burney was definitely more familiar with Adam Smith, since Adam Smith was also a member of the Samuel Johnson Club (Rogers 89). Adam Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) played an important role in shaping the forms of aesthetics and morality in the eighteenth-century. In the theory of Adam Smith, sympathy is a core element for the sense of morality. Smith's theory of moral sentiments contributed to the rise of Sentimentalism in eighteenth-century England.

Frances Burney was fashioned by the mainstream notions of sentiments and virtues, and in turn she expressed them in her novels. *Evelina*, however, is anti-Sentimentalism. This practice was quite against the grain in the field of novels when *Evelina* was published in 1778. The dominant genre of novel at that time was sentimental novel. "The declaration 'A Sentimental Novel' actually appeared on the title pages of many works of fiction of this period, and was particularly common during the 1770s and 1780s" (Mullan 2236). Even though Sentimentalism was highly influential at that time, Burney's heroine Evelina was not under the sway of this philosophical and cultural trend. Sentiments were taken as a proof of capability of morality. The abundance and overflow of sympathy and sentiments were considered to be a symbol of moral advantage. Rejecting the logic of reason and urban life, Sentimental novels of the eighteenth-century advocated feelings and rural life. When Burney wrote *Evelina*, she deviated from this convention. At the beginning of the novel, Evelina leaves the rural district and moves to the cosmopolitan London. She is sanguine and rational, even if she has some flaws, which are inevitable problems and marks of growth in a novel of Bildungsroman. The notion of "reason" is used by most of the characters as an important means to fashion their identity. Words like "reason", "reasoning" and "unreasonable" appear more than ninety times in *Evelina*.

Frances Burney is on an assured ground to know how to self-fashion the identity of herself and her heroines in the novels. Burney and Evelina can be

deemed as a two-way reciprocal expression of self-fashioning. The publication of *Evelina* can be considered as a literary event that enabled both of them to tell “her story” and to self-fashion herself. Throughout the novel, the consciousness of morality is a central theme. The major characters like Evelina, Mr. Villars, Lady Howard and Mrs. Mirvan are the embodiment of morality. They guide their actions with strict moral disciplines. Apart from that, some of the minor characters like Sir Clement Willoughby, the flamboyant and frivolous nobleman, keep virtues and decorum in their mind all the time. Even for Madam Duval and the Branghtons, the vulgar antagonists, they have a wrong code for the sense of appropriateness which is contrary to the widely accepted standard and mainstream morality. Nevertheless, they still confine their ethical selection and identity to the domain of morality. It is not their intentional neglect of morality, but instead, it is the discrepancy between their false sense of “morality” and the mainstream standard of morality that makes them look disagreeable to the other people.

According to ethical literary criticism, “moral enlightenment is the fundamental function of literature, which is achieved through the reader’s esthetic experience in the process of reading”(Nie, “Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory” 191). The fictional narrative of *Evelina* serves as a fabric, into which Burney weaves her ideas of moral maturity, ethical selection and ethical identity for young ladies of the eighteenth-century. The texture of the epistolary novel foregrounds the narrative voice and authority of Evelina. She functions as a center of consciousness, through which readers come into contact with other characters. The moral maturity of Evelina presents the conflict of individual will-power of self-fashioning and the strong shaping power of culture.

Works Cited

- Burney, Fanny. *Diary and Letters of Madame D'Arblay*. Ed. Charlotte Barrett. London: Frederick Warne & Co., 1876.
- . *Evelina: or The History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World*. Paris: Theophilus Barrois, Junior, 1808.
- Epstein, Julia, “Marginality in Frances Burney’s Novels.” *The Cambridge Companion to The Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996. 198-211.
- . *The Iron Pen: Frances Burney and the Politics of Women's Writing*. Madison: The U of Wisconsin P, 1989.
- Ferguson, Harvie. *Self-Identity and Everyday Life*. London and New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Renaissance Self-Fashioning: From Moore to Shakespeare*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1980.

- Kvande, Marta. "Frances Burney and Freanes Sheridan: Epistolary Fiction and the Public Sphere." *Everyday Revolutions: Eighteenth-century Women Transforming Public and Private*. Eds. Diane E. Boyd and Marta Kvande. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2008. 159-187.
- 苏珊·S·兰瑟:《虚构的权威:女性作家与叙述声音》,黄必康译。北京:北京大学出版社,2002年。
- [Lanser, S. Susan. *Fictions of Authority: Women Writers and Narrative Voice*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2002.]
- Lipsedge, Karen. *Domestic Space in Eighteenth-Century British Novels*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Mullan, John. "Sentimental Novels." *The Cambridge Companion to the Eighteenth-Century Novel*. Ed. John Richetti. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 236-256.
- Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 13.2 (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. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- Park, Julie. *The Self and It: Novel Objects in Eighteenth-Century England*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010.
- Radcliffe, Elizabeth. *On Hume*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 2002.
- Rogers, Pat. *The Samuel Johnson Encyclopedia*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, 1996.
- Sabor, Peter. *The Cambridge Companion to Frances Burney*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
- Spencer, Jane. "Evelina and Cecilia." *The Cambridge Companion to Frances Burney*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 23-38.
- Varney, Andrew. *Eighteenth-Century Writers in their World*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan Press Ltd., 1999.
- Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. "Burney and Dramatist." *The Cambridge Companion to Frances Burney*. Ed. Peter Sabor. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. 55-74.
- Watt, Ian. *The Rise of the Novel: Studies in Defoe, Richardson and Fielding*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1957.
- Wigelsworth, Jeffrey R. "Fashioning Identity in Eighteenth-Century Politics: The Case of John Toland." *Anglo-Irish Identities: 1571-1845*. Eds. David A. Valone and Jill Marie Bradbury. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2008. 59-83.

脑文本、引文与玛丽安·摩尔诗歌的美国文化身份书写

Brain Text, Quotation, and the Writing of American Cultural Identity in Marianne Moore's Poetry

何庆机 (He Qingji)

内容提要: 玛丽安·摩尔以大胆的形式创新著称,然而形式的激进与内容上的保守却构成了一对矛盾;这一现象在三十年代及之后的诗歌中表现的尤为突出。本文尝试以聂珍钊的脑文本概念为切入点破解这一矛盾。本文认为,要修正对摩尔三十年代诗歌的误读,首先必须理解引文对美国文化的建构意义,把握摩尔诗歌创作的杂糅性特质和去等级化策略。在此基础上回到三十年代探索美国文化身份的语境中重新审视摩尔诗歌。本文认为摩尔以其拼贴式的、杂糅的引文策略,从两个方面完成了对美国文化身份的书写。一方面摩尔通过美国地理图景的呈现,书写了以驳杂和多元为核心词的美国现实;另一方面则借助异域,包括异域动物,以道德品质主题之表,行定义美国文化之实。

关键词: 玛丽安·摩尔;脑文本;引文;杂糅性;文化身份

作者简介: 何庆机,文学博士,浙江工商大学外国语学院教授,主要研究方向为英美文学(杭州,310018)。本文为国家社会科学基金常规项目“玛丽安·摩尔诗歌全集翻译与研究”【项目批号:19BWW068】的阶段性成果。

Title: Brain Text, Quotation, and the Writing of American Cultural Identity in Marianne Moore's Poetry

Abstract: Marianne Moore is known for her bold formal innovation, yet the radical form of her poetry contradicts with the so-called conservative content, which is said to be particularly represented in her poetry of 1930s and thereafter. This paper tries to decode this contradiction and modify the misreading of her poetry under the lens of Nie Zhenzhao's conception of brain text. The paper holds that it is of absolute necessity in the first place to have a preliminary understanding of the constructive significance of quotation to American culture, and of hybrid and dehierarchal nature of Moore's poetry, which in turn becomes the starting point to return to the 30s' context of pursuing American cultural identity to reread Moore's poetry. This thesis then proposes that Moore, with her strategy of collage-like and hybrid

quotation, carries out her way of Americanness writing. Moore represents American reality with multiplicity as its core by presenting American landscape on the one hand, and attempts to define America by apparently discussing moral traits or quality through the image of exotic place and animals on the other.

Keywords: Marianne Moore; brain text; quotation; hybridity; cultural identity

Author: He Qingji, Ph.D. is Professor of English in the School of Foreign Languages at Zhejiang Gongshang University (Hangzhou 310018, China). His field of interest is British and American Literature (Email: willyhe66@163.com).

文学是与传统、历史不可分割的，也是一个民族、一种文化的传统和历史的一部分。现代主义诗歌出现之前，典故（allusion）是诗歌实现与传统互相勾连最主要的互文手段；而在现代主义诗歌中，引文（quotation）则取代典故成为最重要的手段。这在美国现代主义诗歌中尤为明显——庞德（Ezra Pound）、艾略特（T. S. Eliot）、威廉·卡洛斯·威廉斯（W. C. Williams）和玛丽安·摩尔（Marianne Moore）均在诗歌中大量使用引文。典故与引文的最大差异在于，后者与权威（authority）有着直接或间接的关系。英文中，言说之缘起者即作者（author），与“权威”一词同源。自古以来，能被他人作为“他人之言”而引用的，均为位重权高者或被认为掌握了真理者。自文艺复兴时期之后，尤其是随着小说的发展，引文开始进入文学创作中，成为文学中的一部分。典型的例子便是《唐·吉珂德》，其中大量引用了传奇文学中的文字。然而，引文却一直未能“合法”地进入诗歌创作中。在浪漫主义时期，诗歌中使用引文，是被明确禁止，被视为不耻的，以至于柯勒律治、华兹华斯只能“偷偷”地引用弥尔顿的诗句¹，因为浪漫主义诗人的独特自我以及诗歌的原创性（originality）被视为占主导地位的要害，“引文”作为“他人之言”自然无法在诗歌中获得合法的地位。然而，到了19世纪末、20世纪初，自我、真诚观念已经发生了变化，浪漫主义诗歌的真诚观已然失效，诗人的自我已经无法维系其作为意义来源的地位²。艾略特的非个人化诗学，实际上意味着诗歌的权威以及诗歌的意义来源，从个人的权威转向了艺术的权威，意味着诗歌的文本转向，也意味着传统的转向。由此，早已是文学一部分、文化一部分的引文，便成为现代主义诗人创新诗歌的重要手段。而对美国现代诗人来说，引文的意义还在于引文承载着他们对美国文化身份的思考。

作为“新大陆”，美国是个“文化资源”匮乏的国家。在欧洲浪漫主义诗人抵制传统，将传统、引文视为负担，美国的浪漫主义作家却要面对没有这种负担之负重。伊丽莎白·格利高里（Elizabeth Gregory）指出，缺乏本土的、

1 See Elizabeth Gregory, *Quotation and Modern American Poetry* (Houston: Rice UP, 1996) : 4-18.

2 关于自我、真诚观念的演变及其与诗歌的关系，参见拙文“诗歌的救赎：现代主义真诚与玛丽安摩尔的诗歌定义”，《外国文学研究》4（2015）：99-109。

原初(primary)的文化资源,意味着美国作家、诗人只能从他处获取、借用资源;这使得他们意识到美国文化的“文化附属性”(cultural secondariness),即“美国文化依赖于其他文化,尤其是欧洲文化”(20)。不过,在爱默生(R.W. Emerson)等超验主义者看来,文化附属性与其说是美国文化的特有属性,不如说是文化的共性。爱默生在“引文与原创性”(“Quotation and Originality”)一文中指出,“没有纯粹的原创性”,“所有人都引用”(qtd. in Gregory 18)。也就是说,文化附属性从一种文化负担转为文化资产,而引文则成为一种构建美国文化的策略。美国现代主义诗人将引文纳入诗歌中,显然也是一种文化策略,是以承认美国的文化附属性,承认对其他文化,尤其是欧洲文化的依赖性为潜文本。不过,在具体的诗歌创作实践,却走向了两个不同的方向,表现出对文化认同的不同态度。一个方向的代表诗人是艾略特,以认同、维系原创性与附属性的等级秩序为出发点,进而将自己的诗歌纳入整个西方(或者说欧洲)体系和传统中。另一个方向的代表诗人是威廉斯、玛丽安·摩尔,在否认旧的等级秩序的基础上,将文化附属性本身作为一种积极的、正面的元素。表面上看,摩尔引文的使用与艾略特等的旁征博引、引经据典类似;然而,也正是在引文的使用上,摩尔与艾略特表现出深刻的差异。这种差异,与她质疑各种等级秩序的立场(包括性别等级秩序)相吻合,具体体现在摩尔引文的杂糅性、跨界性和去等级化上。基尼·霍温(Jeanne Heuving)在研究摩尔诗歌的性属特质时认为摩尔的诗歌自三十年代开始便水准下降,“总体来说令人失望”,只是成为“价值观的正面肯定”(141)。这里的“价值观的正面肯定”是指摩尔有些诗(表面上)探讨的道德和文化品质。本文以聂珍钊的脑文本概念为切入点,探讨摩尔诗歌的引文策略,以期修正对摩尔诗歌尤其是三十年代后诗歌的误读。本文认为要做到这一点,首先要把握摩尔引文(及写作)的杂糅性和去等级化特质以及这一特质与摩尔女性声音的勾连,因为摩尔对美国文化身份的书写,不仅采用了同样的引文与写作策略,而且这一书写实际上潜藏着女性的声音。

一、脑文本、引文与摩尔的声音

自上世纪六十年代以来,“文本”(text)以及相关的“文本性”(textuality)、“互文性”(intertextuality)等术语,经罗兰·巴特(Roland Barthes)、茱莉亚·克利斯蒂娃(Juliet Kristeva)、雅各·德里达(Jacques Derrida)等学者的论述和发展,成为文学研究、文化批评等领域的重要概念和术语。“文本”作为“符号或能指的网络、系统或结构”(Greene 1426),是文学之所以为文学之依据和根本。聂珍钊通过研究口头文学的流传,提出脑文本(brain text)的概念,指出口头文学“同样是文本的流传,只不过这种文本与我们现在所熟悉的物质文本不同,是一种脑文本的流传”(“文学伦理学批评:口头文学与脑文本”11),并进而提出文本的三种形态,即“除了脑文本,还有书写文本和

电子（数字）文本”（“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”31）。这里的“书写文本”即指通常意义的文本概念。在阐述脑文本概念时，聂珍钊并未直接讨论互文性问题，不过互文问题实际上内嵌于脑文本概念之中。在论述脑文本与文学创作的关系时，聂珍钊指出，“作家在大脑中以脑文本和脑概念为材料，按照文学的伦理规则对保存在大脑中不同的脑文本和脑概念进行重新组合，编辑加工成新的脑文本，即文学脑文本，这就是文学的创作”（“文学伦理学批评与脑文本”167）。也就是说，作家编辑、处理的，既可以是现实的体验、感官印象形成的脑文本，也可以是文学记忆、文化记忆形成的脑文本，而后者即是通常意义的互文性。如果说，巴特的“作者之死”论断，不仅颠覆了传统意义的作者（author）的权威（authority），也释放了文本意义解读和生产的可能性；那么，聂珍钊的脑文本理论则将通过脑文本的编辑处理概念，抹平了传统意义的文学与文化的等级意识，而这些则早在摩尔的引文处理策略中呈现出来。

摩尔自1915年起便开始在诗歌中使用引文，具体为“致蒸汽压路机”（“To a Steam Roller”）、“勤勉之于魔术如进步之于飞行”（“Diligence Is To Magic As Progress Is To Flight”）、“过去就是现在”（“The Past Is The Present”）三首诗。此后，使用引文的诗歌数量呈不断增长之势。根据玛格丽特·郝丽（Margaret Holley）的统计，在卡莱尔时期（1915-1917，即至摩尔迁居纽约之前），摩尔一半的诗歌使用了引文，20年代至40年代，这一数字增长到三分之二，而50与60年代，则为四分之三¹。从1924年出版《观察集》（*Observations*）开始，摩尔用注释标注引文的出处。可以明确的是，摩尔使用引文本身肯定不是受艾略特的影响——布莱克墨尔（R. P. Blackmur）认为，实际上是庞德与艾略特受到摩尔的影响²。但1923年后摩尔诗歌发生的变化——引文数量的剧增、注释的使用，显然与1922年《荒原》的出版有着直接的关系，只不过这种相关性更主要是体现在两人的差异上。同样是使用引文，摩尔的诗歌之所以被称为拼贴诗，自然是因为诗人刻意借用绘画中的拼贴技巧，将直接引文非常“自然”地嵌于诗歌中“自己”的语句之中，俨然是向读者呈现一幅完整的拼贴画。然而，这一理解和解释，只是拼贴诗形式和技巧的表层，其深层或精髓则是杂糅性和异质性。摩尔诗歌的引文出处，摩尔借用的“材料”，如同拼贴画的材料一样，通常具有混杂的特点。摩尔将自己使用引文的诗歌创作方式称为“杂糅的构筑方式”（“hybrid method of composition”）（Stapleton 49），其中涵盖的意义也与此相近。摩尔借用艾略特之法，将出处注出，但表面之间却突显了她与艾略特（以及庞德）在引文上的本质不同，表现出一种“散

1 See Margaret Holley, *The Poetry of Marianne Moore: A Study in Voice and Value* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987).

2 See Charles Tomlinson (ed.), *Marianne Moore: A Collection of Critical Essays* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc., 1969): 66-86.

漫诗学”（disjunctive poetics）的特征（Gregory and Hubbard 7）。

首先，艾略特与庞德的引文，几乎都来自经典之作，而又以欧洲经典为主，且语言多样；而摩尔的引文，则几乎全是英文，且以非经典甚至非文学作品为主——报刊、广告、宣传册、私人信函，甚至日常会话。在这一点上，威廉斯与摩尔有共同之处。这显然隐含了对“权威”的不同理解和对等级秩序的不同态度。其次，艾略特的引文，往往具有相对的完整性，既保持了原文的完整意义、原文的“权威”，又由引文的互文性而使诗本身纳入文学传统中，诗歌的意义得以升华。而摩尔的引文策略，可看作对“引文作为权威”的反语；摩尔的引文通常是碎片式的，被切分、嵌入诗歌中，脱离了诗本身，引文则无法独立生发意义。第三，引文被置入引号内，便意味着对意义“权威”、对原作者的认可与尊重；不过，摩尔有时却更改直接引文的措词，或将自己的言论置入引号内，或一字不落地引用却省去了引号¹。这种戏仿似的引文，总体上可看作摩尔以权威被认可的方式，认可自己的权威。

摩尔引文的杂糅性和非经典性，自使用引文之初便表现出来；如第一首使用引文的诗“致蒸汽压路机”引用了当时的美国音乐评论家劳伦斯·吉尔曼（Lawrence Gilman），第二首“勤勉之于魔术如进步之于飞行”则引用了一首摇篮曲。在使用引文之初，摩尔便表现出对“引文作为权威”的质疑以及对这种权威的“操控”。“过去就是现在”引用了一位教师上圣经课时说的话——“‘希伯来诗歌是 / 一种能净化心灵的散文’”（Moore 88）²。口头语的引用，本身权威性就与经典文献的引用不可同日而语，更不用说发表此言论的只是一位普通教师；让这种权威性更受质疑的是，在引用前“我”如此说道：“我想重复了他的话，/ 一五一十，一字不落”。这里，“我想”（“I think”）意味着“我”并不确定；“我想”实际上是对“一五一十，一字不落”的自我怀疑。不过，摩尔真正将引文作为意义的生成形式，作为消解并建构权威（意义与“真理”）的手段并将这一手段发挥至极的，是在艾略特出版《荒原》之后。“诗歌”（“Poetry”）一诗的引文及版本史可作为一个典型的例子。

该诗在两处引用了托尔斯泰和叶芝的观点或论述。摩尔引用托尔斯泰，却意指相反的方向：托尔斯泰认为除了“公务文件以及 / 教科书”外（Moore 267），其他都可入诗，而摩尔认为这两者也可以作为诗歌的“材料”，进一步消解了诗与散文的区别。在引用叶芝时，摩尔则将原文的“‘过于忠实于想象的写实主义者’”（“too literal realist of imagination”）修改为“‘想象的直译主义者’”（“literalists of the imagination”）（267-68），引用叶芝的“原话”却同时通过悄悄的小修改否认他的观点。不过“诗歌”1919年初版

1 See Cristanne Miller, *Marianne Moore: Questions of Authority* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995) 177-78.

2 本文所引诗歌均出自 Marianne Moore, *The Complete Poems of Marianne Moore* (New York: The Macmillan Company and The Viking Press, 1981)，译文为笔者自译，后文将不再一一加注。

时，由于没有注释，这些修改、变动以及由此产生的意义便无法体现出来。1924年摩尔出版《观察集》，给收录其中的“诗歌”增加了注释；由此，引文与注释才真正成为诗歌的一部分，参与意义生产，参与对权威的消解与建构。1967年，摩尔出版《诗全集》时，将“诗歌”大刀阔斧削减到三行，不过将完整版及原注释作为注释，编入诗集中。在注释版中的完整版中，摩尔又悄悄地做了一个小修改——给“有真实蟾蜍的虚构花园”加了一个引号（但并未注释引文出处）（267），变成了引文，使之由原来的诗人自己的声音，变成了具有权威性的他人之言。

就这样，摩尔表面上采用了与艾略特类似的引文加注释的形式，将两人的差异巧妙地掩盖起来。在摩尔的诗歌中，杂糅的引文构成了多重的异质性声音，与摩尔自己的声音相互交织在一起，形成一种张力。玛格丽特·郝丽认为从摩尔对引文的使用，可以看出“摩尔将其诗歌作为一种合作，作为一个多重声音的共同体（community of voices）”（Holley 115）。的确如此；不过需要补充的是，读者需仔细聆听才能分辨出与“别人的声音”交织在一起的诗人自己的声音，如“诗歌”一诗所示。而正如聂珍钊所言，在文学文本中，作者的沉默并非真正的失语，“文学文本中的沉默省略了大量的叙述，但是沉默之中的脑文本是仍然存在的”（“文学伦理学批评与脑文本” 172）。艾略特的《荒原》出版后，摩尔不仅巧妙地借用了注释手法，还刻意增加了引文在诗中的比例，但其结果则是凸显了两人的同中之异。在这类诗中，最典型的是“沉默”（“Silence”）、“章鱼”（“An Octopus”）和“婚姻”（“Marriage”）。“沉默”是其中最短的一首，也是引文比例最高的一首；全诗14行，“父亲”的引文便占12行半——“我父亲以前说，/‘卓越的人从不长久驻留，/从不被人带去朗费罗的墓地/或去看哈佛的玻璃花。/就像猫一样自立——/把战利品拿到无人处，/老鼠尾巴就像鞋带一样耷拉嘴角——/他们有时喜欢独处，/让他们开心的话可以/让他们一言不发。/最深沉的感情总是在沉默中显露自己；/不是沉默中，是在节制中。’/他也满心诚意地说，‘把我家当作你的客栈吧。’/客栈不是住所”（Moore 91）。

根据摩尔提供的注释，这首诗的“原材料”是诗人听到一位女士说的话——或者说，整首诗都是引文。因此，虽然诗歌中未出现诗人本人的言语或评论，此处“父亲”的引文，实际上是“引文的引文”；而诗人的观点则在引文之中，也在引文之外。表面上，父亲以自己作为一个卓越的美国人而自豪，并希望女儿具有这些品质：“自立”、“克制”。然而，父亲引文比例的“无节制”却将父亲-女儿、男性-女性的权力关系暴露无遗。在这种权力关系下，作为具有“权威”的父亲-男性，希望女儿-女性能够保持沉默，像那只猫一样，“让他们开心的话可以/让他们一言不发”，能够满足于“‘把我家当作你的客栈’”。对此，女儿非常“节制”地只回应了一句“客栈不是住所”。诗歌没有说“客栈不是家”，而是用“residence”一词；从居住这一行为来看，“residence”指

长久甚至永久居住，正好与客栈只是短暂居住相对应。女儿的回答，说明了即便是住在父亲的房子里，“她也不会或不可能‘生活’其中，不管是精神上的还是物质上的”（Miller 187）。诗歌的标题是“沉默”，但沉默的不是父亲，也不是“克制”的女儿；沉默的是诗人——诗人只是客观地引用父女间的对话，但诗人的沉默通过女儿的克制，通过悄悄的“客栈不是住所”却成为掷地有声的沉默，成为大声地沉默。而在“婚姻”一诗中，“沉默”的摩尔通过大量的“他人之言”（出处驳杂的引文），借助夏娃之言，表达了对男权思想和等级观念的批评。可以说，“婚姻”与“沉默”是摩尔诗歌中女性思想最明确最清晰的。1935年摩尔《诗选》出版时，将“沉默”编为最后一首诗。对此，查尔斯·阿尔提瑞尔（Charles Altieri）认为如此编撰的目的，旨在暗示“诗集中的每首诗既指向对女性力量的确认，又被这一力量修正”（Altieri 269）。

二、驳杂与多元：地理图景与美国现实

如前文所言，作为依赖欧洲文化、文化资源匮乏的国家，美国的文化独立性一直是美国思想家、作家、诗人思考的问题，而威廉斯则最明确致力于建构美国风格（American idiom）的现代主义诗人。威廉斯的“敌人”则是以艾略特为代表的欧洲文化中心主义者。1922年《荒原》刊登于《日晷》，取得了巨大成功，但对威廉斯来说，却是爆炸性的打击——“如同投下的一颗炸弹，毁灭了我们的世界，把我们向未知领域所进行的种种勇敢探索炸得粉碎”（张子清 127）。威廉斯似乎感到了深深的孤独感，不过他的孤独感却基于误判的基础上——摩尔同样致力于美国文化身份的思索和探讨，只不过如同其诗歌中的女性声音一样，摩尔从不那么直接。实际上，美国社会对美国文化独立与自觉的努力从未停止过，并因艾略特的《荒原》，在二十年代激发了人们“对美国本土文化的呼唤”（Molesworth 263）¹。

摩尔三十年代的诗歌延续了绘画艺术影响下的观念和观看方式，延续了摩尔独特的引文方式和引文策略。从诗歌内容来看，这一时期的诗歌可分为两大类，一类以地理与文化关系为主题，如“弗吉尼亚·不列颠”（“Virginia Britannia”），“高空作业工”（“Steeple Jack”）等。另一类即动物诗，如“蛇怪蜥蜴”（“Plumet Basilisk”），“穿山甲”（“The Pangolin”）等；不过这些动物诗的主题实则是自然与文化的关系，并进而探讨美国的文化属性问题。这些诗歌虽然不再限于女性问题、艺术本质问题等的探讨，不过内嵌于摩尔引文策略中的女性性属特质却延续着——游离的视线（流动性）、杂糅化与碎片化（反整体性）以及去等级化。琳达·丽维尔（Linda Leavell）认为，摩尔的诗歌形式创新是对当时审美语境的回应，“反映出她对审美、社会乃至

1 See also Linda Leavell, *Marianne Moore and the Visual Arts* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1995): 169-73.

精神等级秩序的强烈抵制”（8）。

摩尔 1925 年任《日晷》主编，诗歌创作搁笔了七年；再次发表诗歌是 1932 年的“小说的一部分，诗歌的一部分，戏剧的一部分”（“Part of a Novel, Part of a Poem, Part of a Play”），该诗后被分为三首不同的诗歌——“高空作业工”、“英雄”（“The Hero”）、“学生”（“The Student”）。这三首诗的合与分都有一定道理。合之理在于三首诗都探讨一个问题——美国文化问题；分之理在于虽然三首诗都以人为标题，但第一首诗实际上是地理描写诗，呈现的是典型美国海边小镇图景。摩尔在诗中常借地理之名，行探美国文化之实。而这类诗歌又可再分为两类：第一类呈现的是美国现实的、本土的地理，如“章鱼”、“人们的环境”（“People’s Surrounding”）、“纽约”（“New York”）以及“高空作业工”。第二类是时空上的他域地理，并以此关照美国的文化属性，如“英格兰”（“England”）、“弗吉尼亚·不列颠”、“斯宾塞的爱尔兰”（“Spenser’s Ireland”）等。

虽然都属于现实地理图景诗，但所列四首诗却特点或内涵迥异。“人们的环境”共七节变换着六个不同的有景无人、一掠而过的场景，其中两个与美国相关，即第三节体现美国式效率和功利至上的综合体和第五节地域广袤美国西部。“纽约”一诗呈现了作为商业中心的都市场景，不过却很少“描绘”的笔触。“章鱼”则是对位于西雅图的雷尼尔雪山（Mt. Rainier）的全视角观测与描绘。所谓全视角是指诗人似乎从各个不同的视角，对雪山不断重复呈现。与这种多视角相应的是引文数量多且驳杂；全诗共有 50 多个直接引文（还不计入未加标点符号的，“偷来”的引文），出处以雷尼尔山旅游宣传册为主，加上经典作家如亨利·詹姆斯（Henry James）、约翰·罗斯金（John Ruskin）、艾默生等。由此呈现的美国地理图景与艾略特的荒原图景形成对比——从风格上、意蕴上、文化渊源上等等。摩尔在此诗中，通过转喻的方式以雷尼尔雪山指称美国；诗歌结尾处写道：“完美无瑕，干脆利落！完美无瑕，干脆利落！/ 因获取事实的能力 / 无情的准确是这条章鱼的本色”（Moore 76）。在这里，章鱼指代雷尼尔山，也指代美国；摩尔显然意在指出美国的文化品质便是如章鱼一般，具有精确地“吸附”事实的能力。

从表面形式上看，“高空作业工”与“章鱼”没有类似之处——后者是由引文碎片构成的自由体诗，前者是没有一处引文的音节诗。不过，找到这两首诗的共同点并非难事——同为具体地理场景描绘诗，同样使用了转喻手法，同样以具体地理图景的描绘，呈现一种美国现实。还有一处比较隐蔽的共同点，即上文所引的“无情的准确”。“高空作业工”的第一句为“丢勒肯定会找到生活在这样 / 一个小镇的理由……”（Moore 5）。丢勒的画注重局部细节处理，力求精确刻画，同时往往通过日常生活背景的描绘，展示启示录式的图景。摩尔的诗歌秉持精确美学原则，同样注意具体的、局部的细节；这或许可以解释为什么摩尔在此诗中没有使用其标志性的直接引文。摩尔似

乎试图完全依靠自己的“权威”，以文字为读者呈现一幅完整的、不被其他声音打断的、丢勒式的风景画；当然，这幅风景是美国式小城镇、美国式日常生活。全诗共 13 节；开头三节写道：

丢勒肯定会找到生活在这样
一个小镇的理由，可以观赏
八尾搁浅的鲸鱼；碧空蓝天的时候，清新
的海风飘进屋内，海面
微波漾漾井然有序就像
排排鱼鳞。

三两成群，一群接一群，海鸥
不停地来回飞翔于镇上的钟，
或者展开翅膀绕着灯塔航行，翅膀保持不动——
轻轻地微震一下身体
便缓缓上升——或者
飞聚鸣叫

于海面，似孔雀颈上的紫色
褪成了绿蓝色，就像丢勒
将蒂罗尔的松树绿改成了孔雀蓝和几内亚
灰。你可以看到二十五磅
的龙虾；还有要晾干的渔网
摆挂齐整。（Moore 5）

摩尔以音节诗节特有形式——诗行排列犬牙交错，各诗节精确复制，勾勒出一幅线条清晰的渔镇图——静谧、有序、生气盎然；画面中的一切似乎都那么确定、可控——八尾搁浅的鲸鱼、二十五磅的龙虾、鳞波荡漾的海面、摆放齐整的渔网……。不过，不确定性却孕育、交织于确定性之中，海水颜色的变化即是预兆（“似孔雀颈上的紫色 / 褪成了绿蓝色”）。从句式来看，英文原诗中预兆变化的分句与描写海鸥的分句是完整的一句话：“the seagulls keep flying.....or flock mewing where a sea the purple of the peacock’s neck is paled to greenish azures as Durer”在紧接下来的第四节，便狂风大作“打弯了 / 盐沼草，惊扰了天上的星星还有 / 塔尖上的星星；能看到如此多的混乱 / 是一种福分……”（Moore 5）。诗中“混乱”的英文用的是“confusion”，而不是“disorder”或“chaos”；从诗歌文本和语境来看，这里的“confusion”是指平静与狂风、有序与无序交织相伴的状态。之所以是“福分”，应该是指

诗中的“你”能有幸得到启示。诗歌最后一节写道：

生活这样的小镇不可能
有什么危险，民风淳朴，
高空作业工在教堂旁放置了危险提示牌
而他在刷新那个坚挺结实
指向天空的星星，矗于塔尖，
代表希望。（Moore 7）

摩尔在诗歌的中间几节，通过细节的展示，将这个似乎“没有什么危险”、指向希望的普通美国小镇具体呈现给读者。在这个小镇，教堂是小镇的中心，为各色人、物提供“适宜的庇护之地”（“fit haven”），有“流浪汉，儿童，动物，犯人”，还有“那些总统们，回报那些原罪驱使的参议员的方式，/ 是对他们置之不理”（Moore 7）。在这个小镇，有“一间校舍”、“商店内设的邮局”、“渔场”、“鸡场”等等。在这个“五脏俱全”的小镇，鲜明的特点显然是驳杂与多元：这里展示的是人的多元——多元而居于这适宜之地。摩尔用另一句话重复表达了这样的观点：“英雄，学生，/ 高空作业工，以各自的方式/ 各得其所”（Moore 7）。不过，需要注意的是，“总统们”和“原罪驱使的参议员”在小镇中显然不是现实的存在；但摩尔正是通过这句看似与整体画面格格不入的句子，将美国历史、文化的潜文本嵌入诗中，将这个小镇定格为美国小镇。

在诗中，摩尔以驳杂和多元为核心词，将读者带进小镇，观看小镇；而这个词亦即“confusion”的另一层意义。这种多元的特质，除了表现在各色人之外，还表现在“物”上。摩尔同样以罗列的模式，毫不简洁地、“无序”地将这种多元与驳杂展示出来：在这个小镇上，可以看到各种植物花草——“香蒲，菖蒲，蓝莓和紫露草，/ 条纹草，苔藓，太阳花，紫苑，雏菊——/……矮牵牛花，蕨；粉红百合，蓝色/ 百合，虎皮百合……”（Moore 6）；同时，这种多元性，还表现在独特性，表现在与其他地域、其他文化的不同上。诗中写道，“这里他们用猫，而不是眼镜蛇/ 捕杀老鼠”（Moore 6）；而那位大学生则“带上非母语书籍”（Moore 6）。摩尔似乎觉得在此诗未能对独特性充分展示，在“学生”一诗中，以学生、知识为范例，进一步比较美国与欧洲国家的差异——“学生自愿/ 自觉学习，不愿放弃/ 独立性”（Moore 101）。

这便是摩尔通过地理图景，呈现出来的美国现实，一个确定性与不确定性相伴、多元而又独特的现实。如果仅仅读最后一节，或者仅仅停留在其表面，一个明显的误读便是这些小镇（进而美国）是个世外桃源，因为“生活这样的小镇不可能/ 有什么危险”，而且充满了希望。不过，就像小镇上的宁

静随时被大风惊扰,阅读摩尔的“危险”也随时存在。显然,危险不会因为这位或那位高空作业工竖起一个提示牌而消失,而使得“小镇不可能/有什么危险”——这个牌子反而成为了这句话的自我否定和自我嘲讽。实际上,摩尔在诗中真正的意图,是告诉读者危险是现实的一部分——大风、犯人、原罪驱动的人等等。最重要的认识到这一现实(标识牌),同时还保持着希望和信念;而这种希望和信念不是虚无缥缈的、先验的(“天上的星星”),而是具体的、根植于此地的(“塔尖上的星星”)。

三、异域与“定义”美国

威廉斯的《春天及其他》(*Spring and All*)和《美国性情》(*In the American Grain*)是诗人在二十年代对艾略特的直接回应,代表着对本土文化的呼唤。摩尔的“章鱼”于1924年发表;该诗被称为摩尔的《荒原》,毋宁说这是摩尔式诗歌版的《美国性情》。担任《日晷》主编后,摩尔则通过编辑评语的形式,关注美国文化特质和文化身份和问题,而这种关注不是如霍温所说的简单的积极肯定或道德说教。摩尔1934年发表的文章“典型的美国人亨利·詹姆斯”(“Henry James as a Characteristic American”),与《美国性情》一样,乃“定义美国”的一种努力,同时也可作为摩尔三十年代诗歌创作的重要脚注。

如前文分析,《高空作业工》呈现的美国图景,是一个具体的美国现实——混杂的、多元的、去除了严格等级秩序的美国现实。不过,需要修正的是,这首诗“没有一处引文”的说法并不完全正确,因为诗歌最初发表时只是“小说的一部分,诗歌的一部分,戏剧的一部分”的第一部分,而第二、三部分(“英雄”、“学生”)都是使用了引文的音节诗。第一部分作为不借助他人之言的地理图景,与后两部分构成了一个完整的整体,构成了“美国的一部分”的图景,并以提喻的方式定义美国。研究摩尔时,诗歌选择方面会遇到的两个问题。一个是诗歌的版本问题:摩尔喜欢修改已发表的诗歌,选入诗集的常有不同于最初发表的诗歌的现象。这一修改的习惯,即是对作为权威的“作者”观念的肯定,同时也是否定——修改即是对之前版本的否定,而有权修改又是一种对自己的权威的肯定;对“权威”的这一双重态度也反映在摩尔对引文的使用上。另一个问题则是诗歌在《诗集》的编排问题——打乱了诗歌发表的时序;如需梳理、研究摩尔诗歌创作的发展变化,则必须参考其他资料,将时序重新调整过来。1935年出版的《诗选》,未按诗歌发表的时序,而是根据难易程度,将难懂的诗排在诗集的前面。不过,问题是排在第一首的“高空作业工”既非最典型的摩尔诗歌,也非最难懂的。从典型性来说,这首诗是最典型、最直接呈现美国现实、美国图景的诗。摩尔在1967年编辑《诗全集》时,保留了《诗选》的完整性,并将“学生”一诗编入之后的《何年》(*What Are Years*)集子中。这足以说明“定义”美国对于摩尔的重要性;这

与二十、三十年代摩尔诗歌创作时的历史文化背景，以及摩尔二十年代担任《日晷》主编的经历一样，都应该成为我们审视摩尔诗歌、尤其是 30 年代及之后的诗歌必须考量的要素。

实际上，“定义”美国是摩尔三十年代诗歌的重要主题。除了前文提到的“高空作业工”等三首诗外，此间其余诗歌都可归入“异域”诗歌之列，其中便包括上文提及的“他域地理”诗歌以及动物诗。早在“章鱼”一诗中，摩尔便以提喻的方式，将美国的文化特质定义为“多样性”（诗中用的词是“diversity”）——“大雪山是各种生物之家”（“home of a diversity of creature”）（Moore 73），“只有这里才有对各种动物同样重要的优点 / 熊，麋鹿，梅花鹿，狼，山羊，鸭子等等”（Moore 73）。对于具有“无情的准确”的天性以及“捕获事实的能力”的“章鱼”来说，传统的语汇和预设的观念（preconception）显得苍白无力，诗中写道：“可以用‘树’来指称这些 / ‘像松树一样趴在地上的东西吗’？”（Moore 75）定义这种独特的树如此，定义美国亦然。因此，摩尔在另外几首诗中（“英格兰”、“斯宾塞的爱尔兰”、“鲸鱼里逗留”[“Sojourn in the Whale”]），借助他域，通过与其他国家的比较，以“拒绝定义美国的方式定义美国”，或者说“重新定义”美国（Leavell 183）。

诗歌“英格兰”并非以英格兰为主题的诗歌，如此冠名只是因为“英格兰”是诗的第一个词。在这首诗中，摩尔在比较了英国、意大利、法国、东方等国或地区后，将美国，这个曾经“没有草皮，没有源流，没有语言的国家”，定义为“书信用 / 浅显美语，猫狗都懂”。这个国家吸纳了其他不同国家的美德——“中国升华的智慧，埃及人的洞察力，/ 浓缩在希伯来语动词中 / 强烈深厚的情感”（Moore 46-47）。与“英格兰”及其他几首诗不同的是，“弗吉尼亚·不列颠”通过历史他域，通过弗吉尼亚（美国）“优美的地理风景与丑陋的殖民史之间的对比”（Miller 151），探讨宗主国及文化与殖民地及文化的权力关系问题，并借助美国的蓄奴问题质疑西方传统的二元对立话语，以及白人、欧洲文化中心主义者的虚伪。这些标榜“解放”（liberty）的殖民者，“在获取我们欲取之物时 / 或者说在殖民之时”，新共和的第一面旗帜上写着“‘不要践踏我’”；不过他们却践踏着黑人，在蓄奴制中“将黑鬼当作 / 大概可用的合作者”，然而这些“黑鬼”也最终成为“暴君的最佳敌人”（Moore 109-110）。

在 1926 年发表于《日晷》的一篇评论中，摩尔将 20 世纪概括为一个“好奇的，散漫的，不连贯的”世纪（“of curiosity, of excursiveness and discursiveness”）（Martin 55），而摩尔诗歌的形式特征也恰好与她理解的社会、文化特征相对应——奇妙的异域形象，新奇的诗行排列（音节诗节），散文文化而非诗化的语言，碎片式的引文，游离的视线等等。这也是摩尔不同于其他现代主义诗人之处——不是去控制碎片化和无序，而是赋予多元性、异质性和差异性“合法”地位。摩尔诗歌的题材选择上也体现了这一点。摩尔

三十年代的异域诗歌除“九个油桃和其他瓷器”（“Nine Nectarines and Other Porcelain”）等几首外，都属于“动物诗”，且均为异域动物。这些动物通常不入诗歌、没有一般意义的诗意，如“跳鼠”（“Jerboa”）将读者带到了黑非洲；而在“怪蛇蜥蜴”（“The Plumet Basilisk”）中，摩尔将哥斯达黎加的怪蛇蜥蜴比作“水陆两栖下落的龙”（Moore 20），视线也不停地转换游离——从哥斯达黎加，到马来、哥本哈根。摩尔以异域动物为题材，一方面与她理解的“好奇的”时代特征相吻合，另一方面则因为以异域动物为题材，无需剔除附着于事物、词语之上的旧文化符号，便于呈现事物本身。而这也是以一种隐蔽的、潜在的方式摆脱欧洲传统的影响，同时展示美国文化的独立性和多元性特征；如“怪蛇蜥蜴”所言，“我们有我们的两栖蜥蜴，他们/有他们的马来龙”（Moore 20）。

可以说，摩尔三十年代的诗歌，集中讨论美国文化问题，在当时的社会文化语境中，是一种伦理责任，也是一种策略——在那种具体语境中，摩尔那种难懂的、复杂的诗歌，更易被理解、被接受。对摩尔如此，对威廉斯及其他诗人、作家、学者来说亦然。不过，脱离了这种语境，这种探讨也具有危险性：一来被误解为以诗说教，二来诗歌的多重意义易被忽略。例如，伯纳德·恩格尔（Bernard F. Engel）等学者便称摩尔为道德主义者，“希望提倡一系列的价值观念……勇气，独立，责任，真诚……”（Engel 1）。作为摩尔典型的异域动物诗，“穿山甲”的表层的确是在“提倡”某些品质——优雅、勇气等；然而不论是从形式还是从内容来看，其意义远不止于此。全诗共9节，按内容可分为三部分——第1至3节是穿山甲的具体描绘，第4到8节围绕着“优雅”及对此的混杂认识，比较穿山甲、机器与人类，最后一节聚焦于人的“定义”。诗中涉及道德品质话题，是摩尔理解的美国价值观念，如“勇气”——“忍受着夜间陌生之地咄咄逼人的孤独旅行”（Moore 118）、“他不怕任何事情”，如“自制”——“不挑衅不好斗”（119），如“毅力”——“在逆境、困境中变得优雅起来”（119），如“优雅”——诗中“优雅”一词重复出现了7次。不过，这种重复并不意味着摩尔在简单地提倡某一品质，而是如玛格丽特·郝丽所言，通过比较穿山甲、机器、人，探讨“这些品质的本质与可能性”，“不是明确的提倡而是质疑与探寻”（Holley 102）。然而，在这种探寻之外，我们更需注意的是摩尔通过诗歌形式传递的意义，以及摩尔借助这种探寻、通过探寻过程的细微处，所传递的审美观念，或者说道德与审美的统一观。

从形式特点来看，这首典型的音节诗，每节在音节数和排列形式上基本达到了精确重复的效果；这种精确重复使得诗歌构成了形式上的整体感，如同摩尔对穿山甲的形体描述一样：“叠加鳞片如椎体漂亮有序规则齐整/不间断……”（Moore 117）。然而，这种整体感和不间断感又被一种语言、句式的间断所打断，给人一种断裂感。诗歌除了第三节和第八、九节以完整句

子结尾外，其余 6 节的句式均跨越了两节才构成一个完整的句子。这种句式的使用方法，给人一种既连续又断裂的效果。连续，是因为句子延伸到了下一节，两节由一个句式串接起来；断裂，是因为一个完整的句子被两节之间的空行生硬地、必然地、习惯性地中断、隔开了。句法上的另一个特点，是一个完整的句子中，插入修饰性的短句、短语，构成了句式的碎片化现象。这种断裂与连续以及碎片化，与摩尔理解的社会结构特点（不连贯，如前）形成一种对位关系。第四到第八节，是穿山甲、机器、人的比较，而且这种比较相对混杂交错，呈现并置的态势；这既给人一种混杂感，又颠覆了人、动物、机器的等级秩序，人与自然、人与机器的二元对立。在诗歌中，摩尔也直接表达了形式特点蕴含的意义（直译）：“太阳和月亮和白天和黑夜和人和牲畜 / 都各有卓越之处 / 人不能顽固不化，视而 / 不见；各有各的出色之处！”（Moore 118）根据摩尔的诗后注释，这首诗的“材料”主要取自科普读物《自然史》（*Natural History*），语言特点全然不同于传统的诗化语言。这首诗只有三处直接引文，而这些引文均不源自西方经典。语言上的这两个特点与前述的句式特点一样，消解了传统的等级秩序和清晰的边界划分——散文与诗歌、经典与通俗等等。

从某种程度上说，霍温、恩格尔等学者对摩尔诗歌的“道德”解读不无道理，因为不可否认“穿山甲”及摩尔其他类似的诗歌，在内容上的确涉及道德、品质等话题；但作为语言与形式的艺术，诗歌绝不能被简约化为通过形式传递信息般的内容。深受摩尔影响的纽约派诗人约翰·阿什伯里（John Ashbery）曾告诫读者对摩尔的诗歌切勿简单化，因为“摩尔不是古董式的道德说教者，其诗歌同时从多层面切入，构成了交响乐般的文本”（Molesworth 443）。阿多诺认为，形式和内容是一种辩证关系，形式绝非封闭而自足的，而是具体的、历史的；形式创新“标志着与旧文化的决裂”（Joyce 59），“（现代作品的）构成因素和形式语言必须自发地回应客观情境”（Adorno 33）。这意味形式创新不仅是一种伦理责任，同时还与社会、历史、政治、文化、伦理等因素交织在一起。因此，当我们回到摩尔诗歌形式创新（此文专指引文）的语境中，回到创作这些诗歌时包括摩尔在内的学者、诗人对美国性的追寻语境中，我们不仅可以更好地理解摩尔诗歌形式的特质，进而使得形式本身得以参与意义的生产过程，挖掘出摩尔悄悄地隐藏于文本之中、文本之外的意蕴——就本文讨论的诗歌而言，即指诗人对美国文化身份的书写。

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Aesthetic Theory*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1997.
- Altieri, Charles. *Painterly Abstraction in Modernist American Poetry: The Contemporaneity of Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

- Engel, Bernard. F. *Marianne Moore*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1964.
- Greene, Roland, et al (eds). *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry and Poetics*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012.
- Gregory, Elizabeth. *Quotation and Modern American Poetry*. Houston: Rice UP, 1996.
- Gregory, Elizabeth and Stacy Carson Hubbard (eds). *Twenty-First Century Marianne Moore: Essays from a Critical Renaissance*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- Heuving, Jeanne. *Gender in the Art of Marianne Moore: Omissions Are Not Accidents*. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1992.
- Holley, Margaret. *The Poetry of Marianne Moore: A Study in Voice and Value*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1987.
- Joyce, W. Elizabeth. *Cultural Critique and Abstraction: Marianne Moore and the Avant-garde*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1998.
- Leavell, Linda. *Marianne Moore and the Visual Arts*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1995.
- Martin, Taffy. *Marianne Moore: Subversive Modernist*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1986.
- Miller, Cristanne. *Marianne Moore: Questions of Authority*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1995.
- Molesworth, Charles. *Marianne Moore: A Literary Life*. New York: Atheneum, 1990.
- Moore, Marianne. *The Complete Poems of Marianne Moore*. New York: The Macmillan Company and The Viking Press, 1981.
- 聂珍钊: “文学伦理学批评: 口头文学与脑文本”, 《外国文学研究》6 (2013): 8-15。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Oral Literature and Brain Text.” *Foreign Literature Studies* (6) 2013: 8-15.]
- “脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”, 《外国文学研究》(5) 2017: 26-34。
- [—, “The Forming Mechanism of Brain Text and Brain Concept in Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Foreign Literature Studies* (5) 2017: 26-34.]
- 聂珍钊, 王永: “文学伦理学批评与脑文本: 聂珍钊与王永的学术对话”, 《外国文学》(4) 2019: 166-75。
- [Nie Zhenzhao, Wang Yong. “Ethical Literary Criticism and the Brain Text: Academic Dialogue Between Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Yong.” *Foreign Literature* (4) 2019: 166-75.]
- Stapleton, Laurence. *Marianne Moore: The Poet's Advance*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1978.
- 张子清: 《二十世纪美国诗歌史》。吉林: 吉林教育出版社, 1995 年版。
- [Zhang Ziqing. *A History of 20th Century American Poetry*. Jilin: Jilin Education Press, 1995.]

基督教公共阐释与社会改良：马丁·路德的身份与选择研究

Christian Public Interpretation and Socio-Religion Reformism: Martin Luther's Choice of Ethical Identity

陈开举（Chen Kaiju）

内容摘要：马丁·路德以其《九十五条论纲》开启了颠覆性的宗教改革运动。他以大量的宗教研究、基督教基本理念阐释、《圣经》德文翻译等文献不可逆转地改变了基督教公共阐释的格局，他领导的宗教改革运动顺带不可逆地推进了社会其它诸多领域的变革。马丁·路德的杰出贡献与他的伦理身份选择是密不可分的：以对基督教的虔诚信仰为他的宗教批评备注了在场的专业合法性，以对信众的大爱扛起了人文主义的大旗；以严谨的学风令人信服地揭露教皇教会的腐败、欺骗和伪善，以笃实的研究全面深入地阐释了基督教的宏观、微观一系列基础理论，他对基督教的阐释也成为新的公共阐释；他的宗教改革推动了社会的改良，但他反对暴力革命等激进的社会变革手段。他对基督教至真至诚的信仰、对信众的大爱和社会发展应当以和平改良的方式进行的伦理原则既反映了社会历史条件的规定性，也充分体现了他主观上的抉择。

关键词：宗教改革运动；宗教阐释；不可逆性；社会改良主义；伦理身份选择

作者简介：陈开举（1969—），博士，教授，博士生导师，广东外语外贸大学阐释学研究院常务副院长。研究领域：文化研究、文化哲学、阐释学、翻译。

Title: Christian Public Interpretation and Socio-Religion Reformism: Martin Luther's Choice of Ethical Identity

Abstract: With the publication of *The Ninety-Five Theses*, Martin Luther initiated the Reformation. With abundant contribution shown in his literature concerning religious studies, fundamentals of Christianity, and the German translation of Bible, he led the irreversibly subversive Reformation, ushering in a series of other reforms in social life. Martin Luther's ethical choices are indispensable to his above-mentioned eminent contribution: piety in Christianity endorsed his profound critiques and reforms, sincere love to the Christians underpinned his

deep humanism, and meticulous studies and deep devotion to religious research and reform brought about profound critique on Christianity. His own religious interpretation rose to the status of public interpretation. His religion-reformation laid emphasis on moderate social reform in the spheres of thoughts and beliefs, objecting to radical social uprisings or revolutions in other social life. His ethical choices resulted from both the objective socio-historical conditions and his own subjective determination. Applying theories of philosophy of culture, hermeneutics, and ethical identity, the special focus of this essay is on his ethical choices, which led to his outstanding contribution to the reform in Christianity and the progress of the society.

Keywords: the Reformation; right of religious interpretation; irreversibility; socio-reformism; choice of ethical identity

Author: Chen Kaiju (1969–), PhD in cultural studies, is Professor of English Language and Culture, PhD supervisor, Executive Vice-President of Institute of Hermeneutics, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (Guangzhou, 510420, China). His major research interest includes cultural studies, philosophy of culture, hermeneutics and translation (Email: 200010931@oamail.gdufs.edu.cn).

历史在相当程度上是由一批批为了人类生存与发展做出突出贡献的人们汇成的星河，他们要么在远古时代率领先民勇敢地面对自然挑战，因为其创世壮举为后人尊为神灵，要么在古代引领民众夺取部族间重大冲突的胜利而被后人奉为民族英雄，更有一批解蔽祛魅的思想启蒙先行者，用革命性的思想知识点亮人类心灵之烛而被后人立为圣贤——马丁·路德无疑是这类启蒙者中最耀眼的星宿之一。2005年11月28日，由德国电视二台举办的“最伟大的德国人”评选活动中，马丁·路德名列第二位（仅次于康拉德·阿登纳）；2017年，在马丁·路德宗教改革500周年之际，德国中部的哈勒、威登堡（Wittenberg）等地举行大型庆典活动，纪念马丁·路德宗教改革运动；如今德国到处可见的一系列以马丁·路德及其新教相关的城市、教堂、学术机构等建筑和名称无不提示着人们铭记这位对德国、欧洲乃至世界宗教、思想、社会发展史做出过划时代贡献的伟人¹。

马丁·路德最突出的贡献在历史学、思想史、社会学界公认的是宗教改革运动的发起者和领导者，这方面的研究已经十分丰富。本文以马丁·路德的《基本宗教文集》为主线，围绕他宗教改革的基石和对社会的影响，剖析其革命性宗教思想背后的伦理身份与选择，解析其思想形成与发展过程中社会环境、阶群关系、家庭背景、个人经历等影响他的伦理身份的客观规定性，

1 关于德国现实社会生活中有关马丁·路德的纪念性建筑、机构等，详见顾梦飞：“马丁·路德改革之旅侧记”，《天风》，2007年第19期，第36-38页。

同时又力求析出他主观选择的一面。需要说明的是，路德的这三个重要身份特征构成的是一个相互关联的整体，在分析时本不能完全将它们割裂开来，他的重要文献也基本上同时体现了这些伦理身份。

一、至诚的基督教信徒与义无反顾的宗教改革先驱

马丁·路德是虔诚的基督教徒和神职工作者，他至真与至诚的信仰表现为看似相互矛盾实则有机协调的两个方面：一方面，对于基督教教义和主旨、教徒的权利与义务等有关信仰的一系列重大基本问题，他始终秉持与坚守着近乎原教旨主义的理解立场；另一方面，对于所认识到的当时基督教教会组织中的种种弊端，他毫不妥协地揭露、批判与革新，成为当世与后来人们敬仰的宗教改革先驱。应该说，他的主要人生经历塑成了他对基督教至为纯粹的信仰，驱使着他对信仰实践中的弊端发起义无反顾的革新。

马丁·路德（Martin Luther）于1489年出生于德意志中部图林根的艾斯莱本（Eisleben）的一个普通农户，是家里九个孩子中的第八个。母亲是虔诚的基督教徒，路德的生活环境中时刻受到宗教的浸染。路德小时候为了维持求学时的生活所需，曾参加一个唱诗班，在富有人家吃晚餐时为他们唱圣诗，以获得进食主人餐后剩余的食物。1501年春，路德进入德国著名的埃尔福特大学学习，在获得学士、硕士、博士学位后，又开始学习法学。但是，深受家庭和生活环境中基督教的影响，感受到社会快速发展带来生活急剧变革给他内心的冲击，以及出于对死后审判的畏惧、对黑死病和战争的恐惧、对内心平和的追求等，特别是他于1505年7月一次偶然的暴风雨中进行祷告时体验到了神的保佑，于是不顾父亲的反对，毅然决定放弃继续学习法律，转而到埃尔福特奥古斯丁修道院开始苦修，通过刻苦的学习获得了神学博士学位。1507年晋升为神父，1508年受派到威登堡的一个小修道院，讲授《圣经》和道德哲学，次年成为《圣经》教授。

潜心学习和研究神学、虔诚苦行修道的路德于1510年11月至1511年4月受当地教会的派遣前往罗马朝圣，却亲眼目睹了教皇和教士的各种丑恶行径：言行不一的虚伪欺诈、穷奢极欲的物质生活、纵欲放荡的浪行作风，等等。这就彻底颠覆了路德心中对他们预期的神圣形象，对他一直以来的笃信不啻为一种嘲讽性的重击。1517年3月，教皇利奥十世以修缮罗马圣彼得大教堂为名颁售赎罪券，这种明目张胆的欺骗性的盘剥敛财行径彻底激发了路德对教皇的全面批判。1517年10月31日，在威登堡教堂大门上张贴了路德以拉丁文写成的《关于赎罪券效能的辩论》（亦称《九十五条论纲》，以下简称《论纲》），由此正式揭开了路德宗教改革运动的序幕。

宗教改革运动一旦开启，势如洪流，完全超出了路德本来局限在宗教信仰范围温和改良的意愿，也因此塑造了路德此后的生活：主要投身于指导宗教改革运动，同时应对教皇教会的各种诘难，从始至终深入研究基督教理论

问题，从事神学教授工作并进行音乐研究，以及反对激进的社会革命。由路德发起的宗教改革迅速发展为涉及到社会各方面的精神自由和社会解放的改革运动，对德国、欧洲乃至世界历史的发展产生了巨大的促进作用，他本人也因此成为了推进社会进步的具有世界意义的巨人。由他发起的宗教改革成功的标志为1529年新教的建立，随着该教快速地传播到世界各地，形成了与天主教分庭抗礼的基督教新格局。

路德具备着正统而精深的神学素养，与其他思想、信仰改革的导师一样，他主要是通过大量的文章和著述发起和推进着宗教改革运动：自1517年抨击教皇教会的《论纲》发表之时起，他就不得不大量写作，以及时回应来自罗马教皇和教会的各种诘难，指导宗教改革运动中的行动，同时也深入阐释了关于基督教和神学根本性的诸多理论问题。路德的重要作品收录于鲁尔（Timothy F. Lull）编辑的《基本宗教文集》（以下简称《文集》）中¹，共21篇，涵盖了六大基本主题：神学基本问题、圣经教义、基督之公义、圣礼、教会改革、基督徒的自由。他在这些文献中的宗教思想不可逆转地颠覆了教皇、教会和神职人员对宗教阐释权的垄断，彻底改变了宗教阐释的基本语境与阐释路径，由这场宗教改革引发的一系列其它社会改革乃至革命运动客观上推动了资本主义现代性的演进。他的贡献也形塑了他在人类历史上的基本身份：宗教改革的发起者和领袖、基督教的公共阐释者和社会改良的倡导者。

二、伦理选择与宗教改革

马丁·路德具有正统而深厚的神学涵养，忠于信仰、坚守基督教原教义是他的身份赋予他的伦理规定性；但同时，至诚的信仰蕴含的纯粹性促使他对信仰实践中的弊端毫不妥协地批判与改革，又深刻体现了他的伦理选择。马丁·路德的时代处于中世纪（476—1453年）结束之初，宗教戒律对精神生活绝对掌控、对世俗社会广泛渗透。德国作为工商业落后于西欧的农业国，宗教对精神和社会生活的桎梏较西欧更为严重，对宗教和神职机构的批判需要何等坚定的伦理信念才能激发出百折不挠的勇气！综揽《文集》，可以解析出马丁·路德对教皇教会的批判和由之引发的宗教改革背后所坚守的伦理信念与抉择。其中最能体现路德宗教改革中伦理选择的当数《论纲》，这里我们以该文献为重点结合相关其他著述考察他的伦理选择。

毫无疑问，1517年10月31日张贴在德国维滕贝格诸圣堂大门上的马丁·路德的《九十五条论纲》不啻为一记重磅炸弹，言辞犀利、直捣问题核心的《论纲》清晰地揭露了教皇教会奢靡、腐败、伪善的丑恶面目，是向罗马教皇教会发出的革命宣言，堪称路德最重要的作品，它的发出被认为是宗教改革运动开始的标志；这场改革运动成熟于他的体系化宗教理论的形成，标志为路德教

1 该著于1999年12月在中国社会科学出版社出版。近期上海译林出版社组织对该著的英文版进行编注（笔者负责该著的编注），新版即将由该出版社出版。

的确立。《论纲》中的每一条都通过严谨的条分缕析不可辩驳地直指问题的核心和根源，充分体现了作者深厚的学术、神学学养；同时，《论纲》充满了路德对民众的深切关怀和对罗马教皇和教会腐败奸诈的切身观察、体悟与痛恨。此文的迅速传播引起了爆炸性的反响，并由此引发了路德宗教改革运动。路德的主要宗教思想大多可以在这九十五条论纲中找到踪影。限于篇幅，我们仅选取其中的五条回看路德在那个教皇教会至上的黑暗时代发起的宗教、思想批判、解放之壮举。¹

第 86 条：教皇是一切富人中的最富有者，为什么不用他自己的钱来建造圣彼得教堂，而必须花费贫穷的信徒们的钱呢？

这里，对生活艰辛的信徒的同情和对富贵而贪婪的教皇的厌恶是路德的基本立场，对教皇的伪善、欺诈是路德批判的内容。他对于教皇与信众贫富对比以及贫穷的信徒们被剥削这些问题的提出，点醒民众的同时也会引起对于贫富差距和权力不平等关系的反思，由此导向宗教改革的迫切性。进而，路德直接戳穿了教皇教会等宗教中介组织以“善功救赎”之名的敛财面目，他写道：

第 27 条：有人说当钱币一投入钱柜中叮当作响时，灵魂就超脱炼狱飞入天堂，这是宣传人的捏造。

此条是路德研究中被引用得最多的句子之一，它以直白的语言、生动的描述、无情的批判在受众中产生了广泛深入的影响。当然，这一条也同样明确地将批判指向中介性的教皇、教会人员而不是上帝或宗教本身。所点出的“宣传人的捏造”，预示着他要通过随后多年的论证，提出他最核心的“唯信称义”学说，推行改革以消除信众繁重而多余的“善功”负担。

可见，路德对以“赎罪券”为代表的教会敛财行为的批判，出发点是从教会的剥削、教内等级之间的不平等的表面现象入手，其身份立场乃是基于他的成长背景和对社会与信众的观察，基本良心和一个普通的具有正常基本良知的人对于普罗大众朴素的感情，当这种良心与他所忠于的宗教信仰和事业之间发生冲突时，明知要冒着冲击教皇教会权力机构的巨大风险，仍毅然地坚持基本的良心。这就必然要求他对于“赎罪”问题作出“善功”之外的阐释。于此，路德说：

第 36 条：每一个真诚悔改的基督徒，即令没有赎罪券，也同样可以

1 以下各条中译文参考了李成德，“马丁·路德新宗教观的形成”，《河南大学学报》（哲学社会科学版），1987 年第 1 期，第 112 页；宋慧国，“浅评马丁·路德宗教思想的演变”，《安徽文学》，2008 年第 6 期，第 342 页。

得到赦罪或免罚。

这一条一方面仍是直接批判教皇教会发行赎罪券的丑恶行径，指向了隔在人与上帝之间诸环节节外生枝的面目，“真诚”作为唯一要件的提出也为路德后续较为系统的“唯信称义”说铺设了理论基础，祛除了信仰与善功之间的关系，点出了其改革的重心所在：重视“唯信称义”的原则，接受教会形式和体制的多样化，质疑和消解了现实世界里教皇教会的特权。

从伦理身份的角度看，路德对“真诚”的强调和对善功（“赎罪券”）勇敢的否定，依据的是他对纯厚的基督教修养，秉持的是作为一名纯粹的神学家和神职人员本应坚守的道德律令。这种坚守既体现了他纯然的身份特征，也充分体现了他不畏强权、毅然选择与既有宗教机制决绝之大无畏的抉择。这种冲击力极强的抉择在第5条中更是直截了当地直指教皇教会之伪善、欺诈本质。

第5条：教皇除了凭自己的权柄及教会法规所科的惩罚外，既不愿意亦不能豁免任何惩罚。

这一条明确地揭示了教皇及其下属的教会组织乃是介于人与神之间的中介性、寄生性环节，因而不能解决罪恶的根源问题。这对于解蔽教皇教会长期自我标榜的神圣性、神秘性不啻为一记重击，对受控受迫的普通信众的解放性和对位居统治地位的教皇教会的颠覆性由此可见一斑。对照教会的条规，他进一步指出：

第22条：事实上按照教会法规，人在今世所应受的任何惩罚，教皇并不能使其在炼狱中的灵魂获得赦免。

注意，路德在这里点出了此岸世界与彼岸世界的区分。同时，路德反对了教皇赦罪之说，但并没有反上帝或者说彻底的反宗教。所以路德的宗教改革之革命性明显具有为上帝“清君侧”的味道，更彻底的革命性批判要到几个世纪后费尔巴哈时代。他的这一批判一经提出，就必然动摇了现有的对基督教的解释权，促使他要提出替代性的阐释，同时也就形成他的宗教改革方案，成就他作为宗教改革运动的领袖。

从上面摘取的五条论纲可以看出，所列条款直接针对“赎罪券”这种不可饶恕的欺诈行为加以鞭笞，这在罗马教皇和教会组织看来简直是大逆不道的叛教行为，却让广大普通教徒沐浴了解放的阳光。时年34岁的马丁·路德以知识渊博、充满朝气、富有正义感和同情心等形象，充分彰显了他作为虔诚的基督徒、神学家和宗教改革领袖的伦理身份，既体现了他成长过程中的

社会历史规定性，也体现了他个人的主观努力与抉择。

首先，虔诚的基督教信仰决定了他基本的伦理身份。因为信仰至真至诚，所以毅然放弃前途光明的法学学习，终身投入基督教神职人员的职业；深入钻研，对于所发现的问题始终秉持认真负责的精神，抨击并倡导改革。他批判的不是基督教本身，而是如何信仰它的问题。其次，对信众的大爱使他义无反顾地发动宗教改革运动，既体现了信仰的规定性，也体现了他自己选择从纯正的信仰出发，坚守原则，反对教皇教会等基督教中介组织在信仰实践中对于这些原则的背离。这种大爱既源于他自幼艰苦生活养成的对平民之疾苦感同身受的同情，也出于基督教信仰中本来就蕴含着的对信众负有拯救之义务。基于教皇教会的奢华与信众的穷苦形成强烈对比的表象入手展开批判，随着运动的深入，触及到关于信仰的标准、信众的义务与权利等理论问题，改革的成果最终在新教中得到全面、完整的体现。第三，坚持唯信称义论，倡导正本清源，强调上帝和《圣经》的权威性，剔除教会等中介组织过多的职能和权力。

三、基督教公共阐释中的伦理阐释

马丁·路德对于基督教信仰实践过程中的诸多严重积弊的批判和改革主要是通过对相关基督教教义的再阐释进行的。他的阐释广泛地被信众和社会接受和认同，上升为新的公共阐释，他本人成为基督教公共阐释者之一。本节基于他对《圣经》的阐释和对于基督教重大基础理论问题的阐释，分析他作为基督教公共阐释者的伦理阐释。

马丁·路德 20 岁起就担任神学教授，他的职业生涯中相当大的一部分工作就是对《圣经》的阐释：包括作为神职人员向信众讲授《圣经》，批判与改革过程中他对《圣经》相关内容的阐释，以及作为神学家进行《圣经》的德语翻译工作等。其中第一项工作是日常工作，第二项在本文其它部分都有论及，在此重点谈谈他对《圣经》的德语翻译之公共阐释意义。

在受到罗马教皇教会迫害而隐居于瓦尔特堡期间，路德将《圣经》翻译成通俗易懂的德语，分别于 1522 年、1534 年出版了他的德译本《新约全书》和《旧约全书》。其译文通俗易懂、准确流畅、优美生动，在相当长的时间内他又对译文反复修订，不经意间成就了路德在翻译界、文学界很高的学术声望，如德国著名诗人海涅曾经这样评价路德的《圣经》译本：“马丁·路德创造了德语，是因为他翻译了《圣经》而完成的，……这部古老的书是使德国语言不断更新的源泉。路德所译《圣经》中的所有成语和句型都是德语的，作家可以一直使用。”（伍渭文 35）当然，翻译和文学美并非以宗教教化信众为使命的路德的关注焦点，实际上“教诲是文学的本质属性，审美是为文学的教诲功能服务的，是文学的第二功能”（聂珍钊 14）。

路德的这项艰苦而长期的工作正是旨在让普通德国信众能够直接阅读到

《圣经》，更有效更确当地理解基督教的要义，从而为本民族人民提供指导生活的思想信仰蓝本。正因为德语《圣经》让最广大的普通德国信众能够凭借母语就能获得教义，从此改变了深刻影响着人们思想和信念之源的阅读方式。这也意味着将基督教教义的获得、理解和解释权极大地赋予了普通信众，消解了神职机构作为上帝与信众之间中介环节的必要性。所以说，路德通过这项艰苦的工作，实现了他在以德语为母语的广大信众中对基督教经典典籍的公共阐释，消解了此前罗马教皇教会一直对基督教教义独享的阐释权。

对既有的基督教组织革命性的冲击还来自于路德对基督教重大基础理论问题做出的一系列回归到其原教义的阐释。《论纲》揭露了当时基督教中的一些不可调和的根本性问题，使得既有的宗教信仰框架神圣而光辉的形象轰然坍塌，这是一个“破”的环节；随之而来的就是“立”的问题，即对于神职中介环节课加给信众的种种“义务”的涤除带来了“怎样做才能算是信仰”的基础性理论问题。路德作为问题的提出者必须针对这一信仰的标准问题给出深刻而又有说服力的新的阐释，这也关系到他发起的宗教改革是否能够成功。这里我们以路德对于“义/称义”的阐释为例，揭示他的阐释成为新的公共阐释的学理依据。

《两种公义论》¹（1519）原本是路德为圣枝主日（即复活节前的星期日）做的一篇讲道词，清晰地论述了信众究竟应该通过何种方式才能成功赎罪并获得救赎这一基督教核心的基础性论题。该文阐释了路德与此前关于耶稣基督上帝公义之公共阐释根本不同的理解，是他的宗教学说体系中最重要基石性理论阐释，颠覆了以往的“善功”赎罪论，为《论纲》中驳斥的一系列敛财行为做出了理论上的依据，也为新教的减负赋权革新奠定了基础。

路德指出，第一种“义”不可能源自带有原罪的人自身，必须由无条件施爱的耶稣基督自外部通过洗礼和信徒的悔过注入给他，于是他可以充满信心地夸耀说“我有着与基督一样的生活、行为、言语、苦难和死亡；一如我像他那样经历这一切”（Luther 150）。“因此，凭着对基督的信仰，基督的义便成为我们的义，他的一切为我们所拥有，乃至基督自身也属于我们”

1 因信称义 (Justification by Faith) 基督教神学救赎论术语。根据《宗教大辞典》（任继愈主编，上海辞书出版社，1998年版），广义上指“信仰”是得到救赎和在上帝面前称义的必要条件。狭义上指基督教新教尤其是路德宗关于如何得救的教义。主要依据保罗在《罗马书》中所说的“因信称义”，反对依靠遵守律法、礼仪、行割礼等行为而称义。认为世人都犯了罪，亏欠于上帝，靠遵守律法等行为是不足以称义的，只有凭借耶稣宝血的祭献，与上帝重新和好，依靠上帝的恩宠和人的信仰，才能被上帝称为义人。马丁·路德据此突出“因信称义”，强调由于基督在十字架上的救赎奇功，人神之间的阻隔已经排除，信徒凭借信仰就可直接同上帝交通，而无须以教皇为首的教阶制度（包括主教、神父）做中保。广义的“因信称义”为各派基督教所信奉；狭义的“因信称义”，则为新教大多数宗派所重视。需要强调的是，后来学界为了突出马丁·路德对于称义无需善行的理论，一般用“唯信称义”指路德的学说，用“因信称义”指那些坚持信仰与善行并重的学说。

(156-57)。这种义具有无限性，瞬间免去一切罪过，这是因为基督身上是不可能存有罪过的。只要信仰基督，与之合二为一，就能拥有基督的公义。上帝所赐的这种义可以取代亚当所失去的最初的义。对这种义之性质的强调为他的“唯信”说立下了根据。

第二种“义”乃是我们本身具有的，原本非我们独自实现，而是因为借助了第一种“义”在普通的日常生活中完成的各种善行，是第一种“义”作用的结果(150, 157-58)。这种义在生活中包含着三个方面：根除欲望、爱护邻舍、顺服并敬畏上帝(157)。这种义以基督为榜样，向着基督的形状转化，这也正是基督所求。如同基督不为自己谋利，所做的一切都是为了我们，他也正希望我们如此为邻里树立同样的榜样(158)。路德关于上帝之爱、信徒对上帝的信仰和对邻里的爱的阐释，强调立虔诚为根本，涤除在信仰中的私欲，既消除了“赎罪券”之类的宗教中介机构敛财行为的合法性，也为减轻信众负担、削除宗教机构和神职人员特权等主要改革内容奠定了清晰而坚实的基础。

为了完善对宗教之爱的阐释，路德也论述了作为爱之反面，即恶与恨的问题。简言之，上帝无条件的爱应该获得我们对祂虔诚的信仰，那么，如何对待恶呢？论及惩恶以捍卫公义的问题，路德将参与诉讼的人分为三类：寻求复仇者、没有复仇欲念的人和并非出于自身利益但追求正义者(163-64)。路德倡导第二种，作为基督的福音和表率，宜以德报怨，坦然接受惩罚，为仇敌的得救而心安(164)。对于与爱构成矛盾体的恶与恨的阐释，充分体现出路德严谨的学风。

路德以其“唯信称义”说打破了教皇教会及神职人员对基督教解释权的垄断，将宗教的阐释权和信仰权交到了普通人的手中。“路德提出‘两个王国’的理论，认为人是活在世俗世界里的，因此，人能够从事人间的一切事务：可以当兵，可以挣钱，可以受教育。第三，路德的观点与当时人们痛恨罗马教廷的世俗化有关，人们对罗马教廷失去信心，导致路德理论被广大反对罗马教廷的人们所认可。”（朱孝远 9）他对基督教的阐释很快获得了众多信众的认同，从而上升成为对基督教的公共阐释。“马丁·路德的新观点本来只是一种个人阐释。在被大众接受后，因信称义、凡信徒皆祭司、基督徒靠上帝拯救而不靠善功自救、宗教崇拜的对象是神而不是人，所有这些，都成为公共性阐释。路德的观点成为公共阐释后，产生出巨大的社会影响力。在制度层面出现了超越宗教领域改革的社会改革运动。修道院被关闭、宗教仪式被简化、教堂的财富转变为社会救济的公库；修女还俗，僧侣结婚；最后，是由国家、政府来管理宗教事务”（朱孝远 9）。当然，他的个人阐释之所以成为公共阐释，有着多方面的原因：他渊博的基督教理论和知识、对《圣经》的熟悉程度以及译为普通人能读易懂的德语文本、他的观点反映了民众的需要等，使他的阐释具有公共阐释之“理性、澄明性、公度性、建构性、超越性、

反思性”要求（张江 1）。

回到路德作为基督教公共阐释者的伦理原则与选择的问题。与其说他对至真至善的伦理坚守与选择出于主动的阐释，毋宁说是通过他的宗教职业、宗教批判和改革多位一体、一以贯之地展开的。

路德对基督教至真的信仰首先源自他的生活背景，这一点除了前文中已经有所涉及的来自他家庭的熏陶外，那时的基础教育乃至整个教育过程中相当大一部分内容就是关于基督教的。在此深厚的基督教信仰的基础上，才会出现当他在 16 岁时（1505 年 7 月）因为偶然的奇幻体验而彻底皈依基督教。唯有他对基督教至真的信仰才能支持他不畏强大权势的教皇教会，始终坚持由他自己对基督教教义深刻的理解，对亲眼所见的他们的各种恶行毫无保留地加以揭露和批判。至真至诚的信仰，可以贯通地解释他在专业 / 职业选择中强烈的自觉意识，他作为地方神职人员到罗马朝圣时能够撇开等机制森严的宗教体制和上层教会组织的光环而深刻认识到他们的腐朽、奢靡、伪善，清晰地发出革命檄文性的《论纲》。面对随之而来的各种迫害，他仍然毫不妥协，投入几乎全部精力翻译《圣经》，针对改革运动中的各种问题进行及时的研究、阐述，充分表明在这个过程中他的伦理选择都处在高度自觉状态之下：不惧威权、为基督教之“真”而斗争，甘愿承担由此可能引发的可怖后果。

同时，他的改革也充分反映着他对善的坚守。体现在他的批判与改革过程中主要是指他始终切实地维护着基督教教义中宣扬的对于信众的大爱，当然，这本来也是对“真”的坚守。《论纲》中就尖锐地批判教皇教会的敛财行为，反映普通信徒生活的疾苦；后来在《两种公义论》中深刻论证了信仰的标准，从而把广大信众从繁重的“善功”负担下解放出来；《论基督徒的自由》清楚地阐释了信众的权利和义务，为减负、大爱做出了较为全面的阐释。

作为改革成功的标志性成果，他所创立的新教在他对基督教新的公共阐释的指导下，不折不扣地践行了这些伦理原则：大量减轻信众的负担，消除甚至机构与人员的特权，连最基本的仪式也精简到极致：只保留了洗礼和圣餐礼两项。这些改革同时也会伤及作为教会组织的新教本身的利益，不顾自身利益而毅然选择这些坚守伦理原则，正体现了他和他改革中真正而彻底的伦理操守，从而实现了权力与利益从教会机构向普通信众的转移，或者说实现了从天国到人间的转换，真正实现了从思想和伦理上对民众的解放。

四、社会改良的伦理理想

路德推进的宗教改革也带动了社会其它领域的革新乃至革命运动。路德关注的重心在于思想信仰领域，他反对暴力革命，支持社会改良。他的相关文献也充分体现了其社会改良的伦理理想。

路德成长的时期乃是欧洲黑暗的中世纪的尾端，以人文主义为要旨的文

文艺复兴运动逐渐融蚀着来自宗教和封建专制的双重桎梏。那个时期的德国，外受罗马教皇教会的宰制而处于分裂状态，内受本土封建势力的禁锢，经济社会的发展远远落后于资本主义初步发展的西欧国家。受到这些或显或隐的社会历史背景的影响，基于自身的信仰、职业精神和对平民的同情，路德引发并领导的宗教改革运动的方向愈来愈明确，并触发了相应的社会改良乃至变革运动。这两种运动具有基本相同或相似的总体方向：向着自由、平等、博爱之路变革。本节我们以《论基督徒的自由》为例，考察路德作为社会改良主义者的伦理理想。

“论基督徒的自由”（1520）与“关于教会特权制的改革致德意志基督教贵族公开信”、“论教会的巴比伦之囚”一起被称为马丁·路德“改革运动三论著”。在该文中，他提出了著名的两个似非而是的原则：“基督徒是全然自由的众人之主，不受任何人辖管；基督徒又是全然忠顺的众人之仆，受任何人辖管”（Luther 596）。这是基于人内在的灵或精神与外在的肉身之分而言的。一方面，内在的精神凭着对上帝的信仰获得自由，“基督徒对上帝的信心包含了他所需要的一切，故称义无需善行。既然无需善行，他也不需要律法；既然无需律法，他肯定就不用法律的羁约……这就是基督徒的自由，即信念使我们不耽于闲散或邪恶的生活，无需律法和事工而称义得救”（601-02）。这番对基督徒的自由的论述是路德思想的核心要素，为普通信徒与上帝间的直接交流、“唯信称义”等标志性改革思想提供了学术基础。

另一方面，外在的肉身意味着信徒总是要生活在具体的现实社会之中，需要通过一定的事务完成相应的角色，处理与他人之间的关系。“真正的基督徒不是为了自己而活，而是为基督和邻里而活。他凭着信仰活在基督里，凭着爱活在邻里中。通过信仰他提升自己归于上帝，通过爱使自己降到邻里之中。而他自己永驻于上帝与他的爱里”（623）。这里解释了信徒在生活世界中的行为要受到利他原则的束缚，但强调了第一方面的决定性作用，也就是强调因为信仰而获得与神相通，做自己主人的自由。如此，精神与肉体、信仰与实践两个方面之间的关系就得到了合理的解释。

他否认教士阶层“在人与上帝间的‘中介’地位及种种特权，其坚定的立场具有明显的反封建进步性”（雷雨田 刘兴仕 18）。路德倡导的宗教改革运动的推进速度和影响超乎了他的想象，并且迅速扩展到社会其它多个领域。李文娟高度评价路德的功绩：“人创造了‘神’，促使人们都去遵守这个‘神’，给人以终极关怀，在人的心中树立一种至高无上的信仰，带领人类一步步走向文明，使人类一步步向着这个‘神’靠近，即向着人类所设定的理想前进”（李文娟 143）。虽然这种评价过高了，因为如此彻底而全面的论述是几个世纪以后费尔巴哈在其《基督教的本质》中完成的，但是，费氏的这番高论中明显透露出路德学说的深刻影响。

他鼓励人们从事世俗事务即积极地生活在邻里之中，这样的观点为资本

主义的发展打破了一些思想桎梏，以至于有学者称“马丁·路德倡导的宗教改革原则是现代企业家精神的雏形，它使人们在创造个人财富和提高社会福利方面找到了一个平衡点，由此开始推动经济和文明的良性循环”（王文军凯夫 87）。路德以宗教改革为要旨的思想声援、推动了德国乃至整个西欧的反封建斗争。表面上，路德针对教宗、教会势力的革命性批判不但没有批判封建势力，而且他的宗教批判受到了一些封建贵族的庇护，其政教分离思想甚至维护了德国封建贵族势力。然而，精神生活中的等级制度都能够拆除，那些世俗生活中的封建等级制也就处于风雨飘摇之中了。同时，路德的宗教改革还彻底颠覆了罗马教皇的统治，对民族国家的形成和发展也具有重要的意义。“路德宗教改革的工作一方面借助了成长中的民族国家的力量，另一方面也推动了民族国家的兴起，为民族国家的政治理论发展提供了一片沃土”（姜淼 9）。

当然，路德的改革出发点和行动范围始终局限在宗教内，对于相关的社会变革，他主张温和的社会改良主义。他希望通过人对宗教至真至诚的信仰达到思想的纯洁，因为享受教徒的权利达成人与人之间的平等，践行基督徒的义务达成社会的博爱。思想信念中的问题只能通过该领域的运动去完成，故而主张通过思想信仰的改造达成社会的改良，反对暴力等激进但充满破坏性的手段。究其原因，这也应该是大多数思想领袖的普遍观念：相信通过改变思想进而改良社会虽然可能形式上是渐进缓和的，但过程一般处于可察可控的范围，不会带来很大的破坏性的社会秩序失衡。社会实践中的革命洪流给他带来了很大的冲击，也招致了他的无情批判乃至诅咒。

一方面，在宗教信仰和思想上，他对教皇、教会、神职人员等基督教中介组织和势力虚伪、伪善、腐败等丑恶面目不可调和的激烈批判和他所领导的宗教改革无疑具有较强的革命性，必然导致后者与他的决裂和对他施加严酷的责罚，但他虽受重压仍矢志不渝。另一方面，当他发起和领导的宗教改革运动引发了宗教信仰以外的、冲击着封建秩序和利益格局时，他选择维护庇护者的利益，反对激烈的暴力革命对权贵的冲击，这也体现了他主观选择的一面。这两个方面彰显了他作为虔诚的基督徒、具有大爱宗教情怀而严谨笃实的神学家、宗教改革领袖和社会改良主义者的伦理身份和选择。

五、结语

循着路德所领导的波澜壮阔的宗教改革运动之路，通过他的《基本宗教文集》所反映的丰富而系统的思想，反观他的伦理身份与选择。我们认为，他的基本身份可以界定为多重而整一的几个主要方面：虔诚大爱的基督徒、基督教的新的公共阐释者以及宗教改革领袖和社会改良主义者。他的虔诚体现在对于基督教教义纯粹的坚守，坚持《圣经》的权威性，主张“唯信称义”而削除传统教会机构对信众苛加的“善功”从而极大地免除了基督徒的负担；

他对于“信”“义”“善功”“自由”等基督教基石性理念的阐释确立了他的基督教新的阐释体系，为他的改革奠定了坚实的理论和思想基础，产生了巨大的影响，也成就了他作为基督教公共阐释者的地位；他领导的宗教改革运动成功地导向了新教的成立，而对于由此引发的社会其它领域的改革，他持着保守的改良主义态度，尤其反对暴力革命。他的宗教和社会改良思想深刻反映出他所选择与坚守的伦理原则：对基督教至真至诚的信仰、对信众大爱之善、社会和平改良的发展方式。

Works Cited

- 范迎春：“马丁·路德的宗教改革及其对西方近代社会的影响”，《衡阳师范学院学报》1（2015）：112-14。
- [Fan Yingchun. “On Religious Reform of Martin Luther and Its Influence on Modern Western Society.” *Journal of Hengyang Normal University*, 1 (2015): 112-14.]
- 顾梦飞：“马丁·路德改教之旅侧记”，《天风》19（2007）：36-38。
- [Gu Mengfei. “Sidelights on Martin Luther’s Reformation Journey.” *Tian Feng* 19 (2007): 36-38.]
- 姜淼：“马丁·路德宗教改革对近代政治哲学的影响”，《南昌航空工业学院学报》（社会科学版）4（2006）：6-9。
- [Jiang Miao. “The influence of the Protestant Reformation of Martin Luther to Modern Political Philosophy.” *Journal of Nanchang Institute of Aeronautical Technology (Social Science)* 4 (2006): 6-9.]
- 雷雨田，刘兴仕：“马丁·路德宗教改革的特点及其意义”，《广州大学学报》（社会科学版）1（2002）：18-22。
- [Lei Yutian, Liu Xingshi. “Characteristics of Martin Luther’s Reformation and Its Influence.” *Journal of Guangzhou University (Social Science Edition)* 1 (2002): 18-22.]
- 李成德：“马丁·路德新宗教观的形成”，《河南大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）1（1987）：110-15。
- [Li Cheng-de. “The Formation of Martin Luther’s Religious Outlook.” *Journal of Henan University (Social Science)* 1 (1987): 110-15.]
- 李文娟：“谈马丁·路德的宗教与人生观”，《才智》34（2009）：143。
- [Li Wen-juan. “On Martin Luther’s View on Religion and Life.” *Ability and Wisdom* 34 (2009): 143.]
- Luther, Martin. *Basic Theological Writings*. Ed. Timothy, F. Lull. Beijing: China Social Sciences Publishing House, 1999.
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundamentals and Terms.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2010): 12-22.]
- 宋慧国：“浅评马丁·路德宗教思想的演变”，《安徽文学》6（2008）：342-44。
- [Song Huiguo. “On the Evolution of Martin Luther’s Religious Thought.” *Anhui Literature* 6 (2008):

342-44.]

王文军 凯夫：“试论马丁·路德的宗教改革与现代企业家精神”，《云南财贸学院学报》（社会科学版）5（2003）：87-88。

[Wang Wenjun, Kai Fu. “On Martin Luther’s Religious Reform and Modern Entrepreneurship.” *Journal of Yunnan Finance & Economics University* 5(2003): 87-88.]

伍渭文：《路德文集》（第一卷），路德文集中文版编辑委员会编。上海：上海三联书店，2005。

[Wu Weiwen. *Writings of Martin Luther, Vol. 1*. Ed. Board of Luther’s Writings (Chinese). Shanghai: Shanghai Sanlian Bookstore Press, 2005.]

张江：“公共阐释论纲”，《学术研究》6（2017）：1-5。

[Zhang Jiang. “On Public Interpretation.” *Journal of Academic Research* 6 (2017): 1-5.]

朱孝远：“宗教改革史研究中的公共阐释学”，《历史研究》1（2018）：8-14。

[Zhu Xiao-yuan. “Public Interpretation in the Study of the History of Religious Reform.” *Historical Research* 1(2018): 8-14.]

“折叠”死亡的寓言：《立体几何》中的科技伦理

The Allegory of “Folding” Death: The Scientific and Technological Ethics in *Solid Geometry*

郭英剑（Guo Yingjian）刘向辉（Liu Xianghui）

内容摘要：作为伊恩·麦克尤恩早期短篇小说中的一篇“异作”，《立体几何》偏离了他向来关注青少年、儿童和年轻人问题的主题模式，通过反乌托邦的科技伦理书写揭露了极端化的科技崇拜现象，并对现象背后的道德危机进行了隐喻式批判。作品借助三个不同叙事层次、不同类型的“死亡”事件以寓言形式呈现了人类社会长久以来在社会关系、朋友关系、夫妻关系方面的伦理秩序失衡乱象。亨特之死是对学术伦理秩序物化的反抗，“M”之死是对友情伦理秩序衰亡的控诉，妻子之死是对家庭伦理秩序崩塌的痛击。通过营造三场看似“温情平和”实则“震惊骇人”的“折叠”死亡悲剧，《立体几何》不仅表达了对科技偏执狂群体的控诉，而且对如何解决科技伦理危机提出了无声叩问，进而呼唤构建一种和谐的生命伦理秩序。

关键词：死亡；寓言；伊恩·麦克尤恩；《立体几何》；科技伦理

作者简介：郭英剑，中国人民大学“杰出学者”特聘教授、中国人民大学外国语学院教授。研究方向：英美文学、文学翻译、英语教育与高等教育研究。刘向辉，许昌学院外国语学院副教授，中国人民大学外国语学院博士生，研究方向为英美文学。本文系2019年河南省哲学社会科学规划项目“美国华裔文学中的中国城市意象研究”【项目编号：2019BWX022】的阶段性成果。

Title: The Allegory of “Folding” Death: the Scientific and Technological Ethics in “Solid Geometry”

Abstract: As one distinct work of Ian McEwan’s early short novels, “Solid Geometry” differs from the habitual subject pattern of concerning adolescents, children and young adults. Instead it discloses the radical phenomenon of worshipping science and technology by means of anti-utopian scientific and technological ethics writing, and implicitly criticizes the hidden moral crisis. In virtue of three “death” events of different narrative layers and different types, “Solid Geometry” demonstrates the ever-lasting disordered ethics in terms of social relations, friend relations and conjugal relations in the form of allegory. The death of Hunter is a rebellion against the materialized academic ethics, the death of “M”

is an accusation to the dying of friendship ethics, and the death of “my wife” is a heavy attack to the collapsing family ethics. By constructing three seemingly “tender and mild” but virtually “shocking and scary” “folding” tragedies, “Solid Geometry” not only expresses the accusation to the scientific paranoiacs, but silently poses a question of how to solve the crisis of scientific and technological ethics, and calls forth the construction of harmonious life ethics orders.

Keywords: death; allegory; Ian McEwan; “Solid Geometry”; scientific and technological ethics

Authors: Guo Yingjian is University Distinguished Professor and Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Renmin University of China (Beijing 100872, China), specializing in English and American Literature, literary translation, English education, and higher education (Email: yjguo2006@gmail.com); Liu Xianghui, is Associate Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Xuchang University (Xuchang 461000, China), and a doctoral candidate of English Literature at the School of Foreign Languages, Renmin University of China (Beijing 100872, China), specializing in English and American Literature (Email: 93614305@qq.com).

引言

作为一个在文学批评界和商业领域均取得巨大成功的当代英国作家（Wells 250），伊恩·麦克尤恩（Ian McEwan, 1948- ）继续以笔耕不辍的姿态书写着“多产作家”的形象。然而国内外学界的研究更多关注其中后期的长篇小说创作，而对其早期的短篇小说创作缺乏充分的关注，且现有为数不多的研究主要局限于“恐怖伊恩”（Ian Macabre）的观点范式。以短篇小说集《最初的爱情，最后的仪式》（*First Love, Last Rites*, 1975）为代表的早期作品的确通过“满纸满篇尽是乱伦、残暴、变态性行为和谋杀”的“震荡文学”（literature of shock）手法营造出阴森恐怖的现代社会画面（蓝纯 23），但是这些作品不仅仅通过恐怖画面制造出“在神经和情感上留下永久划痕”的“伊恩·麦克尤恩后遗症”，还通过打破“希望和失望、恐怖和安慰、寒冷和温暖、荒诞和逼真、暴力和柔弱、理智和情感”等边界的创作手法（余华 4-5），反映出作者对人性中残忍、易堕落一面的异常敏感（陆建德 300），同时表达对人类社会的深刻忧思和伦理关怀。

相较于小说集《最初的爱情，最后的仪式》里的其它几个作品，《立体几何》（“Solid Geometry”）似乎偏离了“关注青少年、儿童和年轻人问题的主题模式”（Malcolm 21），而通过反乌托邦的技术伦理书写以兼具“温和”和“惊悚”的手法揭露了极端化的科技崇拜现象，并对现象背后的道德危机进行了隐喻式批判，呼唤构建一种和谐的生命伦理秩序。作为伊恩·麦克尤恩非自然叙

事的一个典范之作（尚必武 31），《立体几何》借助三个不同层次、不同类型的“死亡”事件呈现了人类社会的长久以来在社会关系、朋友关系、夫妻关系方面的伦理秩序失衡乱象。造成人类伦理秩序失衡的一个关键诱因是对科技的过度崇拜和滥用。作品中的亨特之死是对学术伦理秩序物化的反抗，“M”之死是对友情伦理秩序衰亡的控诉，妻子之死是对家庭伦理秩序崩塌的痛击。无论是故事语境中的亨特，还是历史语境中的“M”，抑或当下语境中的妻子，他们都在以看似“温情平和”的“折叠”场面中“无影无踪”地死去，营造出震惊的骇人悲剧。这些骇人悲剧的出现不仅是对科技偏执狂群体的控诉，而且对如何解决科技伦理危机提出了无声叩问。

一、激情无意的自杀——科技崇拜与学术悲剧

无论是亚里士多德形而上学层面“求知是人类的本性”的理念，还是培根实验科学层面“知识就是力量”的功利主义原则，都在很大程度上推动了科技理性的发展。科技理性带来的实用价值引导人类不断探索新的科技领域，并去展望未来美好社会。日趋显现的理想愿景在 18、19 世纪伴随着工业革命的发展终于演变为一种普遍的科学乌托邦主义，即主张以科技理性为范式主导和规约人类未来，利用科学技术实现人类物质丰裕、秩序合理、自由正义与社会和谐的乌托邦梦想。科学乌托邦思潮的盛行又反过来强化了人们对科学的信仰和崇拜，甚至促使了科学神话的崛起。科学神话的出现其实是后启蒙时代人类对现代科技的复魅，而这种复魅会引发人类构建一个不断趋于“合理化”的社会秩序，进而营造一个具有“多数人暴政”色彩的“大同世界”幻象。幻象的背后隐藏着社会组织结构日趋物化的本质。在物化思维的侵蚀下，原本应当充满生机活力的学术活动变得越来越固化，犹如一个牢不可破的线性封闭空间。具有独立意识的个体若要打破线性的封闭空间，势必付出代价，抑或酿就沉痛的学术悲剧。

《立体几何》中人物“M”所讲述的苏格兰数学家大卫·亨特事件其实就是一个关于学术圈物化的故事。在故事中，亨特发现了“无表面的平面”这一重大几何原理，其“价值超过了马克思和达尔文著作的总和”（麦克尤恩 14）。为了让学界同仁关注自己的重大成果，亨特打破了所处 1870 年代学术活动的传统秩序，没有按照学术会议为其安排的顺序发言，而在会议的第三天自告奋勇地展示所谓的、抑或自嘲的“重要结论”。在 1870 年，以数学学科为代表的传统学术圈已经形成了物化的形态特征。在长达两周的学术研讨中，各位数学家按照其在该领域的地位先后进行发言，地位较高的人发言之后一般就离开，不会聆听关注后面诸多发言者的观点。这种金字塔式的运行机制基本预设了权威至上的学术规约，即处在上层地位的学者可以凭借业已铸就的权威身份面向众多听众乃至整个学术圈发表、传播自己的学术论点，进而达到强化权威地位的目的，而处在底层地位的学者只能在“人数不断减

少”的凄冷氛围中孤独无奈地发表见解。底层学者的见解犹如沧海一粟，只是物化学术结构中可有可无的小零件，无法激起具有震动效果的浪涛。

尽管物化的传统学术规约抑制着新生力量的发展，但笃信科技理性的暗流是不甘沉默的。在学术会议上毛遂自荐的亨特正是此股暗流的携带者，这也正是近代科学史发展的缩影。亨特“无表面的平面”的发现对于当时的学术圈无疑是一股突如其来的冲击波。他第一次以白纸为媒介的“折叠实验”换来的是众人“轻蔑的嘲讽”、“茫然的讪笑”、“一钱不值的杂耍伎俩”、“愚蠢而不知所云的斥责、谩骂和恐吓”（麦克尤恩 16-20）。对于固化已久的学术圈来说，人微言轻的亨特单靠初生牛犊不怕虎的勇敢和一个被戏谑为“炫技表演”的折纸实验是不会掀起轩然大波的，他需要具有终极意义的大手笔之作才可撼动传统、换取所求。早已做好准备的亨特终于被迫使出杀手锏：以自己的身体为媒介进行折叠实验。亨特的“身体折叠实验”的确赢得了在场者的一致惊呼，但与此同时却葬送了自己的宝贵生命。作为一个数学家，亨特精于探索求证、勇于挑战权威和敢于自我牺牲的行为固然值得肯定，似乎体现了一种创新求变的科学精神，但从另外一个层面看，亨特的行为依然是对当时学术建制的一种盲从，他无非是通过展示与众不同的科技成果来构建自己在学术圈的权威中心地位。就技术视角而言，亨特的“无表面的平面”结论是一个颇具革新意义的发现，也正是他以反权威之法构建自我权威的应然之道。在试图构建自我权威的过程中，亨特没有走出社会物化的怪圈，而是以自我物化的形式与物化的社会对接。

亨特与社会的物化对接凸显或夸大了基于科技创新的心智理性（intellectual rationality）和形式理性（formal rationality），即过度肯定了逻辑论证与技术工具的形而上价值和功利化价值（周立斌 16-17），而忽视了道德层面的伦理价值。科技崇拜思想的盛行会激活“少数人”内心的酒神式“迷狂”因子，使其罔顾生命伦理。在亨特的折叠实验中，他对一张白纸以及自己身体的“冷静”处理似乎充分诠释了科技的“理性”，而“理性”背后潜伏着一种“不顾行为后果的”的“非理性”（韦伯 57）。在论证“无表面的平面”原理时，亨特只考虑到如何让实验对象消失，而没有考虑或根本就不能实现如何让实验对象回归，这显然是一个充满漏洞的科技发现，但对于旨在步入学术主流或构建学术权威地位的亨特来说，这个不完美的“重大发现”足以满足其欲求。唏嘘的是，在面临物化欲求与生命伦理的抉择时，处于迷狂状态的亨特选择了物化欲求。从文学伦理学的角度看，亨特身上非理性的兽性因子开始膨胀，致使他身上自由意志的失控（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子》8）。自由意志的失控只会助长虚假需求，而虚假需求的肆虐会遮蔽人类的视野，使其难以认识整个社会的病态并把握医治弊病的时机，进而沦落为错把社会同一性需要当作个人差异化需要的“单向度的人”（马尔库塞 6）。在虚假需求的遮蔽下，亨特已经不能清晰区分

社会同一性和个人差异性的界限，更不能做出体现理性意志的伦理选择，而只能在科技崇拜思想的裹挟下以“飞蛾扑火”之势奔向“无意识激情”铸就的深渊，最终通过无意识的自杀成为盲目科技崇拜的殉道者。凭借对科技力量的盲目崇拜，亨特满腹激情地以自己身体为媒介勇敢进行折叠实验，而他内心根本没有预期到生命将一去不返的悲剧，依然“无知”地期待某日回到英格兰取回交给他人暂存的论文。激情背后的无知与无能充分体现了亨特对自身生命权的践踏，这也恰恰是这场学术悲剧最大的痛点。

二、难以言说的误杀——科学实验与友情悲剧

在科学乌托邦主义的蔓延浸染下，人类实践的目标和价值被置换成某个研究领域的构成要素，充满了工具理性特征，而其价值指称逐渐弱化。作为建构科学乌托邦甚至践行科学乌托邦的一个途径，科学实验是人类对科学发展与人类未来之间关系的不断猜测、解答和试错（邬晓燕 62）。虽然试错法在推动科学进步方面发挥着重要作用，但与此同时试错的频频出现会激化现代科学与社会生活的矛盾张力。一旦缺失了前置性道德引导与后置性的伦理匡正，科学实验就易于陷入以人性沦丧和人的物化为代价的异化状态（杨怀中 249），进而引发不可估量的灾难，这在人体实验领域体现得尤为突出。

《立体几何》中“我”的曾祖父和“M”堪称一对儿交情甚久也甚密的朋友，然而他们的深厚友情却在科学实验的干扰下瞬间不复存在。外祖父虽然不是一个名正言顺的科技工作者，但“爱好清谈、数字和理论”的他却“喜欢以数学家自居”（麦克尤恩 4）；“M”的身份虽然在文中没有交代清楚，但是他同样“颇具学究气”（麦克尤恩 6）。或许正是共通的“学究气”使得曾祖父和“M”在十几年的交往中建立起了深厚的友谊。从差异性看，具有实干风格的“M”不仅“深谙今世风尚”，“对伦敦了如指掌，多次到过欧洲大陆”，而且“熟知社会主义和达尔文学说”（麦克尤恩 10）等当时流行的社会思潮，因此是一个在“现实”社会中游刃有余的社会人；而“我”的曾祖父则是一个从年轻时代就“嗜好坐在炉火边论证推理”（麦克尤恩 10）、而对“屋外”世界几乎不管不问的科技人。二人的差异恰巧以互补形式加深了其友情，即在世俗社会纵横捭阖的“M”可以为只沉湎于科学论证的曾祖父提供源源不断的实验素材。

无论是从交往时间看，还是从交流内容看，“M”与“我”曾祖父的友情都是经得起考验的，但是二人的友情最终只是虚化为科技崇拜的牺牲品。确切地说，“M”最终成了曾祖父科学实验中没有任何生命尊严与价值的“物”，也可以说成为在一场人体实验中失去自我主体意识的实验对象。“M”的悲剧充分再现了人体实验等诸多科技实验活动的高风险性以及背后更为严峻的伦理价值缺失问题。在科技理性主义盛行的现代社会中，人类道德取向不确定性的产生摆脱不了利益追逐、权力获取、欲望满足等因素的影响。一旦科技

实验的物性价值超越道德价值，科技活动隐匿的风险性就会日趋显现，甚至引发灾难。《立体几何》中“我”的曾祖父虽然不是一个真正意义上的科学家，但却是一个拥有强烈执着科学实验意识的“专业”业余科技爱好者。作为一个“专业”的业余科技爱好者，曾祖父既没有自觉的风险预防意识，也没有系统的风险防范能力，更缺乏应有的伦理道德价值和人文关怀意识。在他的世界观中，友情中的交往自由原则已经在不知不觉中让渡给了利益原则。对于“我”曾祖父来说，所谓的利益只是为了满足纯粹而疯狂的科学知识探索欲望。在成功劝说“M”为其取回论文、并经过反复推演之后，“我”曾祖父终于重建了苏格兰数学家大卫·亨特早年提出的“无表面的平面”理论。至此，曾祖父的科学实验算是一种突破性成功，但是他并没有停下探索的脚步，而是再接再厉地主导了一场有违生命道德伦理的人体实验。

在人体实验中，虽然对象有所不同，但就科技伦理而论则是相同的：人体实验必须保护、尊重和促进人的生命价值和尊严，最重要的是取得受试者的知情同意和自由选择，避免任何形式的诱导、欺骗和强迫（王学川 137-138）。但在作品以人体实验为基础的特定伦理环境中，随着“我”曾祖父科学探索欲望的疯狂膨胀，他的伦理身份开始变化，进而导致伦理混乱。这种伦理混乱表现为理性的缺乏以及对禁忌的漠视或破坏（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语》21）。“我”曾祖父不再把友情当作人类宝贵的精神财富，反倒利用友情积极怂恿挚友“M”参与实验，这既是情感理性缺失的表现，也是对人体实验基本伦理的无视与践踏。“M”则出于对“无表面的平面”理论的怀疑或好奇，以“被动”形式借助怀疑论者身份“主动”参与了实验。作为一个怀疑论者，“M”显然不明白、也不相信实验存在的风险，而对于“我”曾祖父来说，他只是渴望看到实验结果，同样不了解或根本就无暇无心顾及可能的风险。从性质上看，这场荒唐人体实验既是一场违背知情同意原则的欺骗实验，也是违背人道主义的强迫实验。作为实验的主导者，“我”曾祖父充分利用了友情关系和朋友的怀疑论者身份，以诱导、欺骗和强迫形式让“M”成为一名受试者，并亲手误杀了“M”。之所以说“我”曾祖父的行为是误杀，是因为无法确定他杀害朋友“M”的动机，而只能确定他怂恿“M”参与实验的动机。至于实验带来的后果，他和“M”都是无法预料的。在此意义上，“我”曾祖父和“M”都是不折不扣的怀疑论者。遗憾的是，“我”曾祖父最终成为了一个误杀朋友的刽子手，“M”则成为了一个被朋友误杀的牺牲品。“我”曾祖父误杀“M”的行为正是科学人战胜社会人的隐喻缩影。作为社会人的代表，“M”之死既是对科学实验肆虐发展的无奈退缩，也是对友情退场进而演化成悲剧的无声回应。

三、步步为营的谋杀——科技滥用与家庭悲剧

除了盲目的科技崇拜和科学实验，科技滥用也是科技理性主义思想蔓延

的恶果。虽然如影随形的科技怀疑主义思想家们一直在尝试通过揭示文明社会的种种危机，来对人类的过激行为和偏执理念提出警告，为科技发展提供可资借鉴的价值坐标（赵建军 80），但终究因为式微而无法真正阻遏科技滥用行为的加剧。科技滥用不仅让作为人类创造之物的技术得到了“反转”的主体性地位，颠覆了其“为人的”基本伦理特质，而且让人的生命化为愚钝的物质力量（马克思 580），沦为技术霸权的牺牲品。科技滥用凸显了技术霸权的意识形态性，其结果往往是具有技术优势的权力持有者对弱势群体的碾压。技术霸权不仅仅体现在国家之间、公司之间等经济政治领域，而且作为一种隐形意识形态，已经渗透到非政治化的广大居民意识中（哈贝马斯 63）。

在《立体几何》中，叙述者“我”借助科技手段对妻子步步为营的谋杀正是技术霸权在家庭伦理场域等非政治化层面渗透的表现。“我”对科技的痴迷和滥用完全把技术霸权主义推进到了“恣意妄为”的境地，而这种极端化做法势必让技术发展偏离民主化方向（李树德，曾长秋 106），进而铸就不可挽回的家庭悲剧。“我”和妻子梅茜结婚六年来一直矛盾冲突不断，既没有和谐的性生活，也没有深度的情感交流。对于“我”来说，婚姻已经成为一个枷锁，因此整理发表完曾祖父的日记之后与妻子离婚是摆脱婚姻困境的首要选择，然而对技术的占有却让“我”有了新的选择，即用曾祖父日记中基于“无表面的平面”理论的人体折叠技术来谋杀妻子。“我”在离婚与谋杀之间的抉择完全是一个伦理选择过程，而这个选择过程取决于“我”的脑文本。根据文学伦理学的观点，脑文本决定人的生活方式和道德行为，决定人的存在，决定人的本质。一个人的思想和行为是由脑文本决定的，一个人的伦理和道德也是由脑文本决定的。因此，什么样的脑文本就决定什么样的思想与行为，或者说，什么样的脑文本决定什么样的人（聂珍钊，《脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评》33）。在此意义而言，“我”的脑文本已经在兽性因子的怂恿下背离了伦理价值，也导致“我”的行动抉择缺乏相应的伦理意识。

在“我”的脑文本框架中，沉湎工作和试图摆脱婚姻原本是并行不悖的两大关键词，但在占有令人震颤的“人体折叠技术”之后，“我”就把两个关键词合二为一——用技术谋杀妻子。显然，在现代技术社会中，技术不仅影响着人们对外部世界的感知，也参与共塑着人们的行为选择与行为方式。这种共塑其实是一种非中立的技术调解，具有显著的伦理意向性（贾璐萌，陈凡 39）。遗憾的是，在一个道德模糊性的后现代时代，人类虽然拥有以前从未享受过的选择自由（鲍曼 24），但其选择本身却面临着伦理意向不确定的状态。人类伦理意向的不确定，必然导致其伦理敏感度的不断降低，也势必导致人类伦理责任意识的淡化甚至丧失。就是在这种不确定状态下，叙述者“我”只是“迟疑了片刻”（麦克尤恩 25）就决定在妻子身上进行“人体折叠”

实验,而“我”唯一能确定的就是:疲惫感让“我”突然产生了如此欲念。“我”的疲惫不只是纯粹的身体疲惫,更重要的是对妻子和婚姻的疲惫。所谓的疲惫只不过是掩盖“我”谋杀妻子的借口而已,真正的原因是“我”早已丧失了“人之为人”的基本伦理善恶观念,或曰“我”的脑文本在技术的调解干预下已发生了异化。

脑文本的异化让“我”作为人的情感钝化为“物”,而情感的物化让家庭悲剧增添了一种骇人的色彩。一方面,情感物化的“我”更加沉湎技术,把占有技术霸权当作人生为数不多、甚至唯一的追求,进而继续忽视或无视妻子的生理需求和情感需求,让原本脆弱的夫妻关系雪上加霜。也正是基于此种状况,“我”对妻子只有嫌弃、怨恨,甚至仇恨,因此尽管妻子通过正式道歉以求换得“我”的谅解,从而恢复或重建美好的家庭生活,但“我”根本不为所动,只是佯装答应,反而坚定了杀妻之心,并紧接着在夫妻恩爱过程中用“人体折叠技术”把轻信爱情的妻子毁灭。由于缺乏基于相互尊重和相互承认的话语沟通环境,“我”和妻子之间早已构筑了一道不平等的话语桥梁。在这种不对等的话语伦理关系中,妻子完全处于有“声”无“力”的弱势地位,妻子的话语已经在或隐或显中沦为技术霸权的牺牲品。另一方面,情感物化的“我”在人性堕落之路上越陷越深,进而加速了家庭悲剧的诞生。

“我”不仅利用妻子对爱情的笃信心态,精心策划出充满爱情仪式的技术谋杀圈套,而且在步步为营的谋杀中,面对妻子在消失过程中的挣扎、悲呼和疼痛,没有任何的情感触动或丝毫悔意,依旧沉醉于技术带来的快感,只是惊叹于折叠过程中妻子肢体对称呈现出来的“令人神魂颠倒的魔力”,并“感到神情恍惚,头皮发麻”(麦克尤恩 28)。“我”利用妻子的情感漏洞精心设计谋杀的行为已经令人触目惊心,而对妻子身体的疼痛,“我”不但表现得无动于衷,反而把其作为个人快感的基础,则更是令人毛骨悚然。在这场家庭悲剧中,“我”俨然是一个丧心病狂的技术霸权占有者和谋杀者,而妻子则是情感物化和技术霸权的双重牺牲品。

结语

《立体几何》借助三层叙事结构展现了技术伦理失衡酿就的“折叠”死亡悲剧,具有较强的现代寓言意义。作品借助三个死亡悲剧的营造,一方面呈现了 1870 年代以来科技理性主义思想蔓延发展的过程,揭示了人类崇拜技术、沉迷科学实验、追逐技术霸权等疯狂状态;另一方面呈现了现代社会中技术形塑人类生活的演进过程,揭示了技术干预下人类伦理意识趋向模糊的物化惨状。作品中亨特、“M”和妻子等三人之死虽然具有一定的魔幻现实色彩,但是可以启示读者思索现代社会技术崇拜背后的道德危机。遗憾的是,麦克尤恩在《立体几何》中只是通过技术伦理书写描绘了一幅具有反乌托邦意味的现代寓言图景,披露了技术异化和情感物化合谋造成的人类伦理危机,

但并没有给出一个具有现实意义的解决方案。在技术愈加盛行的当下，或许无人可以提供所谓的终极解决方案。作品中提及的“人体折叠”技术目前虽然尚未出现，但近年来换头术、基因编辑婴儿的出现以及人工智能技术的飞速发展似乎在某种程度上验证了《立体几何》的技术寓言性。人类只是借助所谓的技术任性地把人体消失于无形、任性地编辑基因，却对如何恢复或拯救消失的身体、如何让基因编辑婴儿健康成长则置若罔闻，根本没有对应的伦理责任意识。这种把人的身体和生命盲目任性技术化的行为是当今社会的严重伦理危机。这不仅是对人类生命尊严的严重挑战，而且是对人类道德伦理的无情践踏。麦克尤恩虽然在《立体几何》中没有提供应对危机的有效方案，但却呈现了技术非中立化的严重后果，具有深刻的警示意义。在技术崇拜思想甚嚣尘上的时代，科学发展应当回归到尊重生命、善待生命的初心本位，而包括科学工作者在内的所有世人都应当怀有强烈的危机意识和伦理责任意识，要对不断加速发展的新技术及其后果做出系统评估，需要重新确认人类的位置，呼唤构建一种和谐的生命伦理秩序。

Works Cited

- 齐格蒙特·鲍曼：《后现代伦理学》，张成岗译。南京：江苏人民出版社，2003年。
- [Bauman, Zygmunt. *Postmodern Ethics*. Trans. Zhang Chenggang. Nanjing : Jiangsu People Publishing, 2003.]
- 哈贝马斯：《作为“意识形态”的技术与科学》，李黎、郭官义译。上海：学林出版社，1999年。
- [Habermas J.. *Technology and Science as Ideology*. Trans. Li Li and Guo Guanyi. Shanghai: Xuelin Press, 1999.]
- 贾璐萌 陈凡：“技术调解下道德主体的重构探究”，《自然辩证法研究》6 (2018): 39-43。
- [Jia Lumeng and Chen Fan. “Research on the Reconstruction of Moral Subject in Technology Mediation.” *Studies in Dialectics of Nature* 34.6 (2018): 39-43.]
- 蓝纯：“伊恩·麦克尤恩其人其作”，《外国文学》6 (1998): 24-28。
- [Lan Chun. “Ian McEwan and His Writings.” *Foreign Literature* 6 (1998): 24-28.]
- 李树德 曾长秋：“第三条道路：在乌托邦与敌托邦之间——芬伯格技术批判理论建构的三个向度”，《求索》10 (2013): 103-106。
- [Li Shude and Zeng Changqiu. “The Third Road: between Utopia and Dystopia—the Three Dimensions of Feinberg’s critical theory of technology.” *Seeker* 10 (2013): 103-06.]
- 陆建德：“‘文明生活的本质’——读麦克尤恩的《阿姆斯特丹》”，《世界文学》6 (2000) : 289-300。
- [Lu Jiande. “‘The Essence of Civilized Life’——Reading *Amsterdam* by Ian McEwan.” *World Literature* 6 (2000): 289-300.]
- Malcolm, David. *Understanding Ian McEwan*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2002.
- 马尔库塞：《单向度的人》，刘继译。上海：上海译文出版社，2006年。

- [Marcuse, Herbert. *One Dimensional Man*. Trans. Liu Ji. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2006.]
- 卡尔·马克思：“〈在人民报〉创刊纪念会上的演说”，选自《马克思恩格斯文集》。第2卷。中共中央编译局编译。北京：人民出版社，2009年。
- [Marx, Carl. "Speech at Anniversary of *The People's Paper*." *Marx/Engels Collected Works* (volume II). Trans. Central Compilation and Translation Bureau. Beijing: People's Publishing house, 2009.]
- 伊恩·麦克尤恩：《最初的爱情，最后的仪式》，潘帕译。上海：上海译文出版社：2018年。
- [McEwan, Ian. *First Love, Last Rites*. Trans. Pan Pa. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2018.]
- 汉斯·摩根索：《科学人对抗权力政治》，杨吉平译。上海：上海译文出版社，2017年。
- [Morgenthau, Hans. *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics*. Trans. Yang Jiping. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2017.]
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子”，《外国文学研究》6 (2011): 1-13。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Ethical Choice and Sphinx Factor ." *Foreign Literature Studies* 33.6 (2011): 1-13.]
- ：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”，《外国文学研究》1 (2010): 12-22。
- [—."Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms ." *Foreign Literature Studies* 32.1 (2010): 12-22.]
- ：“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”，《外国文学研究》5 (2017): 26-34 页。
- [—."The Forming Mechanism of Brain Text and Brain Concept in Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Foreign Literature Studies* 39. 5 (2017): 26-34.]
- 尚必武：“非自然叙事的伦理阐释——《果壳》的胎儿叙述者及其脑文本演绎”，《外国文学研究》40.3 (2018): 30-42。
- [Shang Biwu. "An Ethical Interpretation of Unnatural Narrative: The Foetus Narrator and Its Brian Text in Ian McEwan's *Nutshell*." *Foreign Literature Studies* 40.3 (2018): 30-42.]
- 王健：《现代技术伦理规约》。沈阳：东北大学出版社，2007年。
- [Wang Jian. *Ethical Stipulation for Modern Technology*. Shenyang: Northeastern UP, 2014.]
- 王学川：《科技伦理价值冲突及其化解》。杭州：浙江大学出版社，2016年。
- [Wang Xuechuan. *The Value Conflict of Scientific and Technological Ethics and Its Resolution*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang UP, 2016.]
- 马克斯·韦伯：《经济与社会》（第1卷），阎克文译。上海：上海人民出版社，2010年。
- [Weber, Max. *Economy and Society* (volume I). Trans. Yan Kewen. Shanghai: Shanghai People Press, 2010.]
- Wells, L. Ian McEwan[G]//Shaffer, B. W. *The Encyclopedia of Twentieth-Century Fiction*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
- 郭晓燕：《科学乌托邦主义的建构与解构》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2013年。
- [Wu Xiaoyan. *Construction and Deconstruction of Scientific Utopianism*. Beijing: China Social

Sciences Press, 2013.]

杨怀中：《现代科学技术的伦理反思》。北京：高等教育出版社，2013 年。

[Yang Huaizhong. *Ethical Retrospection of Modern Science and Technology*. Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2013.]

余华：《伊恩·麦克尤恩后遗症》，《作家》2008 年第 8 期，第 4-6 页。

[Yu Hua. "The After Effect of Ian McEwan." *Writer Magazine*. no. 8, 2008, pp. 4-6.]

赵建军：“技术悲观主义的价值功能”，《东北大学学报（社会科学版）》2 (2002): 79-82。

[Zhao Jianjun. "Value and Role of Technology Pessimism." *Journal of Northeastern University (Social Science)* 4.2 (2002): 79-82.]

周立斌：《卢卡奇的物化理论及其演变》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2012 年。

[Zhou Libin. *Lukacs' Materialization Theory and its Evolution*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2012.]

《地下世界》中的伦理与政治：核竞赛的伦理选择与冷战妄想狂的记忆重构

Ethics and Politics in *Underworld*: Ethical Choice of Nuclear Arms Race and the Reconstruction of the Memory of Cold War Paranoia

陈俊松（Chen Junsong）

内容摘要：在1951年10月4日这天《纽约时报》的头版上，有两条并列的大标题：左边是巨人队打出了一个极具戏剧性的本垒打，最终夺冠；右边是苏联又进行了一次核爆炸实验。在以这两个事件为背景、堪称冷战史诗的小说《地下世界》里，当代美国著名小说家德里罗采用了回溯性叙述，全景式地再现了冷战时期美苏之间的剑拔弩张。《地下世界》深刻揭露了美国 and 苏联为了赢得核竞赛所做出的伦理选择及其给国民健康和生态环境造成的严重伦理后果。小说对美苏之间开展意识形态对抗、彼此固守根深蒂固的敌意和偏见的冷战思维进行了批判，并在此基础上重构了那段特定的政治氛围下冷战妄想狂的文化记忆。

关键词：唐·德里罗；《地下世界》；伦理；政治；冷战；文化记忆

作者简介：陈俊松，文学博士，现为华东师范大学外语学院英语系副教授。上海外国语大学文学博士、复旦大学外国语言文学博士后，哈佛大学富布赖特研究学者（2018-2019）。主要从事二十世纪美国文学、叙事学、文化记忆理论方面的研究。本文系国家社科基金青年项目《文化记忆理论与战后美国文学重构研究》【项目编号：16CWW020】的阶段性成果。

Title: Ethics and Politics in *Underworld*: Ethical Choice of Nuclear Arms Race and the Reconstruction of the Memory of Cold War Paranoia

Abstract: The front page of *New York Times* of October 4, 1951 was dominated by two parallel titles: on the left “Giants Capture Pennant, Beating Dodgers 5-4 in 9th on Thomson’s 3-Run Homer,” on the right “Soviet Second Atom Blast in 2 Years Revealed by U.S.; Details Are Kept a Secret.” Drawing on these two events, Don DeLillo’s massive novel *Underworld*, in its reminiscent narration, delineates the fierce confrontation between the two Cold War rivals in a panoramic fashion. In particular, *Underworld* exposes the ethical choice made by the U.S. and the

Soviet Union which were competing for supremacy in the nuclear arms race, and the serious ethical consequences brought about to their citizens and the ecological system. It offers a critique of their engagement in ideological competition and adherence to deep-rooted hostility to and prejudice against each other. As an epic novel about the Cold War, *Underworld* reconstructs the cultural memory of the Cold War paranoia of that special political climate.

Keywords: Don DeLillo; *Underworld*; ethics; politics; the Cold War; cultural memory

Author: Chen Junsong, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of English at the School of Foreign Languages, East China Normal University (Shanghai, China 200241). His areas of research include twentieth century American literature, narratology, and cultural memory studies (Email: jschen@english.ecnu.edu.cn).

引言

在 1951 年 10 月 4 日这天《纽约时报》的头版上, 有两条并列的大标题: 左边是巨人队的汤姆森用一个极具戏剧性的本垒打以 5 比 4 战胜道奇队, 最终夺冠; 右边是美国情报部门探测到前苏联在两年内第二次进行原子弹爆炸。在某种意义上, 棒球代表着民众对娱乐活动的狂热, 蘑菇云则代表了终极毁灭带来的恐惧, 而这二者的并存, 可以说代表了冷战时期美国的生存状态。以这两个事件为背景的《地下世界》(*Underworld*, 1997) 被评论界普遍认为是当代著名美国小说家唐·德里罗 (Don DeLillo, 1936—) 最重要的作品。有评论家把它看作“一个重要的文学事件, 一部主要的当代美国小说, 也许那个十年 [1990 年代] 最受关注的作品” (Ruppersburg and Engles 2)。《地下世界》曾长期占据畅销书榜, 是世界各国读者了解 20 世纪后半叶美国历史的重要文学文本。自出版以来, 国内外学者从后现代主义、叙事学、消费主义、生态主义、垃圾美学、媒介文化等视角对《地下世界》进行了深入的研究。除了个别学者关注到了小说中的技术伦理之外¹, 探讨这部小说的伦理价值和批判力量的研究迄今暂不多见。

所谓文学的伦理价值, 是指“文学的正面道德教诲价值” (聂珍钊, “文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构” 88)。一般而言, 伦理学关心的是“道德价值和正确的行动” (程栋 1)。在文学伦理学批评理论体系中, 伦理主要指的是“文学作品中在道德行为基础上形成的抽象的道德准则与规范” (聂珍钊《文学伦理学批评导论》254)。文学伦理学批评是在借鉴和吸收西方伦

1 朱荣华的论文对《地下世界》中的技术伦理进行了探讨, 指出小说谴责了冷战时期过于迷恋技术理性, 倡导环保地使用技术。参见 朱荣华: “《地下世界》中的技术伦理”, 《外国文学评论》(1) 2012: 185-200。

理批评和中国道德批评的基础上创建的一种新文学批评理论和方法。在聂珍钊教授看来,文学伦理学批评与传统的道德批评的不同之处在于“它不是从今天的道德立场简单地对历史的文学进行好与坏的道德价值判断,而是强调回到历史的伦理现场,进入文学的伦理环境或伦理语境中,站在当时的伦理立场上解读和阐释文学作品”(Ross 10)。在一次访谈中,耶鲁大学英文系教授克劳德·罗森(Claude Rawson)指出,文学伦理学批评的“首要价值不仅在于它是系统性的学说,更在于它鼓舞学者参与到文学文本交流的实践中来”,而且其“伦理内涵突出地表现在它摆脱了规定性或定义性的束缚”(Chen 390-391)。文学伦理学批评以其鲜明的伦理视角和跨学科视域为解读文学作品提供了新的路径和方法。

道德教诲和政治批判原本是早期文学批评中重要的组成部分,但随着唯美主义、二十世纪形式主义文论(俄国形式主义、英美新批评、法国结构主义等)的兴起,审美原则成为了文学批评的基本规范,文本自身一度成了意义的唯一来源,文学的伦理和政治解读遭到排斥。然而,即使是以质疑宏大叙事、反对权威、去除中心为主要追求的后现代主义批评也无法将文学同伦理和政治完全割裂开来。有学者甚至指出,“在后现代的语境下,文学与道德哲学的交叉与融合显得越来越突出”(刘英 94)。

著名后现代主义文论家弗雷德里克·詹姆逊(Fredric Jameson, 1934—)在其《政治无意识》(*The Political Unconscious*, 1981)一书的开篇写道:“本书将论证对文学文本进行政治阐释的重要性(priority)。它不把政治视角当作某种补充方法,也不将其作为当下流行的其他阐释方法的选择性辅助[……]而是作为一切阅读和一切阐释的绝对视域”(Jameson 1)。同时,詹姆逊还指出,“在本书中,我们将较少关注那些形式或文体、纯文本的分析模式”,而要为“仍是当今文学和文化批评的主要形式(predominant form)”的伦理批评(ethical criticism)“留出首要的篇幅”(Jameson 44)。事实上,在当代西方众多的批评理论当中,伦理批评和政治批评(或称意识形态批评)这两种批评方法不仅占有重要的地位,而且二者之间的关系还非常密切。著名美国伦理批评家布思(Wayne C. Booth, 1921—2005)在其《我们所交的朋友:小说伦理学》(*The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*, 1988)一书中写道:

王尔德论述的方式显示了为什么严肃的伦理批评无法最终和政治批评脱离开来。当我们在谈论个人在变化时我们也是在谈论社会在变化。正如大多数自柏拉图和亚里士多德以来的哲学家们所坚持的,伦理和政治是相互依存的(depend on each other)。然后,我们也许可以把“伦理的”这个术语进一步拓展,将其涵盖所有的政治批评,作为与很多人称为意识形态批评大致相当的一个同义词。(Booth 12)

如此看来, 伦理批评本身就包含了政治批评, 二者完全可以综合运用以揭示文学作品中的深层意蕴。在《地下世界》这部堪称冷战史诗的小说里, 德里罗采用回溯性叙述, 从棒球、原子弹、核废料等具有典型美国特征的文化要素作为切入口, 追述了从 20 世纪五十年代初到九十年代的整个冷战史, 全景式地再现了冷战时期美苏之间剑拔弩张的政治氛围。在解读《地下世界》时, 小说中蕴含的伦理警示意义和政治批判不容忽视。本文将从文学伦理学批评和文化记忆理论的视角, 聚焦《地下世界》中的伦理和政治, 考察小说如何反思和批判美苏为了核竞赛所做出的伦理选择及其对国民健康和生态环境造成的严重伦理后果, 并重构那个特定政治氛围中冷战妄想狂的文化记忆。

一、棒球与原子弹: 美苏对峙的隐喻

“冷战” (cold war) 这个词较早出自英国著名政治小说家乔治·奥威尔 (George Orwell) 于 1945 年 10 月 19 日发表的一篇题为《你和原子弹》 (“You and the Atom Bomb”) 的文章。在杜鲁门总统下令对广岛、长崎投下原子弹两个月以后, 奥威尔在震惊之余, 预测世界上会形成这样的景象: “两三个巨大的超级大国, 每个都拥有在几秒钟内毁灭数百万人的武器, 他们把世界分成两半”。在这样的核恐怖平衡下, 会出现“既不可战胜又与周边国家处于永久的‘冷战’状态”的新格局 (Orwell 9)。1947 年 4 月 16 日, 美国金融家、总统顾问伯纳德·巴鲁克 (Bernard Baruch) 在南卡罗来纳州众议院的演讲中使用了“冷战”这个词, 来形容当时美国和苏联之间日趋冷淡的关系。这种状态与二战期间它们曾是并肩作战的同盟这一事实形成鲜明对照。他警告在场的听众, “让我们不要受到欺骗——我们今天正处于一场冷战当中”¹。此后, “冷战”一词被广泛用来指代二战结束后美苏这两个意识形态截然不同的超级大国及其盟国在政治、军事、经济、科技、舆论宣传等众多领域展开的对峙和竞争。而从 1949 年苏联原子弹爆炸成功到 1962 年古巴导弹危机, 堪称冷战期间美苏对抗最紧张的时期。相对于通常意义上的战争, “冷战”虽然没有硝烟和炮火, 但在敌对的两个阵营之间仍然剑拔弩张、一触即发。

奥威尔在使用“冷战”一词时是跟原子弹相联系在一起的, 德里罗的长篇巨制《地下世界》也是以写苏联进行原子弹爆炸开篇的。众所周知, 美国秘密研制原子弹最初的目的是为了应对德国可能造成的威胁, 但纳粹德国在美国原子弹试验之前就投降了。1945 年 7 月 16 日, 美国在新墨西哥州的阿拉莫可德沙漠里成功爆炸世界上第一颗原子弹, 随后把原子弹实际运用于针对日本的军事行动。与此同时, 美国对苏联这个战时同盟却日益感到担忧和不安。二战期间, 美国和欧洲盟国非常依赖苏联军力来共同应对德国。但现在有了原子弹这个人类历史上最具杀伤力的武器, 在对付日本这个问题上, 美国对苏联给予军事帮助的需求不复存在了。因此, 事实上“原子弹本身加深了苏

1 参见 <https://www.politico.com/story/2010/04/bernard-baruch-coins-term-cold-war-april-16-1947-035862>

联和美国之间的不信任”（Gaddis 25）。而斯大林认为“广岛震惊了整个世界，平衡被毁灭了……这绝不允许”（Gaddis 26）。随着苏联在研制原子弹方面的追赶，并于1949年8月29日成功爆炸了苏联的第一颗原子弹，美国的核垄断被打破。美国本土随时可能遭受来自苏联的原子弹袭击，这几乎成为整个五十年代美国民众最大的担忧。

《地下世界》的情节当中有三条核心线索：1. 原子弹试验与美苏之间核军备竞赛；2. 鲍比·汤姆森那个本垒打棒球的下落；3. 尼克·谢的垃圾处理公司的经营活动与核废料处理。从惯常的角度来看，棒球与原子弹似乎没有任何关联，将二者联系起来显得有些突兀。但在小说中，棒球与原子弹却被赋予了独特的联系。棒球无疑是20世纪最受美国民众欢迎的运动，而纽约同时拥有属于国家联盟（National League）的两支劲旅：纽约巨人队（1958年后改名为旧金山巨人队）和布鲁克林道奇队（1958年后改名为洛杉矶道奇队）。这两只球队都曾创造过辉煌的战绩，堪称势均力敌，都颇受球迷喜爱。1951年11月3日巨人队对阵道奇队这场锦标赛无疑受到全国的广泛关注，纽约的本地球迷更是强烈希望能获得冠军。虽然这只不过是场棒球比赛，但双方你争我抢、互不相让，双方的球迷几乎随时会大打出手。在某种意义上，巨人队与道奇队在球场上的比拼与当时美国与苏联在核武器上的竞赛颇有几分类似。

这场比赛最终以巨人队在得分落后的情况下，在第九局打出一个本垒打而戏剧性地获胜而告终。那个被媒体称之为“惊世一击”（The Shot Heard ‘Round the World’）的本垒打，其名称其实出自美国著名超验主义思想家、诗人、演说家爱默生（Ralph Waldo Emerson）的诗作《康科德赞歌》（“Concord Hymn”，1837）。在这首诗歌里，爱默生对在美国独立革命中打响“惊世一击”第一枪的美国先辈表达了赞扬：“精神的力量，让他们敢于 / 去死，而让他们的子孙自由 / ”（Emerson 130）。因此，鲍比·汤姆森这个扭转赛局的“惊世一击”实际上也被赋予了战争的隐喻意义。此外，棒球和原子弹还被作家赋予了更加具体和实在的联系。经过艰苦的对抗，巨人队因为鲍比·汤姆森打出了个戏剧性的本垒打，最终以五比四的比分获得了胜利。“巨人队胜利了！”这场势均力敌、分毫不让、比分紧咬的比赛给在场的观众以及收听电台转播的听众奉上了一场精彩的娱乐盛宴。而与此同时，身在看台上的联邦调查局局长胡佛却从手下的特工那里获得了苏联刚刚在某个秘密场所进行了一次核试验的情报。此时，看台上的观众发出了震耳欲聋的喊声，胡佛想到的却是“吞噬众多城市的热核”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 24）¹。在这里，巨人队的反败为胜与苏联在原子弹研发落后美国情况下取得第二次核爆炸成

1 本文有关《地下世界》的引文均来自 Don DeLillo, *Underworld* (New York: 1997), 译文为笔者自译，有些地方参考了严志忠的中译本：唐·德里罗：《地下世界》，严志忠译（南京：译林出版社，2013年），特此说明。

功之间也产生了某种神秘的联系。作家借小说中的一个人物——马文之口，直接道出了棒球与原子弹之间的这种关联：“整个事情似乎很有趣，因为苏联人在造原子弹时，听好了，他们造的那个放射性核的尺寸就跟棒球一样大”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 172）。因此，那个一语双关的“惊世一击”，无论指的是汤姆森的本垒打还是苏联的核爆炸，可以说宣告了冷战的开始（Fitzpatrick 155）。

在历史上，汤姆森那个本垒打的棒球下落不明，但在《地下世界》里这个棒球却被赋予了一段离奇的经历。它先是被溜进赛场的黑人男孩科特·马丁抢到并带回家，然后被科特的父亲曼克斯·马丁偷偷拿到扬基体育馆外以32.4美元卖了前来观看比赛的棒球迷查理。查理后来把棒球交给了儿子查克，查克把棒球弄丢了。而狂热的棒球纪念品收集者马文·伦迪终其一生都在追寻这个棒球的下落，他后来把这个棒球以34,500美元卖给了尼克。尼克退休后在重新整理书柜时，发现了当初买下的汤姆森本垒打的这个棒球。因此，这个数度易主、几经辗转的棒球经历了从1951年棒球比赛到1990年代尼克回到凤凰城的曲折历程，成为整个冷战史的一个见证。

二、“下风者”和“畸胎博物馆”：冷战中国对公民的伦理责任

在西方政治思想史上，政治的主体实际上处于不断的演变当中。古希腊哲学家（以亚里士多德为代表）是用城邦来定义政治，中世纪经院哲学家（如奥古斯丁、阿奎那等）则用上帝和神学来定义政治，而随着西欧的教会统一体在16世纪解体，作为中立统一体的现代国家（如法国、英国等）逐渐成为定义政治的主体。国家和公民的关系也就成为了西方政治学讨论的核心主题。随着社会契约、自由主义等理论逐渐成为主导思想，保障公民的生命、自由、财产被视为西方现代国家存在的主要目的。

孟德斯鸠在《论法的精神》中指出“国家有义务保障全体公民的生存、食物、合适的衣着以及不损害健康的生活”（孟德斯鸠 518）。在《国家与公民：历史、理论、展望》（*States and Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects*, 2003）这部由剑桥学派思想史家昆廷·斯金纳（Quentin Skinner）等人主编的论文集中，学者们着重探讨了国家和公民的关系。在第三章《公民及其国家：回顾与展望》里，作者分析了作为臣民、纳税人、士兵等不同身份的公民与国家的关系，指出“公民与国家之间的关系是一种主体之间（intersubjective）的关系”（Poggi 42）。公民服从国家，履行纳税、服兵役、保境卫土等义务，国家则应该维持社会稳定，保护公民的安全、利益和尊严。国家与公民之间不仅存在法律关系，而且还存在伦理关系。学贯中西的著名哲学家梁漱溟也注意到，“旧日中国之政治构造，比国君为大宗子，称地方官为父母，视一国如一大家庭”，因此君臣官民之间存在伦理上的义务（梁漱溟 82）。英国哲学家索利（W. R. Sorley）在“国家的道德责任”（“The Morality of Nations”, 1891）一文中指出，“国

家行为是,或者应该是,为了所有人的共同利益;而牺牲财产,甚至是牺牲生命,只有是为了共同福祉时才是正当的”,因此,“国家必须看作对其公民负有责任”(Sorley 436)。尽管国家的道德与个人的道德不同,但并不意味着国家没有道德要求。不仅国家对其公民负有道德责任,而且还对其它国家也负有道德责任。公民有维护国家安全的义务,国家也有保护公民生命和健康的责任。

冷战是决定 20 世纪后半叶世界格局最重大的政治和军事现实。冷战期间很多重要事件都出现在了小说《地下世界》里,如朝鲜战争、支持者为麦卡锡请愿、古巴导弹危机、苏联发射第一颗人造卫星、越南战争等。但与关于冷战史的历史著作或者教科书不同的是,这些事件在小说中只是一笔带过。《地下世界》真正要表现的是美国民众心理上的脆弱与敏感以及美苏为了核竞赛所做出的伦理选择以及造成的严重伦理后果。

作为文学伦理学批评的一个核心术语,伦理选择“具有两方面的意义。一方面,伦理选择 [ethical selection] 指的是人的道德选择,即通过选择达到道德成熟和完善;另一方面伦理选择 [ethical choice] 指对两个或两个以上的道德选项的选择,选择不同则结果不同,因此不同选择有不同的伦理价值”(聂珍钊《文学伦理学批评导论》266-267)。有学者指出,文学作品中体现出的伦理选择最常见的有两类:“一类是将危害社会和伦理秩序的伦理选择转换为警示或劝诫;另一类是将体现楷模或榜样作用的伦理选择转换为道德范例进行鼓励”(陈后亮 40)。致力于维护世界和平并保护国民的生命和健康,还是不惜一切代价赢得意识形态上的激烈对抗,这是冷战期间美国和苏联面临的重大伦理选择。显而易见,这两种道德选项将带来完全不同的伦理价值。美国和苏联研制原子弹是为了获得绝对的竞争优势。试验成功后,这两个国家拥有其他国家无可比拟的军事优势。然而,实现这一目标是要付出代价的,甚至是牺牲本国国民的生命和健康。在小说《地下世界》中,地上试验时期内华达测试基地的工作人员和“下风者”(Downwinders,指住在下风位置的居民)因吸入放射性尘埃出现多发性骨髓瘤、肾衰竭、身体萎缩、呕吐、严重脱发等种种病变(DeLillo, *Underworld* 405)。埃里克告诉马特:“到处有婴儿生下来便缺胳膊少腿。一个本来健康的女人洗头发,结果头发一碰就落。你知道吗,她是个美人,一分钟之前还是满头黑发,转眼之间便完全秃顶了”

(DeLillo, *Underworld* 406)马特问:“这样的情况出现在什么地方?”埃里克说:“主要在犹他州南部,我听说,因为那里处于下风位置。不过,这样的情况也出现在其它地区。有的人得了腺癌。有的人像《旧约》出埃及记中满身出现大红疮。还有人长满大斑点和疹子。咳嗽之后大口吐血。捂着嘴巴的两手流淌鲜血,那是放射物引起的”(DeLillo, *Underworld* 406)。这些美国人民没有受到苏联原子弹的袭击,却受到美国核试验放射性尘埃的危害,造成了永远无法挽回的伤痛。

与此同时，苏联也在哈萨克斯坦秘密进行核试验，也因核辐射造成了极其严重的后果，当地居住的人民沦为实验品。最令人触目惊心的就是在塞米巴拉金斯克市，维克多带尼克和布赖恩参观的“畸胎博物馆”（Museum of Misshapens）时看到的种种畸形和惨状：

他把我们带到一个地方，他管它叫畸胎博物馆。那个地方隶属于医学研究所，低矮的房间里摆满装有胎儿的展柜[……]其中有一件标本是双头胎儿。一个头的脑袋是身体的两倍，一个大小正常的脑袋长错了地方，出现在右侧肩膀上。

[……]

后来，我们看到那个独眼畸胎。那只眼睛长到额头中间，两只耳朵长在下巴上，根本没有嘴巴。（DeLillo, *Underworld* 799）

站在原子弹试验基地，在新墨西哥州从事武器开发的马特和与俄罗斯和独联体高级官员关系密切的维克多开始怀疑，美国和苏联政府当年可能蓄意让一部分人暴露在核辐射当中，甚至用“小孩、婴儿、胎儿和精神病人做实验”，以便研究这种辐射对人体的伤害程度（DeLillo, *Underworld* 417-418, 801）。受到核辐射污染的环境将对人类的生存造成长久的伤害。有学者指出，“被用作核反应器燃料的铀-235的半衰期是 7.1×10^9 年。考虑到与安全存贮废弃物相关联的问题，这个半衰期为这代人提供了损害尚未出生的，或者甚至是想象中的数代人的可能性”（Dobson 220）。

为了获得军事上的战略优势，美国和苏联做出的伦理选择都造成了严重的人道主义危机，甚至犯下了泯灭人性的滔天罪行，完全背离了国家对公民应负有的伦理责任。当小说中的尼克问维克多：“有谁记得我们那时为什么要这样做呢？”维克多回答道：“为了竞争，你们赢了，我们输了。你必须告诉我心里感觉如何。大赢家”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 793）。“为了竞争”，维克多道出了冷战期间美苏之间展开一系列竞赛和对抗的目的所在，这也是冷战最本质的特征。生命权和健康权是公民享有的最基本的人权。在小说中，我们可以看出，为了拥有绝对的力量遏制对方，美国和苏联都陷入了不可自拔的偏执当中。冷战期间美苏为了核军备竞赛做出了错误的伦理选择，让无数国民沦为核辐射的牺牲品，破坏了国家与公民之间的正常的政治伦理关系，造成了严重的伦理后果。

三、从内华达到塞米巴拉金斯克：核试验的生态伦理后果

伦理一般是评价和判断人与人之间的关系和秩序，但随着时代的发展伦理的范畴也在不断扩大。很多超出个人、家庭、社会之间道德的问题也被纳入伦理讨论的范围，因此医学伦理、科技伦理、生态伦理等新话题应

运而生。被誉为“生态伦理之父”的著名美国生态学家奥尔多·利奥波德（Aldo Leopold, 1887—1948）在其《沙乡年鉴》（*A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*, 1949）一书的《大地伦理》（“The Land Ethic”）一文中指出“伦理范畴的扩大事实上是生态演化中的一个过程”（Leopold 202）。长期以来，在有关伦理的讨论中，自然界或生态系统并没有受到应有的重视。利奥波德写道，“[直到 20 世纪中叶]至今还没有一种伦理涉及人与土地、人与生长在土地上的动物和植物之间的关系”（Leopold 203）。他首创了“大地伦理”这一概念，“将[人类]共同体的外延扩大了，把土壤、水、植物和动物都纳入其中，或者可以用一个词来合称：大地（land）”（Leopold 204）。利奥波德“大地伦理”思想的核心是打破人与自然之间“征服与被征服”的传统观念以及“人类中心主义”思想，而将自然界视为与人类平等的成员。他写道：“简言之，大地伦理改变了现代人类在土地共同体中扮演的角色，使其从征服者变为共同体内的普通成员和公民。这意味着对其他正式成员的尊重，同时也是对于共同体本身的尊重”（Leopold 204）。

在人与自然的伦理秩序当中，是尊重自然、善待自然、与自然和谐共处，还是将自然视为攫取财富的源泉、赢得核军备竞赛的试验场，这是冷战期间美国和苏联面对的又一个重要的伦理选择。二战后，美国在新墨西哥州秘密进行核试验，而距离拉斯维加斯 65 英里的内华达试验场成了美国最重要的核武器试验场。1951 年至 1992 年期间美国政府在此进行了 1021 次核试验。而哈萨克斯坦的塞米巴拉金斯克（Semipalatinsk）试验场则是苏联最主要的核试验基地。从 1949 到 1989 年这四十年间苏联共在这里进行过 456 次各类核试验。尤其是 1989 年在此进行最后一次实验时发生核泄漏，给环境造成了严重的放射性污染。冷战期间，美苏之间为了疯狂的核竞赛，不仅给试验场当地居民的生命和健康造成了无可挽回的危害，而且让承受核试验的大地变得千疮百孔，给生态环境造成了永久性的破坏。德里罗在《地下世界》中深刻揭示了消费社会的发展、美苏冷战核竞赛给人与自然之间的生态伦理带来的危机。

尼克·谢（Nick Shay）是《地下世界》中的一个主要人物，整个小说可以在某种层面上被看作是他的传记。他介绍说，“我供职的公司与废物打交道，处理废物，买卖废物，研究全球废物处理问题[……]我们是废物管理人员，废物巨头，处理全球的废物”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 88）。垃圾处理是一个巨大的产业，是消费社会生产方式当中重要的一环。垃圾的不断增多甚至还会改变人们的思维方式。随着美国在 20 世纪二十年代左右进入消费社会，大规模生产不仅消耗了大量的资源，同时垃圾堆积也变得日益严重，并已成为影响人们思维的一种力量。小说借其中一个人物德特威勒之口说：“不消费就死亡。这就是我们的文化提出的要求。它最后都以倾倒告终。我们制造了大量的垃圾[……]我们让垃圾影响我们，控制我们的思维”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 287-289）。为实现攫取巨额财富的目的和满足消费的欲望，美国

社会陷入过度的生产、消费、扔弃的惯性当中，使正常的生态系统不堪重负。学者安德鲁·多布森（Andrew Dobson）主张，“规模有限的行星不能维持无限的经济增长，因此人们必须时刻注意经济的规模以及它对相关的可获得的资源的影响”（Dobson 258）。利奥波德也指出，“如果单纯以经济的利己主义为基础，环境保护体系必定失衡，走上死路”（Leopold 214）。垃圾也引出了我们对于小说标题《地下世界》（*Underworld*）含义的思考。显然，德里罗希望小说的标题具有某种多义性和模糊性。但它首先指向了在地下堆积成山的垃圾，因为越危险的垃圾掩埋越深，这便逐渐形成了一个巨大的“地下世界”。

此外，尼克对垃圾（尤其是核废料）还有着不同寻常的认识，“如今，废物具有一种神圣的光晕，一种不可触摸的侧面”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 88）。废物之所以变得“神圣”是因为这些废物（尤其是核废料）非常危险，让人心生恐惧。出于利己主义，这些处理垃圾的巨头选择把这些核废料深埋在地底深处或海底：“他们身穿登月服，把成桶的危险废物深埋于地下的盐床中。那地方是数百万年以前的中生代海洋干涸以后的遗迹[……]人们怀着尊崇感和恐惧感，把受到污染的废物深埋起来”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 88）。小说中尼克曾对维克多说，“在武器和废物之间，存在一种不可思议的联系[……]武器和废物是一对神秘的双胞胎[……]废物是秘密的历史，是地下的历史”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 791）。垃圾，尤其是核废料，不仅以无声的存在记录了美苏之间的核竞赛，还揭示了核试验严重破坏了人类与环境的“共生关系”（symbiosis）。

冷战期间，美苏为了赢得核竞赛进行了上千次的核试验，产生了巨量带有放射性的核废物。这种完全人造的毒害性垃圾最终却要我们赖以栖息的大地来承受和消化。在塞米巴拉金斯克，尼克得知，“在那个原子弹试验场，一共进行了五百次核试验，全在该市的西南面。即使大气核试验停止之后，因为地下爆炸挖掘的竖井深度不够，不能防止非常危险的辐射泄漏出来”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 799）。正如学者聂珍钊所指出的，“人类作为自然的主体”，应该“担负起保护和修复大自然的道德责任”（聂珍钊，“从人类中心主义到人类主体”31）。在处理核废料和保护环境之间，小说揭露了美国 and 苏联再一次在利己主义的驱动下选择了破坏自然而不是保护自然。虽然他们对核废物“产生了一种类似印第安人对土地的崇拜”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 289），但他们处理的办法不是修复，而是深埋和毁灭，让大量受到放射性污染的土地无法自我修复。维克托曾对尼克透露说：“我们并不挖掘，我们深埋它[……]我们通过核爆炸的方式，毁灭遭到污染的核废物”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 791）。在利奥波德看来，“大地伦理体现了一种生态的良知，而这反过来又反映出一种信念，即个体对于土地健康负有责任。这里说的健康，就是土地自我更新的能力”（Leopold 221）。《地下世界》中反映的美苏这

种一味索取、肆意破坏生态的行为，与倡导人与自然和谐共处的理念完全背道而驰，逃避了人类对保护自然应有的伦理责任。美苏双方在不惜一切代价进行核军备竞赛和生态保护之间做出了错误的伦理选择，表现了其背后狂热的对抗心理和妄想狂。

小说最后用“把一种渴望传遍这座城市阴冷的各个街区，向外飘过沉睡中的小河和果园，直至那孤寂的群山”的“和平”(Peace)这个一词结尾(DeLillo, *Underworld* 827)。这是小说沉痛地追述完整个冷战史后表达对未来的祈盼：不仅国与国之间停止战争，而且人类也不再对自然如此肆意毁坏，“召唤着世界所有的人，召唤着文明与自然的和平共处”（朱荣华 200）。

四、“13”与“卧倒躲避”：冷战妄想狂的记忆重构

在传统的观念中，文学只被视为文化的一部分和记忆保存的一种手段。在这种观念当中，文学是被动地当作记忆的携带者(carrier)。而在文化记忆的视角下，我们还看到文学能主动地参与记忆形成和重建，因为书写本身就是一种记忆行为。正如德国学者雷娜特·拉赫曼(Renate Lachmann)所指出，“文学是文化的记忆，不仅是一种简单的记录手法，而且也是众多的纪念行动……写作既是一种记忆行为，也是一种新的阐释”(Lachmann 301)。小说“序幕”部分写到的那场巨人队与道奇队的比赛是在1951年10月3日举行的。这个看似稀松平常的日期，在冷战氛围中都可能产生特殊的意义。尼克对西姆斯和法里什说：“我认为，第二天我便开始觉得各种各样的信号都指向13这个数字。到处都是噩运。[……]我记住了一个，那场比赛的日期。10月3日或者13。把月份和日子加起来，就得到13”(DeLillo, *Underworld* 95)。在西方文化中，“13”这个数字通常代表着“不幸”、“噩耗”、“灾难”等等，以至于在日常生活中产生了对这个数字的恐惧症。在《地下世界》中，巨人队夺得国家联盟冠军和苏联两年内第二次原子弹爆炸的日期包含有“13”，而这个数字在尼克的头脑中一直挥之不去：

自从前一天那场比赛结束以后，尼克脑袋里一直想着13这个数字[……]今天一整天，他脑袋里全是13这个数字。他要找一只铅笔把它们记下来才行。

布兰卡穿着13号球衣。

布兰卡今年赢了13场比赛。

巨人队开始棒球锦标赛时，落后道奇队13场半。

昨天那场比赛的日期，10月3日。把这两个数字加起来，得数是13。

巨人队今年赢了98场比赛，输了59场比赛[……]9、8、5、9。把这四个数字加起来，把这个得数倒过来，明白多少了吧？讨厌的家伙。

那个本垒打出现时的时间：3：58。把分钟数加起来，得数是13。

除此之外，如果你想了解每局得分情况，你可以拨打的电话号码是ME7-1212。M是英语字母表中的第13个字母；如果把电话号码中的五个数字加起来，得数又是13。

再看一看Branca这个名字吧[……]B的位置是2，R是18，以此类推，Branca这几个字母所处位置的字数之和是39。39有什么玄机呢？如果除以举行那场比赛的日期3，你得到的是13。

汤姆森的球衣号是23，减去举行那场比赛的月份10，你知道得数是多少了吧？”（DeLillo, *Underworld* 678-679）

在这里，尼克将与数字13有关的各种各样的情景拼贴在一起，使人感到眼花缭乱、不可思议，同时也再现了冷战氛围中人心惶惶、敏感脆弱、疯狂荒诞的心理状态。

在《地下世界》中，美国人对来自苏联的原子弹袭击的焦虑和恐惧是贯穿整部作品的一条重要线索。历史上，美国于1945年7月率先成功研制出了原子弹，这给美国民众带来的是一种绝对的安全感和优势地位。在美国政府和不少科学家的认知当中，此后相当长的一段时期美国会一直保持这种核垄断地位。然后，苏联第一颗原子弹的爆炸成功给美国带来了无底的恐惧和不安，他们的生活从此也发生了急剧的变化。在小说中，即便是在国家联盟锦标赛这样的重大赛事，也有不少棒球球迷因担心遭遇危险而选择待在家里收听电台的转播。布莱恩·格拉斯克与棒球纪念品收藏者马文·伦迪在回忆那次巨人队与道奇队的比赛时曾说：

“那是当年一场重要的比赛，为什么有那么多座位空着呢？”

“许多年以来的重要比赛。”马文说。

“许多年。”

“因为某些事情具有无意识恐惧的性质。我从内心深处坚信，人们在空气中感觉到某种灾难，关心的并不是谁将赢得比赛。某种可拍的力量会抹去——那个词语怎么说的？”

“抹去。”

“对，抹去。它可能抹去比赛这一档事。你得明白，在整个五十年代，人们待在室内，仅仅开车时才到外面去[……]。”

“换句话说，那时存在一种隐秘的心理：待在家里吧，因为空气中弥漫着一种威胁”。（DeLillo, *Underworld* 171-172）

1949年8月29日苏联成功地进行了第一颗原子弹试爆，美国的战略优势顿时丧失。随着美苏之间的对立日益加剧，美国民众担心广岛和长崎的悲剧

也可能发生在自己身上。进入五十年代以后,美国民众感到来自苏联的威胁变得越来越近。因此,作家才借小说中人物之口说出整个五十年代人们感到空气中都“弥漫着一种威胁”。政府、军队、学校、媒体、娱乐界都在围绕可能遭遇苏联的核打击而进行一系列的宣传、演练和鼓动。在马特上的天主教学校里,修女埃德加在教室里带领学生进行遭遇原子弹袭击的演练“卧倒躲避”(DeLillo, *Underworld* 718),一遍遍训练应对原子弹袭击的六条准则(DeLillo, *Underworld* 728)。小说中,颇受观众欢迎的脱口秀演员伦尼·布鲁斯更是直接对观众反复宣告“我们全都要完蛋了!”(We're all gonna die!)这种带有明显调侃意味、在娱乐场合发出的“预言”,给观众实则带来极大的震撼,伦尼每隔一段时间就重复一次这句话,似乎暗示危险正一步步临近。在政府的宣传和媒体的渲染下,人们心理上集体呈现出遭受来自苏联核打击的妄想狂。在苏联解体后,仍有美国民众心存疑虑:“苏联解体是真的吗,还是欺骗西方的一个阴谋?”(DeLillo, *Underworld* 81)《地下世界》真实再现了冷战时期美国民众心理上的脆弱与疯狂,揭示了冷战期间美国陷入遭受苏联核打击的受害妄想狂并沉溺其中、不可自拔。

结语

冷战是特定历史时期和地缘政治下的产物,它已结束将近三十年。虽然关于冷战的记忆正渐行渐远,但它对美国民众的影响却是极其深远的。在美国当代著名作家约翰·厄普代克(John Updike)“兔子四部曲”的最后一部《兔子歇了》(*Rabbit at Rest*, 1990)中,主人公曾不无诙谐地问道:“没有了冷战,做一个美国人有什么意义呢?”(Updike 509)。对于作家而言,重大的历史事件总是带有某种巨大的吸引力,能激发自己创作的雄心,在文学中再现历史上的关键时刻和时代印记。在一篇题为《历史的力量》(1991)文章中,德里罗曾写道,“遗忘的历史变成了小说中细致的编织物。小说就是让事情再经历一次(“Fiction is all about reliving things”)。这是我们的第二次机会”(DeLillo, “The Power of History” 63)。

《地下世界》向来被视为美国后现代主义小说的巅峰之作。有学者指出,“后现代世界的当务之急就是伦理转向”(刘英 91)。在文学伦理学批评看来,“教诲是文学的基本功能,是文学产生的积极作用,是一种引人向上的道德力量”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构》87)。作为一部典型的后现代主义小说,《地下世界》主题宏大、人物众多、结构复杂、叙述方式独特,让读者对传统线性叙事的期待落空。实际上,在“情节淡化”(plotless)、“碎片化”(fragmentation)、“非线性”(non-linear)这些后现代主义表现形式背后,蕴含着小说对于作为超级大国的美国和苏联的伦理反思和道德教诲。小说揭露了冷战期间美苏为了核竞赛做出的伦理选择破坏了国家与公民、人与自然之间正常的伦理秩序,深刻剖析了这些违背政治伦理和生态伦理的

行径背后的偏执与疯狂。冷战期间美苏之间卷入意识形态对抗，小说也对这种固守根深蒂固的敌意和偏见的冷战思维进行了批判，并在此基础上重构了那个特定政治氛围中冷战妄想狂的文化记忆。在这部堪称冷战史诗的小说里，德里罗将形式实验、伦理教诲、政治批判和记忆重构有机融合在一起，体现了作家的道德良知，表达了对人类未来走向持久和平的祈盼。

Works Cited

- 陈后亮：“搭建文学批评与社会现实的桥梁：文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构”，《文学跨学科研究》1（2021）：38-45。
- [Chen, Houliang. “Bridging the Gap Between Literary Criticism and the Social Reality: The Value Choice and Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 1 (2021): 38-45.]
- Chen, Lizhen. “Rejuvenation and Innovation: The Past, Present and Future of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 3 (2019): 389-414.
- 程栋：伦理学导论。北京：北京大学出版社，2008年。
- [Cheng, Dong. *An Introduction to Ethics*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2008.]
- 梁漱溟：《中国文化要义》，第二版。上海：上海人民出版社，2011年。
- [Liang, Shuming. *The Essence of Chinese Culture*. 2nd ed. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2011.]
- 刘英：“回归抑或转向：后现代语境下的美国文学伦理学批评”，南开学报（哲学社会科学版）2006年第5期：90-97。
- [Liu, Ying. “Return of Turn: Ethic Criticism in American Literature in Postmodern Context.” *Nankai Journal (Philosophy, Literature and Social Science Edition)* 5(2006): 90-97.]
- 孟德斯鸠：《论法的精神》上卷，许明龙译。北京：商务印书馆，2012年。
- [Montesquieu, Charles Lois. *De l'Esprit des Lois*. Vol. 1. Trans. Xu Minglong. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2012.]
- 聂珍钊：“从人类中心主义到人类主体：生态危机解困之路”，《外国文学研究》1（2020）：22-33。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. “From Anthropocentrism to Human Subjectivity: A Possible Solution to Ecological Crises.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1(2020): 22-33.]
- ：“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。
- [—.“Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020): 71-92.]
- ：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014年。
- [—.*Introduction to Literary Ethics Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- Booth, Wayne C. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California: U of California P, 1988.

- DeLillo, Don. "The Power of History." *New York Times* September 7, 1997. 60-63.
- . *Underworld*. New York: Scribner, 1997.
- Dobson, Andrew. "States, Citizens, and the Environment." *States and Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects*. Ed. Quentin Skinner, Bo Stråth. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 208-225.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. *Ralph Waldo Emerson: The Major Poetry*. Ed. Albert J. Von Frank. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 2015.
- Fitzpatrick, Kathleen. "The Unmaking of History: Baseball, Cold War, and *Underworld*." *Underworlds: Perspectives on Don DeLillo's Underworld*. Ed. Joseph Dewey, Steven G. Kellman, and Irving Malin. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2002. 144-60.
- Gaddis, John Levis. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: Penguin Book, 2005.
- Glass, Andrew. "Bernard Baruch coins term 'Cold War', April 16, 1947." <https://www.politico.com/story/2010/04/bernard-baruch-coins-term-cold-war-april-16-1947-035862>. Web. January 8, 2021.
- Jameson, Fredric. *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. 1981. London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Lachmann, Renate. "Mnemonic and Intertextual Aspects of Literature." *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. Ed. Astrid Erll, Ansgar Nünning. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010. 301-10.
- Leopold, Aldo. *A Sand County Almanac and Sketches Here and There*. New York: Oxford UP, 1949.
- Orwell, George. "You and the Atom Bomb." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell* (Volume IV): *In Front of Your Nose* 1945-1950. Ed. Sonia Orwell, Ian Angus. London: Martin Seeker & Warburg, 1968. 6-10.
- Poggi, Gianfranto. "Citizens and the State: Retrospect and Prospect." *States and Citizens: History, Theory, Prospects*. Ed. Quentin Skinner, Bo Stråth. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. 39-48.
- Ross, Charles. "A Conceptual Map of Ethical Literary Criticism: An Interview with Nie Zhenzhao." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 1 (2015): 7-14.
- Ruppersburg, Hugh and Tim Engles, eds. *Critical Essays on Don DeLillo*. Boston: G. K. Hall, 2000.
- Sorley, W. R. "The Morality of Nations." *International Journal of Ethics* 1. 4 (Jul. 1891): 427-46.
- Updike, John. *Rabbit at Rest*. New York: Random House, 2012.
- 朱荣华: "《地下世界》中的技术伦理", 《外国文学评论》(1) 2012: 185-200。
- [Zhu, Ronghua. "Technological Ethics in Don DeLillo's *Underworld*." *Foreign Literature Review* 1(2012): 185-200.]

何为可能生活：现代鲁滨逊们的伦理选择

On Possible Lives: The Ethical Choices of Modern Crusoes

任海燕（Ren Haiyan）

内容摘要：《鲁滨逊漂流记》开辟了一块生活试验场，面对荒岛赋予的近似绝对自由的选择权，鲁滨逊故事从伦理角度抛出了一个基本问题：伦理选择如何塑造生活？后世作家的重写从不同维度回应了这个问题。图尼埃的鲁滨孙选择从过去和未来两个时间向度、在物质和精神层面，围绕好的生活，展开了乌有史实验；库切将鲁滨逊抽象化为权力的化身，以寓言笔法，建构了善遭到权力侵蚀的世界；而沃尔科特则提出了艺术－幸福生活的模型。这些来自不同历史文化背景的重写，在跨区域的空间里呈现了存在的多逻辑结构，从伦理选择的视角，为探索生活的可能性，提供了重要启示。

关键词：鲁滨逊·克鲁索；米歇尔·图尼埃；J. M. 库切；德瑞克·沃尔科特；伦理选择

作者简介：任海燕，湖南师范大学外国语学院，副教授，主要从事旅行文学、世界的文学、亚历山大·冯·洪堡等方面研究。

Title: On Possible Lives: The Ethical Choices of Modern Crusoes

Abstract: *Robinson Crusoe* opens up a testing ground for life. In the face of the near-absolute freedom of choice granted by the desert island, Robinson's story raises a fundamental question from an ethical perspective: How do ethical choices influence life? Modern re-visions respond to this question from different perspectives. For instance, Michel Tournier wrote a Uranian story to explore the theme from both material and spiritual dimensions. J. M. Coetzee, considering Robinson as an abstract embodiment of power, constructs an allegorical world where power erodes goodness. Derek Walcott provides an art-happiness model for life. These re-visions, conceived in different historical and cultural contexts, constitute a multi-logical structure in a TransAreal space that sheds significant insights on possible lives.

Keywords: Robinson Crusoe; Michel Tournier; J. M. Coetzee; Derek Walcott; ethical choice

Author: Ren Haiyan, is Associate Professor at Foreign Studies College of Hunan Normal University (Changsha 410008, China). Her current fields of interest include travel writing, literatures of the world and Alexander von Humboldt studies (Email: haiyren@hunnu.edu.cn).

1719年《鲁滨逊漂流记》面世时，没有人能够预见，这部作品将成为文学传播史上的现象级事件，更鲜有人能料到，主人公鲁滨逊会成为代表着启蒙精神的现代神话¹，有如“巨石阵”（伍尔夫 1），获得不朽。早在荷马时代，世外海岛就是文学叙事中的常见元素，但鲁滨逊的岛却有别于一般意义上的海岛，其价值在于入世性，在于与现代文明看似隔绝实则紧密的关联，由是，它成为了生活的试验场。面对荒岛场景赋予的近似绝对自由的选择权，面对生活的无数种可能，鲁滨逊故事从伦理的角度抛出了一个基本问题：伦理选择如何塑造生活？笛福的鲁滨逊受海外殖民诱惑，成功开辟新的殖民地，将其打造为彼时的资本主义乌托邦。当鲁滨逊以胜利者姿态回归家园时，他顺理成章地成为18世纪大航海时代背景下“好的生活”的典范。

如果说鲁滨逊在追求“好的生活”的过程中展现的精明、算计、冷漠，甚至于禁欲，无不烙印着殖民主义和资本主义伦理，其后的众多重写都在尝试重新诠释或者创造新的伦理场域，“通过[主人公的]自我选择完成人生的伦理选择，”（聂珍钊 王松林 9）以此来探索人性和存在。法国作家米歇尔·图尼埃（Michel Tournier）的《礼拜五——太平洋上的灵薄狱》（*Friday* 1967）、圣卢西亚作家德里克·沃尔科特（Derek Walcott）的《哑剧》（*Pantomime* 1978）和南非裔澳大利亚籍作家J. M. 库切（J. M. Coetzee）的《福》（*Foe* 1986），就是这种尝试的代表。尽管均诞生于20世纪下半叶，成书时期相近，但作者分散于欧洲、拉丁美洲和非洲，历史文化背景不同，这使得三部重写构建起一个超地域（TransArea）的网络，展示出在这个多种逻辑并存的多样化世界里，现代生活的多种可能。

一、《礼拜五》：时间的游戏

《礼拜五》的故事保留了笛福原作的核心情节，即海岛和礼拜五的出现，并利用礼拜五无意间引发的一场爆炸，将故事分为复制和融入这两个泾渭分明的时期。在第一时期，鲁滨孙投入复制活动，在荒岛上体系性地构建起现代文明的景观，而在爆炸摧毁了一切人为活动的痕迹之后，他选择接纳和融入自然秩序，选择进一步再构可能生活。但《礼拜五》并非《鲁滨逊漂流记》的升级版。小说结尾处，鲁滨孙选择拒绝跟随“白鸟号”返回文明世界，这将一个基于空间扩张欲望的乌托邦（utopia）故事变成了乌有史（uchronia）故事。乌托邦是托马斯·莫尔依托希腊语中表示不的 *ou* 和表示地方的 *topos* 创造的概念，强调空间性，乌有史的构成借鉴了乌托邦，由希腊语的 *ou* 和表示时间的 *khronos* 加 *ia* 构成，强调的是时间性。开辟一处无法“回归”家园的场域（巴迪欧 44），以时间命题替换空间命题，探索生活的可能性，这便是图尼埃重写《礼拜五》的价值之所在。

1 参见任海燕：“警惕启蒙的讹诈：也论现代神话鲁滨逊”，《外国文学》5（2012）：74-81，158页。

因为海难和爆炸，鲁滨孙不得不两次面对不存在人为印迹的生存环境，而他本着实现“好的生活”的目标，做出了两个性质截然不同的伦理选择。第一次，他模仿原神话英雄，殚精竭虑地试图在岛上重现包括上层建筑在内的现代文明体系，建立起“景观符号胜于实物”的物质性世界（任海燕 124），这意味着，在荒岛主题赋予的无数种可能性中，鲁滨孙选择了生活在过去，生活在记忆里。

回到过去的强烈愿望，在鲁滨孙身上悖论式地体现为持敬克己和非理性欲望的结合。一方面，仿佛未曾远离人类社会，资本主义伦理和宗教成为驱动鲁滨孙积极生活的两重动力。所谓积极生活，乃是选择将自身的工具性发挥得淋漓尽致，套用马克思的说法，按照原来生活的面貌为自己创造一个可以度量的世界。他的生活，似乎成为了抽象数字的集合，就连山羊都按照字母和数字混合使用的方式编了诸如 B13、L24 等号码。他延续了笛福之鲁滨逊精巧计算的特点，还将工具理性式计算转变为对自身的伦理要求，成为严格自律和节俭的典型。在克己精神支撑下，鲁滨孙选择了自我异化的劳动。超乎寻常的自律在他的身体上留下了印痕，“割破的裂口，火燎烫伤的疤痕，刀伤，胼胝，种种不可磨灭的斑痕，结成硬壳的瘢痕”（图尼埃 29）。在不懈努力之下，鲁滨孙成功地复制了一个理性彰显，生产制造出大量物质财富，结构严密、法度森严的社会拟像。

按照韦伯的说法，面对资本主义这股世俗力量的强大冲击，宗教以其超验性，成为超拔心态的保证，但在鲁滨孙身上，资本主义精神和宗教教导，以一种奇妙的方式结合在一起。他赋予世俗的举动以救赎意味、以宗教的道德寓意，不仅令宗教的超验性大打折扣，还凭添了几分揶揄意味。例如，鲁滨孙秉承儿时接受的道德教诲，将富兰克林《年鉴》中的批判贫穷、浪费和举债等行为的致富箴言涂写在岛上，试图从宗教层面为生产-消费活动定性。他声称，依照《圣经》所示，生产是善行，播种和收获乃是生产，而由于岛上不存在商品和交易，消费乃是满足一己之私，不能带来财富，与“毁坏”无异（图尼埃 53），因而是道德上的恶行。遵循这一逻辑，为了扬善抑恶，必须在提高产量的同时，降低消费。但这样不仅从前提上否定了生产，还造成新的问题，即稻谷腐烂，鼠患随之而来。与此同时，鲁滨孙还琢磨着将富兰克林的“致富经”拆为 142 个字母，在每头羊身上剪出字母图形，以这种戏剧性的方式揣度天意。

正如只生产不消费将致使生产的意义丧失，在一个没有他者的世界里，文明社会所彰扬的人格和品质诸如勤勉自律等，其意义也发生了改变。当对于自我的道德性约束丧失了更高目的的追求，克己就成为目的本身，而这种机械性的克己，在小说中受到了白日梦的冲击。

《礼拜五》中的白日梦是现在制造过去的一种形式，其表现形式多样，尤以不受控制的幻象为多。通常说来，记忆指向过去，想象则指向虚空和非

现实，而当想象透过欲望，嫁接在鲁滨孙的记忆里时，幻象便产生了。各种白日梦，在鲁滨孙屈从于非理性的渴望，将小岛拟人化、女性化，嵌入譬喻，以建立同它的深层次联结中，达到高潮。例如，他将小岛比喻成“太阳照耀下的一个正在成熟的果实”（图尼埃 93），而自己则是包裹其中的白色果仁。或者，他将小岛幻想成母亲，自视为胎儿，时不时会通过某个窄小的通道爬入海岛内部——他所谓的子宫——并在洞穴中驻留。此时的鲁滨孙恰如斯芬克斯，在由“人性因子”转化而成的“理性意志”与生物本能之间挣扎（聂珍钊 王松林 6-7）。沉浸于过去，向后看的选择好似将脚放入不合适的脚印中，并不能带来“好的生活”，必须重新选择。

礼拜五引发的爆炸，再次赋予鲁滨孙以选择权，这一次他决定生活在未知的可能性之中，伴随着这个指向未来之决定的，是对过去的摒弃和突破。如果说选择过去，部分地是为了回避不确定性，那么选择未来，则意味着需要采取融入的策略，坦然接受不确定的生存状态。复制的前提是否定自然秩序，试图以人为秩序取而代之，在这个过程中，“利益和知识导致了另一种蒙昧，人性和感受的蒙昧”（赵汀阳 8），而融入意味着重新评估这个伦理场域、重新选择伦理身份。

鲁滨孙摒弃了礼拜五的救赎者兼教导者身份，转而视后者为通往未来向度的领路人，跟随他在游戏中生活。这个重塑自我的选择，以顺应自然为根本，通过意料之外的方式，开启了挣脱时间之网的变形。小说写道，鲁滨孙借自然神性，逐步恢复人的天真本性，不仅获得了超常感知力，身体肌肉日渐丰满，行动也愈发灵便。肉体和精神层面的变化均暗示逆生长，鲁滨孙成为了超越世俗的精神性存在，借助自然的能量，成为如孩子一般天真的人，永葆青春，进入代表着至善和绝对存在的“太阳之城”。

鲁滨孙对天真的追求显露出当下日盛的“青年崇拜”的端倪（巴迪欧 20-23），图尼埃将这种追求置于古典哲学的框架体系内，使用诸如太阳神性、首尾相连的蛇、双子星等概念，表达出对不确定性的抵抗，以及对基于古典智慧的伦理秩序的向往。不过，礼拜五的无意识引导无法实现真正意义上的升华，他的存在更像是在暗指太阳之城所代表的超脱线性时间观的精神性生活同样是幻象。随着礼拜五不辞而别，幻象破灭，鲁滨孙顿感时间的重压悉数回来，这不仅揭露了太阳之城的脆弱，表达出对于至善的存疑，也展现出图尼埃对《礼拜五》的乌有史性质有着清晰判断。从这个意义上论，尽管先前的生活面目全非，但“太阳之城”似乎亦非理想化的升华。

图尼埃的鲁滨孙从过去和未来两个向度、在物质和精神层面分别探讨什么是好的生活，却得到了一个极富怀疑精神的结尾。这印证了德勒兹的判断，没有他者的世界，是一个失常的世界。小说模棱两可的结尾，凸显了他者在场的重要性，突出了伦理考量的社会关系维度，而这正是库切构思《福》的基石。

二、《福》：权力与善

在原神话中，鲁滨逊体现了理性的自足性，人的价值独立于社会关系，理性将他从偶然性或者说运气的局限性中解脱出来，外在的厄运最终成就了他和他的理想生活。不同于笛福笔下那个剥离了社会关系的小说世界，《福》以寓言的笔法，呈现了一个权力侵蚀、吞并一切，包括想象力的社会图景。小说以女性人物苏珊·巴顿为纽带，透过她在巴西、荒岛和英国之间旅行穿梭的经历，构建了两重岛屿：一个是同文明社会若即若离的海上荒岛，另一个是英格兰岛。这两座岛屿一个荒芜贫瘠、人迹罕至，一个是丰饶富庶的文明社会，地理空间上也相隔甚远，看起来，他们代表的价值并不兼容，但却因为苏珊·巴顿的数个伦理选择而紧密关联，成为一对异己。小说似乎意在强调，在权力面前，没有一座岛屿是孤岛。

库切借叙述易装的技巧，塑造了一个与体系中心若即若离的价值系统拷问者苏珊·巴顿，并围绕苏珊在不同场域的抉择，再现错综复杂的社会关系。苏珊的历险始于前往巴西寻女而不得，在返回英格兰的船上遭遇叛乱，被流放至某个无名的荒岛，遇到生活在岛上的白人克鲁索（Cruso）及其黑人仆从，被割掉了舌头的星期五。库切曾借苏珊之口，讽刺鲁滨逊神话的理想化建构并指出，荒岛应该是乱石嶙峋、蚊蝇乱舞的荒凉之地（Coetzee 7）。小岛的荒暗指天地不仁，不过并不仅仅是自然对人和人的努力漠不关心，生活于其中的人也几近无欲无求。

初来乍到的苏珊充满好奇，对着克鲁索抛出一个接一个问题，不断试探岛上的伦理底线。透过苏珊之眼，读者发现，与勤勉的神话英雄不同，克鲁索似乎奉行虚无主义，不事劳作，但求蔽体果腹，但当苏珊得知星期五被割掉了舌头，质问公正何在时，克鲁索提出，上帝必须“时醒时睡”，唯有如此，“世界才会欣欣向荣”（Coetzee 23）。克鲁索选择容忍恶，不肯放弃对于星期五的权力，并非真正的虚无主义者。尽管苏珊曾经同情甚至部分认同星期五，当听到克鲁索的说辞后，她没有丝毫犹豫，便接受了他的观点，甚至因认同感而生出对星期五的嫌恶和厌弃，其自我定位也悄然发生变化，她开始讨好权力，自视为星期五的女主人。

作为异己，海上荒岛是英格兰岛的铺垫和先声。苏珊在荒岛讨好克鲁索，回到英格兰，她选择屈从于男性作家的权威。与荒岛上的毫不迟疑不同，回到英格兰的苏珊，其伦理身份起了微妙变化，这令她在面对伦理困境时，曾带着矛盾和迟疑的复杂态度试图同权力抗争。苏珊面临的第一重困境可以称为女儿的陷阱。苏珊决意请男性作家福代笔，书写其荒岛经历，为此，她以书信形式记录下所见所闻所感，这些信件构成了小说的主体。某日，一位素未谋面与苏珊同名同姓的女孩来到她的住处，自称是她寻而未得的女儿。苏珊在英格兰举目无亲，知道她寻女和荒岛遭遇的只有读过其书信的福，凭此

可以推断，此女乃是福凭作家之笔虚构而出。没有母亲会不认识、不认自己的孩子，但这个“父生”的孩子身世来历与苏珊毫不相干（Coetzee 91），这出寻母戏码，显然是福在幕后导演，而他虚构或者说重构代际关系，乃是有恃无恐地向苏珊宣告，男性作家不仅要将她叙述据为己有，更要将她变成他笔下的故事人物。

于是，认不认领这个由男性权威“分配”的孩子，便等同于是否屈从于男性权力。但讽刺的是，在生育权问题——这个女性似乎应该拥有决定权的问题——上，起关键作用的是福。小苏珊起初现身时，福并不在场，小苏珊甚至表示不知道福的存在，此时，他透过父生人物向苏珊施加的压力有限，她还可以尝试将其弃于林中，态度坚定地选择拒绝男性权力的侵吞。小苏珊再次出现，是在福的藏身地，彼时苏珊与福已经见面，并就故事讲述问题唇枪舌剑了一番，而福未能说服苏珊。于是，小苏珊成为福强势昭示男性创作力，表达权力立场和态度的工具。她的出现，在某种意义上是最后一根稻草，令苏珊自我怀疑，认为尽管自己有能力运笔，却无法如福一般用文字在虚实之间创造一个世界，甚至，书写非但不能成为抗争手段，反令其丧失自我：当她写下自己的故事示人，便陷入任人摆布的境地，剩下的只有对于自身主体性的疑惑。福的笔墨虚构，在象征意义上剥夺了苏珊子宫的生育权。苏珊违背意愿认领小苏珊，这一选择虽然令人失望，却并不意外。在男性权威步步紧逼时，关键问题已经由应不应该坚持自身意愿变成能否坚持以及如何坚持。

从时间线来看，接纳父生的小苏珊，同苏珊拱手让出叙述权，放弃捍卫星期五的权利是同步的。当然，从认同星期五到站到星期五的对立面，做出这个转变的选择，其困难程度远大于对小苏珊态度的变化，因而抉择过程充满了踟蹰、犹豫甚至抗拒。苏珊回到英国后，以克鲁索的遗孀自居，俨然全权拥有了全权处置星期五的权力。在这重背景下，她将星期五与自身捆绑，部分地视其为自己的外化，给他贴上诸如孩子、影子等标签。由是，捍卫星期五的叙述权，在苏珊看来就等同于捍卫自身权力，她立场鲜明，有理有据地质问社会的不公以及对于星期五 / 苏珊欲望的无视，讨要叙述的权力。但在福的设计之下，苏珊意识到，被割掉舌头的星期五代表着一套全然不同的话语符号体系，既拒绝基于语音中心的再现，也拒绝被书写，这意味着，长久以来，她关于星期五的建构只是一厢情愿。

幻灭令苏珊放弃了对于星期五的认同。福从权力拥有者的立场，顺势抛出同克鲁索无二的“理性”说辞，唤起苏珊内心潜藏的权力欲望，滋长其对于既定权力结构的向往。在福的指点下，苏珊完成了从同情星期五到甩掉心理包袱，毫无愧疚地加入权力中心一方，从拷问权力中心到一同作恶的转变。“伦理选择行动就是自我选择的行动……通过自己的选择进行自我身份确认”（何卫华 聂珍钊 7）。苏珊的转变反应出自我身份确认的变化，是人性之脆弱的表现，它削弱了先前拷问和质疑权力的力度，将注意力从权力问题转移

到伦理问题上，提出了何为善的命题：在理性指导下做出的选择是最大的善吗？

小说开放式的结尾暗示，《福》讲述的是《鲁滨逊漂流记》的成书史，最后荒岛故事成为了福 / 克鲁索的故事，星期五从苏珊的影子变成克鲁索的影子，而苏珊则消失在荒岛故事里，同其女儿一道，变成福 / 笛福笔下另外的故事。在男性叙述权力面前，苏珊并未真正拥有选择权，她的抗争——无论是言语或是文字形式——均以失败告终，而她的每个选择，都已然成为或者即将成为某个故事的素材。

小说的结局契合了《福》的基本价值预设：善之脆弱。苏珊寻女，一路追寻正义，但她体验到并最终实践的却与之背道而驰。在这个基于权力的选择、对立和诡辩的故事里，身体和性别都是工具性的，鲜有关爱、友谊，尊严更是无从谈起。无论是星期五被阉割、苏珊在肉体和精神层面遭受的屈辱、克鲁索的离世、还是拥有叙述权力的福似丧家之犬般东躲西藏，没有人可以有尊严地活着。在《福》建构的这个权力等级分明、尊严不在考量范畴的世界里，善甚至变得无关紧要。不过，尽管小说的结尾充满讽刺，但库切还是选择留下一丝微弱的希望，依稀存在于物质性的身体中，存在于如星期五那般打上了过往烙印，拒绝被再现、唯一一具生机尚存的躯体中。

三、《哑剧》：幸福与艺术

如果说《福》从权力角度探讨普遍意义的善，关注与公共幸福相关的伦理选择问题，来自加勒比海的诺贝尔奖得主德瑞克·沃尔科特则借剧本《哑剧》抛出了围绕个体幸福的选择问题。这个版本的重写沿袭了鲁滨逊神话中的个人主义精髓，将其移植至加速全球化进程中的加勒比海地区，通过再现来自英国的哈里与当地仆役杰克逊在观念和认知上的分歧、冲突和和解，探究不同文化背景中、阅历迥异的个体，如何通过选择善的手段，令自我变得完满，从而实现幸福。

英国和多巴哥、哈里和杰克逊，沃尔科特似乎在原神话的框架内，构建起符合读者期待的二元对立。但是，尽管二人的出走都意味着否定——或者至少是挑战——生活的连续性和稳定性，以追求幸福，与鲁滨逊不同，哈里的出走并非受扩张野心的驱动，跟权力的关系也不明显。从性质论，他离开英国代表的旧世界前往多巴哥代表的新世界定居，是在生活的连续性遭到破坏之后，刻意回避生活的脆弱和复杂性的举动，既是逃避，也是寻求自我和解和自我实现的博弈。一直以来，哈里努力做一个好人，做正确的事，追求幸福生活，但无常的命运——酒驾引发的车祸导致儿子早夭——摧毁了表面上看起来幸福的家庭。在诸如失望、愤怒等直接动机支配下，哈里选择以异域为改变的契机，移居多巴哥，意图通过这场自我放逐获得鲁滨逊式的全新开始。沃尔科特对于原神话的这一改动，赋予了异域冒险以新的内涵，同时

也让人重新审视幸福问题。

鲁滨逊的冒险经历脱胎于大航海时代殖民扩张的历史语境，隶属于加速全球化的第二阶段¹，它所建立的异域-幸福模型有可能为那个时代提供理想生活范式，但作为哈里的效仿对象，则只能是错位的理想。如果说十八世纪初尚能简单地从时间和空间的维度界定异域，随着加速全球化迈入第四阶段，全球性实时通讯网络的建立(Ette 24)，这两个矢量已经变得捉襟见肘，换言之，在加速全球化的时代，人与人、地域与地域之间的联结以前所未有的方式增强，单纯的时间变化或是空间转换，很难对主体的感官和认知造成足够大的冲击，而与之相伴的风土差异，也未能为主体提供新的经验。由是，哈里寄希望于多巴哥与英国间的地理空间距离，通过地理空间上的位移来切断同旧世界的联结——像鲁滨逊流落荒岛一般——以寻求陌生感刺激，重获生命的鲜活感和意义，注定以失败告终。在岛上生活一段时日之后，哈里沮丧地承认，多巴哥不过是英国的“后院”(Walcott, *Remembrance and Pantomime* 135)。

后院的比喻消解了依托地理空间差距，将坏生活变成好生活的前提，也反映出哈里保守的心态、偏见和习气，于是，沃尔科特尝试加入第三个矢量，即杰克逊所代表的当地人。受到历史和文化的影响，杰克逊同哈里的经验、情感和想象系统均存在差异，但同哈里曾是哑剧演员相似，杰克逊也曾经从事艺术行当。沃尔科特以艺术为媒介，围绕排演鲁滨逊哑剧而起的冲突——从潜在的冲突到戏剧性冲突——做文章，利用差异同时又超越差异，不仅使异域获得异质性，更建立起艺术-幸福的新模型。

艺术为人与人平等地表达和交流“异”提供了形式和渠道。尽管沃尔科特以资本主义的雇佣关系取代了原神话中基于奴隶制的主仆关系，但是剧中人物依然鲜有实质性交流。哈里因为族裔的缘故，天然地继承了鲁滨逊所表征的政治身份，而杰克逊则代表着殖民地，站到了他的对立面。二人朝夕相处近半年，却依据传统的刻板印象进行价值判断，视对方为代表了族裔身份的面具。杰克逊常常对哈里进行绵里藏针式的冷嘲热讽，话锋直指欧洲对加勒比海殖民统治的历史，而哈里则对杰克逊的言外之意置若罔闻，只顾自说自话。因此，尽管他们都以善为手段谋求幸福生活——杰克逊也曾在世界各地努力寻找幸福——二人的善却不能同频共振。甚至，两人在一段冲突中，出于戒惧心理，均捏造了耸人听闻的冲动往事，试图以想象中的恶行为掩护，建构起同想象中的对立方势均力敌的形象。

在构思哑剧情节的过程中，哈里第一次真正听到了当地人杰克逊的声音，

1 德国学者奥特玛·埃特教授将15世纪以来的全球化现象冠以“加速全球化”之名，将其分为数个阶段，第一阶段始自发现新大陆终于18世纪英法取代伊比利亚势力，成为殖民大国，第二阶段从18世纪中叶至19世纪初；第三阶段始于19世纪70年代，终于20世纪头10年；第四阶段从20世纪80年代至21世纪头20年。参见Ottmar Ette, *TransArea: A Literary History of Globalization*. Trans. Mark W Person. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016)。2020年爆发的新冠疫情标志着第四阶段结束，世界进入加速全球化的第五阶段。

体验到了异域之异，并且承认二人对于鲁滨逊故事的迥异理解源于信念的分歧。哈里来自于正在经历现代性之“狂欢”的世界（鲍德里亚 3），他曾参加过一系列狂欢式的解放运动，但却并未能从各种社会性的批评和解放里找到存在的意义，相反，情感表达成为他探寻存在之意义的途径，认知和行动都受喜、悲、失望、愤怒等情绪的影响和支配，情感依恋特征突出。相应的，他视原神话为个体经历的投射及模仿对象，把一个关于时代的宏大叙事诠释成关于妻离子散之孤独的故事，否定了这个宏大叙事背后的其他可能；而杰克逊生养于加勒比海地区，那里犹如时间胶囊，聚拢着一个杂糅多元的世界。沃尔科特曾以西班牙港为例，指出它像是成为文化符号之前的雅典，其文化多样性比乔伊斯的都柏林尤胜一筹（Walcott *Antills*），加速全球化进程对其的裹挟和同质化影响有限。因而，杰克逊高度认同鲁滨逊故事传达的终极信念，并基于对于鲁滨逊形象的认同，将原神话演绎为黑人探险者同白种野蛮人的故事，以具有冲击力的方式游戏鲁滨逊故事。

哑剧排演释放了杰克逊的创造力，他才是如鲁滨逊一般“勇敢地面对自己作为人类存在者的真实处境，不断地追求人所特有的价值的个体”（徐向东 陈玮 3），而哈里只是能力和幽默感都稍显逊色的避世者。面对命运的无常，“只有外力才可以帮我们解围”（纳斯鲍姆 2），杰克逊的创造力成为替哈里解困的外力。他敏锐地察觉到哈里问题的症结之所在，在善的动机驱使下，他在排演鲁滨逊哑剧的间隙，手持哈里前妻爱伦的照片，以之为面具，即兴反串，同哈里一起上演了一出夫妻冲突的戏码。这场戏中戏不仅为哈里的情绪提供了发泄的出口，更令他在亦真亦幻的艺术表演中，鼓起直面过往的勇气，不再逃避。由是，哈里走出多巴哥的价值得以彰显：他不再沉浸于过去生活的挫折，实现了同自己的和解，真正意义上打开了通往全新生活的大门。

从以哑剧方式对鲁滨逊经历的艺术化呈现到艺术化的模拟冲突，艺术成为联结异质性个体的有效途径，使哈里同杰克逊获得了某种意义上的平等，促成了从自说自话到对话的转变。在发生于漂流者客栈的这场争论和冲突中，哈里和杰克逊均实现了成长和改变，不仅获得了对自我的新知，还意识到荒岛问题的核心不在与世隔绝或荒芜而在信念。剧本结束之时，杰克逊做出了新的人生选择：以艺术为信仰，回归艺术人生。艺术凭借超验性直指存在的终极意义。在充分承认、探讨人性的脆弱和生活的脆弱之后，沃尔科特赞美了艺术的创造性价值和救赎性力量，确认了艺术—幸福为理想生活的模型。

四、结语

“文学从来就是人生的教科书”（聂珍钊 88）。笛福笔下的鲁滨逊在对于人之信念的支撑下，扭转了无法控制的命运，将坏的生活变成好的生活，而本文探讨的这三个重写文本，回归荒岛主体预设的生活之不可控性，将笛福原作中单一的伦理身份复杂化，在社会关系中考量为了“好的生活”所做

的伦理选择。相对于鲁滨逊青年时期出海立业，返回英国之后才成家的身份设定，这三部重写的主人公无一不是有家有室之人，处于不同于鲁滨逊的人生阶段，从这个角度来看，他们代表了鲁滨逊神话的成长，是历经两百余年，后人对于青年时期畅想“好的生活”的反思。从图尼埃的鲁滨孙从过去和未来两个向度、在物质和精神层面围绕好的生活展开的乌有史实验，到库切将鲁滨逊抽象化为权力的化身，以寓言笔法建构权力侵蚀善的世界，再到沃尔科特提供的艺术－幸福生活模型，这些重写所呈现的多逻辑结构为何为正当生活提供了重要启示。

Works Cited

- 阿兰·巴迪欧：《何为真正生活》，蓝江译。北京：中国人民大学出版社，2019年。
- [Badiou, Alan. *La Vraie Vie et Je Vous Sais si Nombreux*. Trans. Jiang Lan. Beijing: China Renmin UP, 2019.]
- 让·鲍德里亚：《恶的透明性：关于诸多极端现象的随笔》，王晴译。西安：西北大学出版社，2019年。
- [Baudrillard, Jean. *La Transparence du Mal*. Trans. Qing Wang. Xi'an: Northwest UP, 2019.]
- Coeztee, J. M. *Foe*. New York: Penguin, 1986.
- Ette, Ottmar. *TransArea: A Literary History of Globalization*. Trans. Mark W. Person. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016.
- 何卫华 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评与族裔文学：聂珍钊教授访谈录”，《外国语文研究》1（2020）：1-12。
- [He, Weihua, and Zhenzhao Nie. “Ethical Literary Criticism and Ethnic Literature: An Interview with Professor Nie Zhenzhao.” *Foreign Language and Literature Research* 1 (2020): 1-12.]
- 玛莎·C·纳斯鲍姆：《善的脆弱性——古希腊悲剧与哲学中的运气与伦理》，徐向东 陆萌译。南京：译林出版社，2018年。
- [Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Fragility of Goodness*. Trans. Xiangdong Xu and Meng Lu. Nanjing: Yilin P, 2018.]
- 聂珍钊：“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。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. “Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020): 71-92.]
- 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 Songlin Wang, eds. *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Beijing UP, 2020.]
- 任海燕：“礼拜五的游戏——图尼埃的主体批判”，《外国文学》（1）2019：121-129。
- [Ren, Haiyan. “Play in *Friday*: Tournier's Critique of Subject.” *Foreign Literature* (1) 2019: 121-129.]
- 米歇尔·图尼埃：《礼拜五——太平洋上的灵薄狱》，王道乾译。上海：上海译文出版社，1997年。
- [Tournier, Michel. *Vendredi ou les Limbes du Pacifique*. Trans. Daoqian Wang. Shanghai: Shanghai

Translation P, 1997.]

Walcott, Derek. *Antills: Fragments of an Epic Memory*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1992.

—. *Remembrance and Pantomime: Two Plays*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1980.

弗吉尼亚·伍尔夫：《伍尔夫读书笔记》，黄梅 刘炳善译。南京：译林出版社，2016 年。

[Woolf, Virginia. *Selected Essays of Virginia Woolf*. Trans. Mei Huang, Bingshan Liu. Nanjing: Yilin P, 2016.]

徐向东 陈玮：“导读”，《善的脆弱性——古希腊悲剧与哲学中的运气与伦理》，玛莎·C·纳斯鲍姆著，徐向东 陆萌译。南京：译林出版社，2018 年，3-44 页。

[Xu, Xiangdong, and Wei Chen. Introduction. *The Fragility of Goodness* by Nussbaum, Martha C. Trans. Xiangdong Xu and Meng Lu. Nanjing: Yilin P, 2018.]

赵汀阳：《论可能生活》（第 2 版）。北京：人民大学出版社，2009 年。

[Zhao, Tingyang. *On Possible Lives*, 2nd edition. Beijing: China Renmin UP, 2009.]

论曹禺戏剧创作中的伦理问题

On Ethical Issues in Cao Yu's Drama Productions

刘家思 (Liu Jiasi) 刘 璨 (Liu Can)

内容提要: 曹禺的戏剧创作总是从伦理关系入手, 深刻地描写现实人生。他惯于建构现实感强而又紧张的伦理环境, 预设人物复杂的伦理身份, 表现人物的伦理选择, 对社会伦理关系展开批评; 他善于提炼和形成伦理结, 使人物在纷繁复杂的伦理关系中挣扎, 展现其悲惨人生的发展历程, 从而彰显出宇宙的“残酷”, 暴露社会的罪恶; 他总是将人物的显性伦理身份与隐性伦理身份巧妙地纠缠在一起, 甚至有意利用隐性伦理身份的潜在功能来营造戏剧效果。在曹禺笔下, 人物都有着极强的伦理自觉, 总是以一种极端的方式实施自己的伦理选择, 以期符合伦理道德规范。这种选择往往由长辈的“原罪”式罪恶所推动, 展现了激烈的戏剧冲突。而且, 这种选择不只限于家族伦理要求, 也有因国家、集体、社会和职业等伦理身份而做出的。曹禺总是从主体的伦理立场出发去展开伦理表达, 在人物的多重伦理身份中突出一种身份的伦理选择, 并展示其悖论式结局, 丰富和深化伦理表达的思想意蕴, 寄予着对传统伦理观的独到思考, 凸显主观性的伦理立场和道德价值取向。曹禺戏剧不仅揭示了人类伦理身份的复杂性, 而且揭示了不同时代境遇下的伦理冲突与道德激战, 彰显了人类在伦理道德面前心魂的颤抖与命运的卑微, 表现了个体生命伦理身份要以群体与民族国家伦理要求为前提的基本立场。曹禺戏剧的伦理书写, 给了现实人生以强烈的警示, 反映了曹禺对现实人生的执着关怀, 体现了高度的社会责任感。

关键词: 曹禺研究; 伦理叙事; 剧场性研究

作者简介: 刘家思, 浙江越秀外国语学院中国语言文化学院教授, 院长, 中国曹禺研究会副会长、浙江省中国现代文学研究会副会长, 中国话剧理论与历史研究会常务理事, 主要从事现代戏剧与文学研究。刘璨, 绍兴文理学院元培学院副教授, 主要从事英美戏剧与中外戏剧比较研究。本文系国家社科基金项目“曹禺戏剧的剧场性研究”【项目编号 06BZW048】的阶段性成果。

Title: On Ethical Issues in Cao Yu's Drama Productions

Abstract: Cao Yu's drama productions deeply describe the real life from the perspective of ethical relationship. He is used to creating strained ethical environment of a strong sense of reality and presetting complicated ethical status of the characters, thereby manifesting the ethical choices of the characters and carrying

out criticism of ethical relationship. He is good at refining and forming the ethical knots, making the characters struggle in the complex ethical relations and showing the development course of their tragic life, which may reveal the cruelty and the evils of the society. In his drama productions, explicit ethical identity of characters is ingeniously entwined with invisible ethical identity and the potential function of the hidden ethical identity is used to create dramatic effects. Additionally, the characters in his works all have strong ethical consciousness and always make ethical choices in an extreme way in order to conform to the ethical and moral norms that was driven by the original sin of their elders, which shows fierce dramatic conflicts. As a matter of fact, the choices are not only based on family ethics but based on the ethical identity that related with nation, collectivity, society and professional characteristics. Cao Yu who tends to express ethics from the ethical standpoint of major characters highlights the ethical choices of main identity in the multiple identities of characters and shows its paradox, which enriches and deepens the ideological connotations of ethical expression, offering the original thinking of traditional ethics and demonstrating the subjective ethical position and moral value orientation. Cao Yu's drama reveals not only the complexity of human ethical identity but also the ethical conflicts and moral battles in different times. It manifests the trembling of human soul and the humble destiny in the face of ethics and morality and shows the basic position that ethical identity of individuals should be based on the ethical requirements of the group and the nation. The ethical writing of Cao Yu's drama gives a strong warning about the real life and reflects Cao Yu's persistent concern for the real life and the strong sense of social responsibility.

Keywords: research on Cao Yu; ethical narrative; research of theatricality

Author: **Liu Jiasi** is Professor of Chinese Literature, Dean of School of Chinese Language and Culture, Zhejiang Yuexiu University (Shaoxing 312000, China). He is mainly engaged in the studies of modern Chinese drama and literature (Email: ljs9663@aliyun.com); **Liu Can** is Associate Professor at Language and Literature Branch, Shaoxing University Yuanpei College. Her research interests are British and American literature and comparative literature (Email: ritacc02@163.com).

曹禺戏剧是 20 世纪中国戏剧的高峰，深刻地反映了社会现实，显示了强劲的艺术生命力。这主要得益于他的人物描写艺术。曹禺说：“我觉得写戏主要是写‘人’；用心思就用在如何刻画人物这个问题上”（曹禺，《曹禺全集（第五卷）》256）。纵观曹禺的戏剧，他“总是向人物的内心世界深入开掘，致力于人物灵魂和精神风貌的描写，并把生活真实的客观再现与内在真实的直观表现结合起来，深刻描写出人物复杂奇异甚至是扭曲变态的多面

的性格特征和矛盾分裂、痛苦交战的多重的心灵状态”（刘家思，《苦闷者的理想与期待——曹禺戏剧形态学研究》90-91）。然而，曹禺的戏剧创作总是从伦理关系入手，不仅注重写人，而且“对人物进行道德评判”（刘家思，“论曹禺戏剧的奴仆形象”95），以强化剧场性。聂珍钊先生指出：“只要描写人、描写社会关系，就必然要涉及伦理道德的问题，涉及到对作品中人物的道德评价”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》16）。然而，学术界对于曹禺戏剧中的伦理问题的探讨并不充分，本文试图借用聂珍钊先生构建的文学伦理学批评的理论方法就曹禺戏剧的伦理问题及其剧场性追求做一点探讨，以期就教于大家。

一、曹禺戏剧的伦理环境与人物伦理身份的生成

文学书写都是伦理书写，其书写状态和构建的伦理环境与作家的世界观及伦理意识密切相关。曹禺作为中国现代最伟大的戏剧家，有着很强的伦理道德意识。他总是从社会现实出发，建构出现实感很强的伦理环境，预设人物的伦理身份，深刻地表现人生，对社会伦理关系展开批评。这种意识，既是现实的，也是发展的，呈现了非常复杂的状态。然而，正是这种复杂的状态，使曹禺的戏剧创作呈现了丰富性、生动性和真实性，形成了中国现代话剧的高峰。

曹禺伦理意识的养成，既与他的家庭有密切关系，也与他自幼的学习有关，更与他耳闻目睹的社会罪恶有关。一方面，曹禺出生在一个封建官僚家庭，不仅从小就接受了“寒人之子”的教育，树立了穷人的意识，而且自小感受了封建家庭专制、压抑的气氛，并常常听奶妈段妈讲述她家的悲惨故事，又亲眼目睹了底层民众遭受的损害（田本相，《曹禺年谱长编》25），因此他自小形成了对现实社会伦理环境的不满。另一方面，曹禺的学习也促进了他的伦理意识的形成。曹禺从3岁起开始看戏，中国传统旧戏中的道德教化主题潜移默化地影响着他。同时，曹禺在新文化的学习中成长起来，自小接受了以自由、民主、平等、博爱和恋爱自由、婚姻自主为基本内容的“五四”新思潮的影响。1917年，他开始阅读《东方杂志》《少年》，1920年，就将鲁迅和周作人翻译的《域外小说集》拿来看了（曹禺，《苦闷的灵魂——曹禺访谈录》84），那种苦难意识和底层痛感影响着他；12岁，阅读莎士比亚的《威尼斯商人》，感受着有产者对于底层无产者的欺压；1923年，从《呐喊》《女神》《稻草人》《隔膜》等新文学作品中懂得了“贫和富的区别、穷人和富人的区别”，认识了“富人享受、穷人受罪”的黑暗现实（曹禺，《苦闷的灵魂——曹禺访谈录》16）。1925年，他加入南开新剧团，在王尔德的《少奶奶的扇子》、霍普特曼的《织工》以及南开新剧《一元钱》等剧目中担任一般角色，1927年起便在丁西宁的《压迫》、田汉的《获虎之夜》、陈大悲的《爱国贼》、易卜生的《国民公敌》和俄国亚穆柏的《可怜的斐迦》

等剧中担任主角，接受了阶级论的影响。而且，1919年“五四”运动爆发后，他参加天津的游行，喊着“外争国权，内惩国贼”的口号，从此积极参加各种反帝反封建的政治活动。1921年5月9日国耻日，他参加要求取消二十一条不平等条约的游行；1925年，他参加“南开中学五卅后援会”组织的活动；1927年，他当选为南开中学学生会反日运动委员会委员，并对张作霖屠杀李大钊“感到一种不可抑止的悲愤”，从此接受了马克思主义学说（田本相，《曹禺年谱长编》52—57）。因此，曹禺渐渐地对现实社会伦理道德混乱的状况有了主体认知和艺术体验，对既有的道德伦理准则产生了不满。因此，1927年他在文章中提出：“应当打破偶像的崇拜，和一切类似偶像的因袭无理由不合人道的旧思想的权威”（万家宝，“偶像孔子”19）。这样，不仅奠定了曹禺伦理意识的底色，而且赋予了曹禺戏剧创作伦理表现的复杂性。在创作中，曹禺总是预设错综交织的伦理关系，赋予了戏剧人物多种伦理角色，从而深刻地反映和批判社会现实。

在戏剧中，曹禺总是善于提炼和形成伦理结，使人物于纷繁复杂的伦理关系中走完悲惨的人生旅程，彰显出宇宙的“残酷”，深刻地暴露20世纪半封建半殖民地社会的罪恶。这种伦理结，既有希腊悲剧伦理环境的影响，也有曹禺自己的精心创造，是一种中国化民族化的独特表现。“伦理结是文学作品结构中矛盾与冲突的集中体现。伦理结构成伦理困境，揭示文学文本的基本伦理问题”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》258）。曹禺总是根据题材的不同，构建各种伦理结，强化了戏剧的表现力，增强了剧场引力。如《雷雨》《日出》《原野》作为曹禺的“生命三部曲”，集中展现了人类的伦理困境，使各种矛盾交织在一起，在网状交织的人物关系中形成伦理结，以多重乱伦的故事架构展示剧中人物的生命煎熬感和命运的悲惨性。

在《雷雨》中，曹禺将剧中八个人物“置于一种血缘关系、爱情关系、阶级（阶层）关系、职业关系、主仆关系等多重关系之中”（刘家思，《曹禺戏剧的剧场性研究》101），形成极端混乱的伦理关系。30年前大雪纷飞的大年三十晚上，周朴园将给他生了两个孩子的梅侍萍赶出家门，梅侍萍后来嫁给了鲁贵，改名为鲁侍萍。30年后，当鲁侍萍应约来到其丈夫和女儿四凤做佣人的公馆时，与周朴园重逢，由此引发了一场悲剧，将周鲁两家前后30年来的恩怨情仇予以了充分展示。在这里，每一对关系交织着其他关系。周朴园与周萍既是父子关系，又是情敌关系；周萍与繁漪既是母子关系，又是情人关系；周萍与周冲既是兄弟关系，又是情敌关系；周萍与鲁大海既是兄弟关系，又是主仆、劳资关系；周朴园与周冲既是父子关系，又是政敌关系；周朴园与鲁大海既是父子关系，又是劳资、主仆关系和敌对关系；周萍与四凤既是兄妹关系，又是情人关系和主仆关系；周冲与四凤既是恋爱关系，又是主仆关系，也可以说是兄妹关系；鲁侍萍与周朴园既是主仆关系，又是夫妻关系，还是敌对关系；鲁贵与周朴园既是主仆关系，也是情敌关系。这种伦理混乱状况无法

理顺,生成了戏剧人物复杂的伦理身份,因此任何人都没有挣扎出来。最后,终因这种伦理结不断聚集,酿成了一个命运大悲剧。

《日出》中的陈白露是爱华女校的高材生。她在家道中落后独自来到大都市谋生,却堕落为大丰银行经理潘月亭的情妇。旧时恋人方达生听到她的情况后,从2000里外的家乡来接她回去结婚,反而被她留下来了,从而目击了各种丑恶现象。于是,这个戏剧就形成了个人、家庭与社会融合、爱情与职业交织的多重伦理关系,从而展现了一幅光怪陆离的都市社会图景,暴露了混乱的伦理状况。如陈白露与潘月亭,既是长幼关系,也是客商和情人关系;潘月亭与方达生既是客商关系也是情敌关系;李石清与潘月亭既是上下级关系,也是敌对关系;顾八奶奶与潘月亭,既是客商关系也是男女朋友关系;黄省三与潘月亭既是主仆关系,又是劳资敌对关系。正是这种矛盾与冲突的扭结,形成了戏剧人物复杂的伦理身份,都像缠在蜘蛛网上的蜻蜓,怎么挣扎也逃脱不了其伦理身份孕育的悲剧结局,从而反映了深广的社会历史内涵。

《原野》描写焦、仇两家两代人的恩怨情仇故事。焦母的丈夫焦阎王与仇虎的父亲仇荣本来是结拜兄弟,可焦阎王后来为了夺得仇虎家的田地,烧毁仇家房屋,勾结官府活埋了仇荣,气死了仇虎的母亲,并将仇虎的妹妹卖到妓院;又诬陷仇虎为土匪,将他打进监牢,叫人打断了他的腿,还让儿子焦大星强娶了仇虎的未婚妻花金子。8年后,仇虎越狱前来复仇,但焦阎王已死。于是,戏剧人物就生成了多重的伦理身份。仇虎与焦母是干妈与干儿子的关系,也是仇敌关系;金子与焦母既是婆婆与媳妇的关系,又是仇敌关系;仇虎与焦大星既是从小一起的好兄弟,又是仇敌关系和情敌关系。这种复杂的伦理身份,赋予了作品更强的悲剧性。

值得注意的是,曹禺在戏剧中总是将人物的显性伦理身份与隐性伦理身份巧妙地纠缠在一起,甚至有意利用隐性伦理身份不被剧中某些角色认知的潜在功能来营造戏剧效果。所谓显性伦理身份,就是戏剧情节中明显呈现的人物之间的伦理关系,剧中人物对其伦理身份有自觉的认知。所谓隐性伦理身份,就是指作品情节赋予了人物某种伦理关系而人物对这种伦理身份没有认知。通常,戏剧人物一旦对自己的伦理身份有了自觉,就会沿着世俗社会的伦理规范来规约自己的行为,使之尽量适应社会的舆论导向。如果是英雄人物,总是会自觉地肩负起特定历史时期的社会责任。这种戏剧往往以人物正面的英雄气概或者人性美、人情美、人格美形成艺术感染力,并反映出时代的特征。自然,更多的戏剧是世俗化的,人物明确自己的伦理身份,常常展示其行动的乖谬和人性的复杂,显示人物行动与伦理身份的冲突,从而形成艺术感染力。这在喜剧中表现得尤其突出。然而,许多戏剧作品虽然赋予了人物特定的伦理身份,但人物并不自知,当其按照自知的伦理身份自以为是地行动时,往往违背了这种伦理身份的特殊要求,于是受众就居高临下地去看人物的“失误”和“笑话”,戏剧的剧场性就增强了。

曹禺戏剧是一种悲喜交织的性格悲剧或命运悲剧，常常构建一种独特的伦理环境，赋予戏剧人物独特的伦理身份，然而戏剧人物对自己某一伦理身份往往不自知，总是按照自知的伦理身份去展开自己的行动，而这种行动往往朝着自己某一伦理身份要求的相反方向行进，最终导致戏剧的悲惨结局。正是这种显性与隐性的伦理身份的扭结，形成了戏剧的引力，强化了剧场性。在《雷雨》中，繁漪、周萍、四凤都对自己的伦理身份不尽自觉，各自都是按照自觉的伦理身份行事，最后促成了一场大悲剧。繁漪不知道自己是鲁侍萍的继任者，自然就不知道鲁侍萍是周朴园抛弃的女人，更不知道她是周萍的母亲。她为了赶走四凤，留住周萍，就叫鲁侍萍到周公馆来。这就在剧中引进了一颗定时炸弹。当她拦住正要出走的周萍、四凤，把周朴园叫出来时，鲁侍萍的真实身份被曝光，周萍和四凤的兄妹身份也曝光了，于是一场悲剧就爆发了。在《北京人》中，曾思懿只知道自己是曾皓的儿媳、曾文清的妻子，与愫方是情敌，但不知道愫方是曾皓意淫的对象和拐杖，因此她要赶走愫方也就不自知地得罪了曾皓。当她要给愫方议婚时，曾皓非常不高兴，就弄出了一出闹剧。可以说，赋予戏剧人物多重的伦理身份，使一些主要人物在戏剧中对自己行动的伦理身份顾此失彼，不仅能够显示社会的复杂性，也能显示人性的复杂性，彰显艺术描写的深度，进而形成戏剧的放射力。

在戏剧创作中，艺术构思的关键在于预设伦理环境，赋予戏剧人物以伦理身份。这是戏剧情境的内核。人物特定的伦理身份“是一个人在社会中存在的标识”，文学人物一旦拥有了这种特定的身份，就需要承担这种“身份所赋予的责任与义务”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》263）。伦理身份既有与生俱来的自然身份，也有人生历程中被偶然或必然赋予的特定身份，这就使伦理身份呈现出显性和隐性两种状态，使人物处于自觉和不自觉之中。曹禺的戏剧恰恰把握了这种状态，不仅“早期剧作所处理的题材常具有明显的伦理意味，时常通过塑造矛盾人物形象，从伦理角度深刻地开掘人类行为动机及其复杂后果”（张亮 83），而且他的整个戏剧创作都贯穿着不同形态的伦理母题，从而产生了独特的艺术效果。

二、曹禺戏剧人物的伦理自觉与伦理选择过程

在世俗社会中，人们一旦具有伦理自觉，就会按照社会约定俗成的伦理道德规则去对人生事相做出反应，选择合适的伦理行为，既确保自己的伦理行为的正向性，又期望达成伦理行为的目标。曹禺笔下的戏剧人物也是这样，他们一旦对自己的伦理身份有了自觉之后，就对其伦理行为做出非常强劲的主体选择。这种选择总是由主体意志力支撑着，成为一种不可移易的努力方向。正是这样，人物与周围的伦理环境产生剧烈的矛盾冲突，从而推动剧情迅速发展。“伦理选择具有两方面的意义。一方面，伦理选择指的是人的道德选择，即通过选择达到道德成熟和完善；另一方面，伦理选择指对两个或两个以上

的道德选项的选择,选择不同则结果不同,因此不同选择有不同的伦理价值”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》266-67)。曹禺戏剧人物的伦理选择,在这两个方面都得到了很好的体现。

人是社会的主体,社会性是人的本质特征。其重要表现就是要按照约定俗成的伦理道德规范或国家强力推行的法律条款来进行人生选择。众所周知,伦理就是人类社会中人与人相处的各种行为准则和道德规范,但又因国度与族群的不同而有某些差异性。中国是一个历史悠久的国家,形成了自己的道德伦理规范。虽然在几千年的文化传承中得到了扬弃,但其基本要求和规范已经内化为中国人自觉的主体选择。在曹禺的戏剧中,每个戏剧人物都有着极强的伦理自觉,他们总是以一种极端的方式实施自己的伦理选择,但往往陷入一种伦理两难甚至是伦理困惑之中,反映了传统与现代的冲突。

《雷雨》充分显示了伦理自觉给人生方向的选择带来的巨大影响。周朴园具有很强的伦理自觉意识,但他遵守的是中国传统的旧的伦理规范。他不仅用这种旧的规范约束自己,也用这种规范约束他人;同时,他又有着很强的光宗耀祖的思想,重视自己在社会上的影响。因而,他希望建立一个“有秩序”的“体面”的家庭。这不仅体现在他的婚姻选配中,而且体现在他对妻儿的管教中。他深爱着婢女梅侍萍,和她在一起生下了两个孩子。但是,他知道自己选择既不符合“父母之命,媒妁之言”的伦理要求,也不符合“门当户对”的社会共识,在大年三十遵其母意将她赶出了家门,按照父母之命迎娶了一位门当户对的小姐。这种伦理选择,造成了他巨大的痛苦——三十年来从南到北搬家,家里的什物摆设,一切照梅侍萍喜欢的样子,无时无刻不记着这个恋人。而他这种痛苦的选择又给他的儿子们埋下了祸根。对待家庭,他也严格按照封建伦理道德来教育妻儿,希望建立一个“最圆满,最有秩序的家庭”,从而享誉社会:“我的儿子我也认为都还是健全的子弟,我教育出来的孩子,绝对不愿叫任何人说他们一点闲话。”因此,在周公馆,他的话就是法律,就是圣旨,必须服从,不仅儿子们要言听计从,而且要求妻子繁漪也要“做服从的榜样”。在他眼里,妻贤子孝父尊母慈就是完美的,他自认为这样的选择是最正常、最合理的。然而,正是他的这种伦理选择,铸就了最大的罪恶,酿成了《雷雨》的大悲剧,成为了“罪魁祸首”。

话剧《家》是曹禺根据巴金的长篇小说《家》改写的,但他独特的精心架构,使这部话剧作品艺术上高于巴金的原著。这是学术界的共识。剧中的主要人物觉新的伦理选择不仅没有挽救高公馆衰败的历史命运,而且断送了爱妻瑞钰宝贵的生命,酿成了人生悲剧。觉新是高公馆的长房长孙,自小受到封建伦理道德的教育,有着非常强的伦理自觉。他时时意识到自己对大家庭的责任与义务,以及作为长兄对弟妹们的榜样作用。因此,他总是按照封建伦理道德规范来约制自己。一方面,他感觉自己是大家族权力的继承人,肩负着维护大家庭的伦理责任。于是,虽然心理对矛盾重重的大家族十分不满,尤

其是对叔叔婶婶们的乌烟瘴气、荒诞腐朽的言行不满,但仍然不断地敷衍遵从,到处作揖,甚至不牺牲自己,以维护大家庭的稳定。不仅不折不扣地听从祖父的吩咐,而且在荒淫无耻的叔叔、婶婶们面前总是凑合应付,尽力克制自己。当陈姨太以血光之灾的借口要求妻子瑞珏要过三道桥去分娩时,他就将她送到城外钱大姨妈农庄中的农具房里生产,致使她命丧郊野,形成了自己的终生悔恨。另一方面,他知道长兄的伦理身份,承担着“长兄当父”的伦理责任,必须关爱自己的弟妹。于是,他对反抗的觉慧、觉民尽力保护,在长辈中斡旋。然而,他的这种伦理选择,不仅没有挽救大家族的败落,而且弄得自己妻离子散,痛苦不已。不过,正是这种伦理选择,完成了觉新的性格塑造,充分展示了封建伦理道德的罪恶,形成了剧场的牵引力。

在曹禺笔下,主要人物的伦理选择往往是因为长辈违背伦理的道德罪恶所导致的。从周萍与后母的通奸,到仇虎的复仇,再到觉慧对大家庭的反抗,都是这样的。周萍与繁漪在厅堂里闹鬼,其原罪是周朴园在父母的要求下将鲁侍萍赶走,之后迎娶了年轻貌美、能诗会画而又渴望爱情的繁漪。周萍是一个留学回国的青年,既接受了五四时期的人道主义思想与自由恋爱观念,也接受了西方以情主导、不受拘束的浪漫爱情模式,当他来到周公馆,遇上了年龄相当又美丽的繁漪时,心理充满同情、怜悯和理解,进而喜欢上了她,竟然说出了对周朴园大逆不道的话:“我愿他死,甚至犯了灭伦的罪也干!”从此,他与繁漪开始了长达三年的乱伦生活。然而,随着时间的推移,他对自己的伦理身份有了自觉,认识到了这种选择违背了伦理,无法面对父亲和弟弟,便开始了逃离。此时年轻又有活力的四凤来到周公馆,吸引了他,他试图追求正当的爱情,很快坠入爱河。于是,他决定逃出周公馆,与繁漪分道扬镳。可是,四凤竟是他的同母异父的妹妹,自以为是的伦理选择又使他犯下了更大的罪孽,其根源自然是周朴园的错误。周萍的这种伦理选择显示了很强的盲目性。它告诉人们,个体的伦理选择容易被情感主导,一旦缺乏理性就会形成悲剧,其结果深刻地展示了命运的残酷性。

仇虎选择焦大星作为复仇对象,是因为焦大星的父亲——焦阎王欠下了血债。焦阎王与仇虎的父亲仇荣本来是结拜兄弟,这种特定的伦理关系要求二人和睦相处、互相亲爱和支持,可是焦阎王为了抢夺仇荣的田产,将仇荣活埋,使他家破人亡。八年后,仇虎逃出了监狱,直奔焦家来复仇。他首先遇上放牧的白傻子,不仅得知焦阎王已经死了,而且得知他儿子焦大星娶了自己的未婚妻花金子。这就加深了他的仇恨,也强化了他的复仇意志。可是,焦阎王一死,他的复仇进入了“无物之阵”,使他心理很难受,他要想办法完成复仇的使命。他想到“父仇子报”,那么“父债子还”是天经地义,于是就把焦大星作为复仇的对象。然而,焦大星又是他自小一起长大的兄弟,一回来就“虎子哥”“虎子哥”地叫他,很好地招待他,使他不忍心下手。但是,他必须报仇。于是,他用自己与金子通奸的事情来刺激焦大星,使之

与自己格斗，最后以自卫的名义杀死了焦大星。但是，他心理上遭受了强烈的谴责，怎么也逃不出黑林子，最后在痛苦的煎熬中自杀了。仇虎的复仇行动是作为干爹的焦阎王的罪恶导致的，也获得了成功，但最后却造成了复仇者仇虎自杀的悲剧。显然，这种伦理选择既揭露了统治阶级的罪恶，也反映了抱着落后观念可能导致的严重后果，自然就显示了曹禺独特的思想指向。

觉慧之所以与封建家长斗争，则是由高公馆的长辈们腐朽淫乱激发的。四叔高克安、五叔高克定是高公馆的纨绔子弟，整天无所事事、嫖娼赌博、狎妓蓄优、逍遥生非，分不清尊卑长幼，理不顺伦理道德。觉新新婚，他们在闹洞房时不顾伦理，淫邪下流地尽情捉弄觉新、瑞珏以及喜娘，令人目不忍视，因此觉慧怒斥他们为长不尊的丑行；冯乐山为人虚伪，既道貌岸然，又荒淫无耻，阴险残暴。他曾将娼妓出身的陈姨太赠与高老太爷，所以在高家便肆无忌惮，为所欲为。先是看上高家年少的婢女鸣凤，逼死鸣凤后又欣然接受了高老太爷赠送的婉儿，进行残忍的折磨，但又害怕劣迹败露。在高老太爷大寿之时，残暴地逼问婉儿对高家人说了什么。目睹其兽行的觉慧出于义愤，怒不可遏地冲上去，怒喝他，拉开婉儿。晚辈对长辈的冲撞，通常不合封建伦理规范，但觉慧这种伦理选择，都是长辈们不道德的行径诱发的，符合现代社会的公德规范，显示了曹禺的伦理取向，也增强了艺术效果。

在曹禺笔下，人物的伦理选择不限于家族伦理范畴，还有更多的表现形态。因为“伦理身份有多种分类，如以血亲为基础的身份、以伦理关系为基础的身份、以道德规范为基础的身份、以集体和社会关系为基础的身份、以从事的职业为基础的身份等”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》1）。曹禺戏剧既有家庭题材，又有社会题材，对于伦理选择的书写是广泛的，除了基于血缘、伦理关系和道德规范而做出的选择之外，还有基于国家、集体、社会 and 职业责任而做出的选择。这在他改编的《争强》《新村正》《黑子二十八》和原创的《日出》《蜕变》《艳阳天》《工人王小富》《明朗的天》等剧中有突出的表现。这种行为选择虽然不如因血缘和家族伦理关系主导的选择具有情感张力，但往往具有很强的戏剧冲突，其艺术效果也是很强烈的。

职业是现代社会中人的社会伦理身份的重要标志，职业行为是职业伦理选择的基本表征，曹禺予以了出色的书写。《争强》是曹禺根据高尔斯华绥的名剧《斗争》改译的。大成铁矿工人罢工三个月，要求加薪，几次会商，均无结果，劳资双方僵持不下，不仅影响了生产，也影响了工人的生活。因此，董事长安敦一改变了“宁可公司破产，也不接受工人复工条件”的强硬态度，罢工领袖罗大为也改变了坚决罢工的态度，各自都做出了妥协，劳资双方最终和好。无论是罗大为带领工人罢工，还是安敦一决不答应工人条件，以及后来双方的妥协和好，都是基于铁矿生产和工人生活的实际而做出的职业伦理选择，显示了很强的道德感。《日出》中的李石清是大丰银行的秘书，但他对不公平的现实社会非常不满，他想利用银行秘书这个职位往上爬，进入

社会的上层。因此，他竭力做好银行的工作，从不懈怠。他负责为银行裁减职员，便不留情面地将黄省三裁减了；为了银行股票，又不惜自己掏钱请客，打听消息。充分显示了对银行的忠心，这种伦理选择首先是职业伦理身份要求的。

基于社会正义和公德而做出伦理选择，也是曹禺书写的内容。《蜕变》《黑子二十八》的主人公的行动是出于民族救亡的伦理选择，自然无须赘言，《新村正》中描写李壮图与吴仲寅围绕关帝庙一带的房地产是不是抵押给外国公司而发生冲突，也是李壮图基于维护集体利益的道德意图做出的伦理选择。而《艳阳天》中律师阴兆时与巨商金焕吾的斗争，则是基于道德正义而做出的伦理选择。魏卓平在靠近码头的偏僻处建了一个孤儿院，金焕吾看上后试图强行购买作为秘密仓库。此时，作为朋友的阴兆时挺身而出，为他打抱不平，即使被金焕吾砸毁了家也不妥协。他多方调查，揭露了金焕吾的汉奸罪行，使其受到惩罚，帮魏卓平收回了孤儿院。这种选择充分表现了为朋友两肋插刀的道德母题，既是作为朋友的伦理身份所主导的，也是作为律师的职业伦理规范所要求的，更是基于维护社会正义的道德感和正义感而做出的。

历史告诉我们，人类社会总是从原始蛮荒时代走向现代文明。在这个历史进程中，伦理道德规范越来越强，充分发挥了维护社会安定的重要作用。自然，这种道德伦理自律不是所有人都能做到的。因此，法律制度得以诞生，用国家机器来推行社会规范，维护社会秩序，这成为人类进步的重要标志。但是，即使在法制时代，道德伦理还是人类基本的行为规范，伦理选择仍然是世俗生活的基本形态，其维护社会安定的作用也没有消损。曹禺戏剧充分反映了这一点，其人物基于不同伦理环境做出的伦理选择，充满着现代意味，其内在的矛盾与激烈的冲突，既彰显了愤激又焦灼的“伦理情绪”（余峥和席扬 65），也深刻地展示了人们陷入生活泥沼和情感火坑中挣扎的无奈与无望，显示了宇宙的残忍。所以，其人物的戏剧行动具有艺术活性，孕育着艺术张力，能够感染受众。

三、曹禺戏剧的伦理立场与伦理表达

文学是人类的精神家园，是以作家的思想精神为基础的。文学接受的目的不是单纯的娱乐和消遣，而是在审美接受的过程中自然地接受思想精神的启蒙和伦理道德的教化。因此，在任何一部作品中，作家的伦理立场决定其伦理表达。曹禺说：“一个写作的人，对人，对人类，对社会，对世界，对种种大问题，要有一个看法。作为一个大的作家，要有自己的看法，自己的思想，有自己的独立见解”（曹禺，《曹禺全集（第5卷）》323）。曹禺戏剧总是以表现丰富深邃的思想意蕴为重要指向。他总是从主体的伦理立场出发去展开伦理表达。这种描写是基于剧中人物对于人生价值的感知与认定的行为状态，显示自己的思想倾向，能够启迪和教育受众，引导受众世俗化的行为，

促进社会的文明进步。

首先，在多重伦理身份中突出人物的一种伦理身份，展示其伦理选择，显示主观性的伦理立场和价值取向。人作为社会存在的主体，不仅天生地被赋予血缘伦理身份，而且随着人的成长和社会化程度的提高，还被赋予更多的伦理身份，使人类伦理行为的选择具有了多重可能性。在曹禺笔下，从《雷雨》到《日出》，从《原野》到《北京人》，人物都被赋予了多重伦理身份，但其伦理选择只突出了主要伦理身份，淡化了其他伦理身份。对此，我们无须讨论其主要人物，只要看看那些次要人物，就可以明白这一点。

四风是《雷雨》中的人物。她来到周家做佣人，就有了三重伦理身份：一是父母的女儿，二是周公馆的下人，三是周冲、周萍的女友。在这三种身份中，她选择的不是依从于女儿的伦理身份，听父母的话，也不是顺应周公馆对下人的伦理要求，而是与周萍、周冲兄弟进行感情交往。面对周氏兄弟，她选择了比自己年龄大、使她心理更踏实的周萍。一般而言，这种伦理选择是无可厚非的。因为男大当婚，女大当嫁，男女青年自由恋爱，追求自己的幸福，是五四时代的思想潮流。她从鲁家到周家做帮佣，就是想逃避自己的贫困命运。而且，四风用情专一，对周萍忠贞不渝，这种爱情态度是值得赞赏的。然而，她的伦理选择，并没有给她幸福，而是不断地将她推向绝路，使她始料不及地走向了乱伦的歧路。这是世俗社会所不齿的，也是科学所不允许的。她无法面对，最后触电而亡。这种结果，不仅告诉人们，命运是残酷的，而且告诉人们，在人生要认清自己的身世，不做非分之梦。

《日出》中的黄省三是大丰银行的小书记，拥有四重伦理身份：一是大丰银行的职员；二是孩子的父亲，三是妻子的丈夫，四是潘月亭、李石清的同事、下属。在这四重伦理身份中，他自觉选择了作为职员的伦理身份，试图履行这种身份的职责，以维护作为父亲、丈夫和同事的伦理职责。所以，他在银行全力工作，拿命换工资。他说：“我为着这辛辛苦苦的十块二毛五，我整天地写，整天给你们伏在书桌上写；我抬不起头，喘不出一口气地写；我从早到晚地写；我背上出着冷汗，眼睛发着花，还在写；刮风下雨，我跑到银行也来写！”五年的工夫，他累得只剩“几根骨头，一个快死的人！”因为他想博得同事和银行的好评，能够不断工作，以养活他的老婆、孩子，维持家庭。这种伦理选择是本分的。然而，银行裁员裁减了他，他的老婆跟人跑了，孩子们没有饭吃，他三番五次来求银行，却被李石清、潘月亭毒打，走投无路的他试图亲手毒死自己和孩子。可是，孩子们将毒药抢着吃了，都死了，他自己吃少了，反而没有死成，最后疯了。这种伦理选择反映了底层人民的渺小与可怜，也尖锐地批判了现实社会的黑暗。

人物自觉抓住一种伦理身份来选择个体伦理行为，可以使剧情更加集中，尤其是可以使戏剧人物之间冲突更激烈，各自的内心也交战也更紧张，从而形成更强的剧场性。但是，这些人物最后都没有如意的结局。这就深刻展示

了生活的残忍与宇宙的残酷，形成更强的情感冲击力。这种书写显示了悲悯的情怀和悲愤的情绪，表现了作者主观的伦理立场和情感取向以及强烈的同情心。

其次，通过戏剧人物“原罪”式伦理选择的悖论式结局，丰富和深化作品的思想意蕴，显示主观性伦理立场和道德价值取向。人生是一个迷局，其前途如何，实际上是人们难以把握的，因为世界很复杂，世事难料。在世俗社会中，自然有一些人坚持初衷，不坠青云之志，最后成功了；但更多的人，其人生并不顺达，而是充满曲折。曹禺戏剧充分反映了这一点。他笔下的许多人物一开始就不自知地犯下了“原罪”或者是被“原罪”所诱导，卷进了生活泥潭和命运漩涡之中。原罪是基督教教义的重要内容，也是世界文学中的重要母题，实际上是指祖宗之罪——人类的始祖亚当和夏娃在伊甸园偷吃了上帝禁吃的智慧之果而犯下的罪。这种罪恶具有先天的遗传性，能够传给后世子孙，成为人类一切罪恶和灾祸的根源和诱因。曹禺戏剧贯穿这一母题，从《雷雨》到《北京人》，甚至到《王昭君》，都有不同形态的表现，都呈现了悖论式的结局。

《雷雨》中的周萍一出生就带着原罪，他的父亲在30年前抛弃了他的生母，使他从小失去了母爱，内心非常孤独，在潜意识中形成一种恋母情结，不由自主地对母亲充满想象与思念。这就使他情感上产生倾斜，关切女性的命运，容易同情女性，以至于失去理性。因此，当他从乡下来到周公馆，看到年轻貌美的继母繁漪过着极其孤独郁闷的生活时，心理充满同情，毅然做出了他的伦理选择——与繁漪相爱。这种违背伦理身份的乱伦选择，自然是一时的感情冲动的结果。正如他自己所说：“那时我年青，我的热叫我说出来这样糊涂的话。”显然，作品形象地告诉我们，伦理与情感是存在冲突的，伦理是理性的，情感必须用理性去控制才能合乎伦理，否则就会犯错误。然而，周萍遵照理性的伦理规范去行事，就能如意吗？事实并不如此。周萍与繁漪乱伦三年后，清醒地认识到不能继续下去了，这不是他的人生出路。他厌恶与繁漪乱伦的“这种不自然的关系”。他对繁漪说：“你是冲弟弟的母亲”“我是我父亲的儿子”“你要我陪着你，在这样的家庭，每天想着过去的罪恶，这样活活地闷死么？”显然，这是伦理意识的觉醒，也是道德理性的回归。因此，他与四凤相爱：“我只知道我现在真喜欢她，她也喜欢我。”他决定带她走，觉得这是走了一条光明的爱情正道。他说：“这件事我认为光明正大，我可以跟任何人谈。”然而，他认为光明正大的事却让他犯了更大的罪孽——兄妹乱伦。这不仅出乎他的意料，也出乎四凤的意料，这是怎么也无法面对的。于是，一场悲剧爆发。他们都自杀了，周冲也无辜死亡，鲁侍萍和繁漪疯了。这场悲剧的根源是周朴园，是他抛弃鲁侍萍的“原罪”衍生的。作者在“原罪”的母题下表现人物向伦理正道的回归，却犯了更大的罪孽，充分显示了“天地间的‘残忍’”，并形象地告诉人们“宇宙正像一口残酷的井，落在里面，

怎样呼号也难逃脱这黑暗的坑”(曹禺,《曹禺全集(第1卷)》7-8),也告诉人们任何乱伦的行为,是自觉的还是不自觉的,都将受到惩罚。曹禺就是在这种宿命论式的描写中显示了自己的伦理立场和伦理观念。

第三,通过描写家族伦理、群体伦理和国家伦理的自觉选择状态,丰富和深化伦理表达的思想意蕴,对传统伦理观寄予着深切的思考,从而彰显自己的伦理立场和道德价值取向。伦理规范是对个体行为的一种规约,不仅是个体之间生命体验的行为引导,而且是个体对家族的责任担当、对群体(集体)的义务履行和对国家的使命坚守。在世俗社会中,个体既是家族成员,也是群体(集体)成员,还是国家公民,都被赋予了相应的伦理要求,肩负着相应的责任、义务和使命,但这种要求又往往因时代情势的变化而改变其正误的位置。曹禺戏剧对这种状况进行了深刻的思考。如前所述,《原野》中主人公仇虎杀掉焦阎王的儿子焦大星,为家族报仇后非常恐惧,总是出现幻觉,反复说:“大星,不是我要害你,是阎王。”他在黑林子里总是找不到出路,最后自杀了。显然,通过这种伦理选择状态的表现,对传统的道德伦理观念进行了反思,显示了现代性的伦理立场。在曹禺看来,封建的家族伦理观念虽然有其一定的合理性,但是并不是亘古真理,而是包含着一些落后的观念甚至是腐朽的内容,必须进行扬弃。

曹禺戏剧的伦理书写并不仅仅关注个体自由发展的权利问题,还关注到了社会群体的伦理要求。《雷雨》中的鲁大海,在周朴园开的矿上做工,不满压榨,带领工人罢工,成为来周公馆与周朴园谈判的代表。应该说,他的选择是服从于社会群体利益的,是对群体责任的担当。然而十分荒诞的是,这个周朴园竟然是他的亲生父亲,他的母亲也突然到这里来了,而和他一同来谈判的另外三个代表却早已被收买而妥协了、回去了,剩下他一个人在这里傻子似地等谈判,又被自己的同胞兄弟殴打,而母亲还不允许他“伤周家人”。显然,曹禺对于群体事件并不支持,而是主张冷静协商的处理方式。这种伦理立场显示了曹禺的主观理想。尤其是,曹禺坚持人道主义的伦理立场,主张群体间彼此关怀、相互关爱、友善无私。这种伦理取向《日出》中表现尤其突出。如前所述,李石清是大丰银行的秘书,黄省三的同事,又是孩子的父亲,妻子的丈夫,不仅被赋予了家庭伦理责任,又被赋予了银行的职业伦理规范与群体伦理要求,他对银行忠心耿耿,以铁手腕裁减员工,置黄省三于死地,只想自己往上爬,以期更好地履行作为丈夫和父亲的责任。然而,他并没有如愿以偿,而是被银行开除了,弄得和黄省三一样家破人亡。这种伦理选择的结果表明,曹禺的群体伦理观是反对个人主义的。它告诉人们,在群体中,不择手段往上爬,丧失道德理性,最终没有好结果。

在曹禺的戏剧中,对于国家伦理规范的书写也是重要内容。《蜕变》《黑字二十八》《桥》《明朗的天》《胆剑篇》《王昭君》都予以了艺术表现。在《蜕变》中,曹禺用正反对比的手法描写剧中主人公的不同表现,显示了对于伦

理书写的广度与深度。抗战爆发后，在亡国灭种的危机面前，都必须全身心投身于抗战事业之中。可是，作为政府的伤兵医院院长秦仲宣则仍然过着醉生梦死的生活，大肆贪污腐败，最终受到查处。相反，丁大夫则将全身心投入抗战。抗战爆发后，她舍弃在上海的高薪和优裕的生活，毅然投奔抗日前线，全身心地投入到救治伤员的工作中。而且，她希望救治更多伤员，为国家尽力，为这个伟大的民族效死。因此，她看到医院腐败不堪，就和院长秦仲宣之流展开斗争。同时，她让自己正在求学的独子加入了战地服务团，鼓动全家献身抗日救亡事业。这种伦理选择，显示了一种高尚的道德情操，展现了一个“救苦救难的女神”（刘家思，《曹禺的戏剧人生与艺术》68）的品格。然而，而秦仲宣的行为取向则完全相反。在这里，曹禺通过正反人物不同的伦理选择的描写，表明自己的国家伦理观念与伦理立场，鼓励民众必须为国效力。

由此可见，曹禺戏剧以伦理为基本视角，不仅思考着人生问题，而且关注着社会问题，同时探究着民族文化与国家复兴的宏大问题。他对于人物伦常行动不同状态的表现，都是人物对于自身特定伦理身份的自觉维护或背离，是基于特定伦理价值或自觉的感知与认定，或错误的判断与表现。“在伦理学领域里，价值认定或价值感知的意识活动与逻辑学领域的感知体验活动一样，属于意识分析的最原初的开端或最深层的基础”（倪梁康 105）。正是这种艺术表现，充分显示了曹禺正向的主观伦理立场与伦理理想。

在人类社会，伦理是普遍存在的社会关系，是不以人的主体意志和愿望为转移的客观存在。戏剧是关于人生的艺术，是描写特定时代背景和历史境遇下的生命状态及其相互关系，反映人类生存的基本状况，进而揭示社会的伦理本质。戏剧人物的伦理行为总是建立在对于人生价值的自觉认定与深切感知之上的。曹禺戏剧以其对世俗人生不同形态的伦理书写显示了艺术表现的深度和广度。不仅揭示了人类伦理身份的复杂性，而且揭示了不同时代境遇下的伦理冲突与道德激战，彰显了人类在伦理道德面前心魂的颤抖与命运的卑微。同时，曹禺戏剧对于伦理的书写，经历了从关注生命价值到关注群体价值再到关注民族国家的伦理要求的过程，表现了个体生命伦理身份要以群体与民族国家伦理要求为前提的基本立场。它告诉人们，伦理问题不仅仅是一个简单的个体问题，而且是一个涉及群体和组织规则的问题，既是一个社会秩序问题，也是一个国家管理问题。其前后期对于生命伦理的书写充满着不可回避的矛盾性，目的“在于为人类提供从伦理角度认识社会和生活的道德范例，为人类的物质生活和精神生活提供道德警示，为人类的自我完善提供道德经验”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》14），反映了曹禺对现实人生的执着关怀和强烈理想，体现了满腔的热情和高度的社会责任感。

Works Cited

曹禺：《曹禺全集》第1卷。石家庄：花山文艺出版社，1996年。

- [Cao, Yu. *Thunderstorm Volume One*. Shijiazhuang: Huashan Literature and Art Press, 1996.]
- 曹禺：《曹禺全集》第5卷。石家庄：花山文艺出版社，1996年。
- [Cao, Yu. *Thunderstorm Volume Five*. Shijiazhuang: Huashan Literature and Art Press, 1996.]
- 刘家思：“论曹禺戏剧的奴仆形象”，《南昌大学学报》4（1995）：93-97。
- [Liu, Jiasi. An Analysis of Servant Image in Cao Yu's drama." *Journal of Nanchang University* 4 (1995):93-97.]
- ：《曹禺戏剧的剧场性研究》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2010年。
- [— *A Study on Theatricality of Cao Yu's Drama*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Publishing House, 2010.]
- ：《曹禺的戏剧人生与艺术》。芜湖：安徽师大出版社，2012年。
- [— *Cao Yu's Life About Drama and Art*. Wuhu: Anhui Normal University Press, 2012.]
- ：《苦闷者的理想与期待——曹禺戏剧形态学研究》。北京：中国戏剧出版社，2003年。
- [— *Ideals and Expectations of Depressed People: A study on Morphology of Cao Yu's drama*. Beijing: China Drama Publishing House, 2003.]
- 倪梁康：“价值感知与伦常行动”，《南国学术》1（2018）：98-108。
- [Ni, Liangkang. "Value Perception and Ethical Behavior." *South China Quarterly* 1 (2018):98-108.]
- 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014年。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014.]
- 万家宝：《偶像孔子》，《南中周刊》25（1927）：15-19。
- [Wan, Jiabao. "Idol Confucius." *Nankai Middle School Weekly* 25 (1927):15-19.]
- 田本相：《苦闷的灵魂——曹禺访谈录》。南京：江苏教育出版社，2001年。
- [Tian, Benxiang. *The Depressed Soul: A Collection of interviews about Cao Yu*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Publishing House, 2001.]
- ：《曹禺年谱长编》。上海：上海交通出版社，2017年。
- [— *The Chronicle of Cao Yu's life*. Shanghai: Shanghai Jiao Tong University Press, 2017.]
- 余峥和席扬：“伦理兴趣与文化取向的对位效应——曹禺剧作文化价值论之一”，《山西师大学报（社会科学版）》2（1989）：60-65。
- [Yu, Zheng and Yang Xi. "Ethical Interest and Cultural Orientation: One of Cultural Axiology of Cao Yu's Drama." *Journal of Shanxi Normal University* 2 (1989): 60-65.]
- 张亮：“艰难的涉渡之舟：曹禺早期戏剧叙事伦理”，《广州广播电视大学学报》3（2016）：83-87。
- [Zhang, Liang. "The Tough Raft of Fording: The Narrative Ethic of Cao Yu's Early Drama." *Journal of Guangzhou Radio&TV University* 3 (2016): 83-87.]

爱欲的乌托邦：论《会饮》中阿里斯托芬的讲辞

The Utopia of Eros: On Aristophanes' Encomium in Plato's *Symposium*

汪云霞 (Wang Yunxia)

内容摘要：在柏拉图的《会饮》中，阿里斯托芬借助圆球人神话揭示了人的嬗变与爱欲的多重面向。在阿里斯托芬看来，人是自然与文明双重规训的结果，一种斯芬克斯因子的存在，人的爱欲源于天性而成于教化，其实质就在于寻求自身失去的另一半，修复残缺，达至整全。这种爱欲观彰显了爱欲的关系性、唯一性与整全性，但把所爱者视为属己的一半，而非独立个体，也就消解了爱欲的开放性与异质性。对整全性的爱欲既然指向远离文明的自然状态，则这种爱欲想象也是虚幻的。苏格拉底与奥古斯丁的升阶之歌，开辟了爱欲的理性与信仰维度。但爱欲之为爱欲，在于它的无规定性和无条件性，既不能归之于自然，也不可归之于至善至圣，而只能复归于人自身，是人的自由创造与表达。要实现爱欲的突围，就要从自我走向他者，从独白走向对话，从爱人如己走向爱人如人。

关键词：柏拉图；《会饮》；阿里斯托芬；斯芬克斯因子；爱欲；双性同体

作者简介：汪云霞，文学博士，上海交通大学人文学院中文系副教授，硕士生导师，主要从事中国现代诗歌与中西比较诗学研究。本文为国家社科基金一般项目“罗伯特·白英跨文化叙事中的中国形象研究”【项目编号：18BZW152】阶段性研究成果。

Title: The Utopia of Eros: On Aristophanes' Encomium in Plato's *Symposium*

Abstract: In Plato's *Symposium*, Aristophanes' encomium on Eros inspires us to learn human nature and its afflictions and the essence of love. According to Aristophanes' tale, human beings in the past are bisexual creatures. By the command of Zeus, each of them was cut into two and each of them is unisexual and seeks the other half. That means man is an existence of Sphinx factor. The desire and pursuit of the whole is the essence of Eros. Aristophanes' speech reveals love's three attributes: relationship, exclusiveness and wholeness. But since the beloved is regarded not as an individual, but as the lover's own half of the whole, both the openness and the otherness of love will be destroyed at last. Besides, the wholeness is nothing but an illusion which couldn't be achieved by returning to the primeval

past. Contrast to Aristophanes' view of love, both Socrates and St. Augustine constructed the ladder of love, upward to the Idea or to the God. However, all of them shared the same love paradigm of separation and unity. In order to transcend the deficiency of their love narratives and to realize the liberation of love, the lovers need to transform from monologue to dialogue, from self-love to other-love, from loving the other as oneself to loving the other as the other.

Keywords: Plato; Symposium; Aristophanes; Eros; Androgyny

Author: Wang Yunxia, PhD, is Associate Professor and MA supervisor of Comparative Literature and vice dean of the School of Humanities, Shanghai Jiao Tong University(200234, Shanghai). Her research focuses on comparative poetics and modern Chinese Poetry (Email: yunxia@sjtu.edu.cn).

阿里斯托芬是古希腊著名诗人，被尊为“喜剧之父”。然而，阿里斯托芬为人所称道的，除了他那熠熠生辉的喜剧作品外，还有他与苏格拉底等人的往来唱和。阿里斯托芬在自己的作品中揶揄过苏格拉底，虽然苏格拉底据说还在剧场向阿里斯托芬脱帽致敬，但他也坦诚，自己遭受控告，和阿里斯托芬不无关系（Apology 18D-19C）¹。柏拉图虽然在“听了苏格拉底的谈话后，就把自己的诗作投进了火堆”（拉尔修 138），并试图在理想国里驱逐诗人（Republic 595B, 607B），但他却为阿里斯托芬撰写了墓志铭（阿里斯托芬 227）。柏拉图作品的诗性风格，向来深入人心，连后世的诗人锡德尼和雪莱都赞赏不已（锡德尼 5；雪莱 457）。在《会饮》这部诗意盎然的爱欲之书，柏拉图让阿里斯托芬与苏格拉底等人隆重出场，坐而论道。透过柏拉图的完美呈现，我们有幸见识了阿里斯托芬的风采。这位喜剧之父，成了柏拉图的剧中人，藉此柏拉图展现了自己的诗人气质。然而，正如我们不能把剧中人阿里斯托芬和剧作家阿里斯托芬混为一谈，我们也不能简单的说，柏拉图笔下的阿里斯托芬说出的就是柏拉图的心声。

《会饮》与其说是一篇哲学专论，倒不妨说是一部诗歌或戏剧杰作。行文架构上，俄罗斯套娃般层层套嵌，环环相扣；思想路径上，拾阶而上，交相辉映。在这场思想盛宴中，柏拉图时而引经据典，时而故事新编；虽不乏观念沉思，但言说更加精彩。从座次安排上看，阿里斯托芬居于所有发言人的中间位置，具有特殊的地位；在内在的思想交锋中，阿里斯托芬也处于和苏格拉底双峰对峙、平分秋色的局面。在柏拉图的整个爱欲思考中，阿里斯托芬的爱欲观念无疑具有突出的位置。那么，我们应该怎样来理解剧中人阿里斯托芬的爱欲讲辞呢？他的讲辞为何如此令人着迷？他的人性论与爱欲观，

1 柏拉图引文采用标准页码，《会饮》译文参考刘小枫编译：《柏拉图四书》，北京：三联书店，2015年。

有着怎样的洞见与偏见，又能给予后人哪些启示？如果说“所有关乎爱欲的争论都发端于柏拉图”（Irving Singer 47），那么，在这种思想回溯中，重新反思剧中人阿里斯托芬的爱欲观念，无疑是非常必要的准备工作。

一、何以为人：一种斯芬克斯因子的存在

爱欲首先是作为一位神祇出场并接受赞颂的。但阿里斯托芬无意为爱神争夺神谱位置，也无意于强调它的古老、伟大抑或高贵，而是把它拉向人间，凸显其与人类的密切关系。因为爱神“最怜爱世人，是世人的扶持者，是治疗世人的医生”。既然爱神与人类的命运息息相关，所以，阿里斯托芬首先探讨的，就不是爱神的尊卑次序，而是“人的自然（天性）及其遭际”（Symposium 189d）。那么，何为人？人性是如何建构起来的？阿里斯托芬以诙谐幽默的神话故事为我们揭示了人的双重面向。

阿里斯托芬首先描绘了人类的所谓最初的生存景象。从前的人是圆球状的，所有器官都成双成对，四手四腿，两张脸庞，生殖器官也是两个。因为两两成双，所以这样的原始人的性别特征，也就一分为三，表现为男男、女女、既男又女。这样的原始人从何而来，何以一分为三？原来他们分别是太阳、大地和月亮的后裔。他们通过排卵于外，而不是两性结合的方式来繁衍子嗣，这意味着他们尚无人的爱欲，只有一种自然力量。而这种自然力量让他们自我膨胀，总想有所作为。他们不满足于地上的翻滚，而要打开通天路，与天上宙斯诸神比高低（Symposium 189e-190c）。圆球人所象征的人类生存景象仅仅是未加修饰的原始状态，一种非神非人的自然状态。根据希腊神谱，整个世界都来自于宇宙诸神，太阳、月亮和大地也从属于宇宙诸神，即便是奥林匹亚众神，从出身来说也都是宇宙诸神的后代（吴雅凌 80, 150, 354）。但阿里斯托芬的讲辞没有论及太阳、大地和月亮的神祇地位，也没有涉及圆球人是否分有某种神性的问题。这就意味着，圆球人及其祖先都是属于自然领域，只有宙斯等奥林匹亚众神才跻身神圣世界（Steven Berg 61-62）。

神人之间，乃至诸神之间的紧张与冲突，为阿里斯托芬进一步探讨人性及爱欲埋下伏笔。正是这种人神对峙，最终带来了人类生存处境的改变以及人的嬗变。圆球人的自然本性所催生的向上的力量，与以宙斯为代表的天上诸神构成冲突。对后者来说，原始人的这种狂妄显然是一种僭越，意味着对于既定宇宙秩序的挑战（林志猛 22）。因为整个世界都受制于宙斯诸神，神人之间泾渭分明，容不得任何的改变，否则惩罚和规训就随之而来。阿里斯托芬指出，宙斯诸神出于算计，既不能把原始人统统灭绝，也不能任其胡作非为，最后想到的办法是把人一劈为二，既削弱了人的力量，也加增了人的数目。宙斯还威胁人类，如若依然狂妄，就把世人再切割一次。那样的话，人类就更加孱弱，只能一只脚蹦跳着行走世间。很显然，在人神的第一次对决中，人类就败下阵来。他们虽然没有遭遇灭亡的命运，但他们不得不接受

命运的改变。宙斯把人类切成两半，阿波罗受命扭转脸脖，平整皮肤，并在身上留下一些皱纹，让“世人记住这些古老的遭遇”（*Symposium* 191a）。于是，从前的双性人，现在变成了单性人，单纯的男人或女人。这是多么沉重的创伤！但人类的第一次重塑导致了混乱、无序和死亡。因为每个人都盲目地渴望着与自己的被切割的另一半结合，摆脱当下的残缺状态，恢复过去的整全状态。然而这种自然冲动所带来的超出预期的灾难性后果在于，虽然他们无力再去挑战诸神，但也忘记了保全自我。他们在寻求中由于失去了生殖本能而趋于灭亡。这一后果，不仅有违人性，也影响了神性。宙斯诸神在失去挑战的同时，也失去人类的顺服和祭拜，自身存在也就岌岌可危。从而整个世界的有序性就荡然无存。由此可见，人神之间虽然存在冲突，但本质上他们处于一种共生共在相互依存的平衡状态。因此，出于怜悯，也出于自保，宙斯亲自对人类进行了二次改造：通过摆正人的生殖构造来改变人类的生殖方式。把从前的外在卵生，变成了如今的有性生殖。于是，男女之间的相互拥抱和两性结合，就能够孕育生命，繁衍后代。与此同时，这种相互拥抱，也给人们带来了平静与满足，生活得以继续，人神相融无碍，各自安好。

阿里斯托芬的讲辞揭示出人类的两种不同存在样式及其转变过程。圆球人是宇宙诸神之子，无所或缺，自由自在的野蛮人，半球人是宙斯诸神的费心之作，爱欲，生殖，劳作，献祭，忙乱不堪的文明人。前者目空一切，犯上作乱，敢于和宙斯诸神比高低，有着乐生遂性的自然本能；后者则带着创伤记忆，怀着回归的希望，希冀从残缺回归完整。圆球人早已不在，现存于世的真实的人，则是经过宙斯诸神两次重塑了的半球人。正如古希腊神话中狮身人面的斯芬克斯一样，阿里斯托芬笔下的半球人同样具有双重的规定性，是一种斯芬克斯因子的存在（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子》5）。从起源上看，人出自自然，是自然的一部分，分有原初圆球人的身体与欲望；从实存来说，他则是诸神的杰作，是文明礼法规训的结果，是一种伦理选择的结果。这种双重性，意味着人之为人，经历了漫长的进化与选择，是自然与文明双重锻造的结果。阿里斯托芬诉诸于圆球人的自然力量，来挑战既有的宇宙秩序和礼法，质疑宙斯诸神的权威性与合法性。这象征着自然对于文明的挑战，彰显着自然与文明，天性与人性之间的张力。但他又肯定了人性乃宙斯诸神重塑的产物，这就意味着，人尽管源出于宇宙自然，残存着自然的天性与兽性因子，但终究隶属于文明礼法，是由人性因子所决定的（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：人性概念的阐释与考辨》15-17）。

进一步来说，阿里斯托芬虽然直面了人的现实生存处境，但他对于自然与文明均怀有一定的质疑与批判。在阿里斯托芬看来，原始状态固然完满无缺，成为人类的原始记忆与永恒复归之所，但却不能使人之为成为可能。现如今的改头换面的半球人，虽然与古老的宇宙诸神保留着渊源关系，但他们现在却和宙斯诸神相似，并接受宙斯诸神的统治。阿里斯托芬在描述人类

的悲惨命运的时候，事实上也就对宙斯诸神的合法性提出了质疑。作为荷马与赫西俄德的传人，柏拉图及其剧中人阿里斯托芬在接受希腊的神话谱系的同时也在不断的加以重构（马特 4-6）。阿里斯托芬关于人的嬗变的故事，无疑借助了希腊的神话传统，并给予了新的阐释（K.J. Dover 41-50）。虽然从来源上说宙斯诸神也是宇宙诸神的后代，但作为第三代神祇，他们早已通过反叛获得了自己现有的神圣地位，摆脱了自然并凌驾于其上，成为现实世界秩序和礼法的制定和守卫者（列奥·施特劳斯 168, 173）。进而言之，宇宙诸神的神圣性已经退化乃至消失，只能接受宙斯的辖制，乃至成为自然的一部分。而宙斯诸神则成为文明与礼法的化身，他们打破了宇宙世界最原始的自然状态，在重新创立宇宙秩序和法则的同时，也树立了自身的权威与合法性。不过，宙斯诸神自身的合法性始终受到怀疑，其贪婪自私，残暴嫉妒的形象也处处显示出僭主特征。半球人在借助爱欲实现自我的同时，也意味着要恢复过去的整全状态，复归于圆球人时代。这正是自然对于文明的反抗与逃离，尽管这样的反抗和逃离最终是无效的。这正是人类命运的复杂性：既不能重回原初的自然处境，也不能安于文明规训的命运，只能在自然与文明之间挣扎。

二、爱欲的本质：对整全性的追求

阿里斯托芬的圆球人既让人忍俊不禁，也让人肃然起敬，暗自沉思，不免悲从中来。这显然不是插科打诨，而是亦庄亦谐，彰显了悲喜剧的统一（Harry Neumann 420-426）。正是人的嬗变，让爱欲彰显。反过来，也正是爱欲，让人之为人，成为可能。爱欲成为人的应有之义与根本所在。没有爱欲，人类或者沦为自然，或者趋于灭亡。有了爱欲，人才能休养生息，满怀希望。那么，何为爱欲，爱欲何以可能？爱欲有着怎样的内在规定呢？如果说关于人性的描述只是序曲，那么，关于爱欲的想象才是阿里斯托芬讲辞的中心地带。

爱欲内在于人性深处，是人性的展示，与人的存在相伴相生。如果说人是一种斯芬克斯因子存在，人的本质决定于其中的人性因子而不是兽性因子，那么，爱欲同样包含了自然与文明的双重性，是源于自然而成于教化，有着深深的文明烙印。在阿里斯托芬那里，爱欲的生成经历了痛苦的演变过程，至少包含了三个阶段。最初，遥远时代的圆球人基本上是无爱欲可言的。他们的卵生方式意味着生殖无需外求，无需与他人发生关系。既没有交往的需求，也没有相互的渴望。他们有的，只是一种自然的力量，这种自然的力量还谈不上是爱欲或理智，而更多的只是一种自然本能，或者说一种爱欲的萌芽。随后，当圆球人被一分为二，由整全状态转而成为残缺状态的时候，“每一半都渴望着与自己的（另）一半走到一起”（Symposium 191a）。彼此之间相互欲求，成为爱欲的第一要义。不过，这种相互欲求简单而粗暴，它无分男女，不问彼此，未经思考，不计后果。尤为可怕的是，这种欲求忽略了生息劳作，潜在地具有死亡倾向，最终导致了自我，乃至整个人类的毁灭。一方面，导

致毁灭的爱欲严格说来就不是真正的爱欲，至少不是普遍意义上的爱欲，因为如果没有了人类自身，爱欲从何谈起？只能是一种幻象。所以，这种欲求虽然为我们提供了爱欲的第一要义，但毕竟还不是真正意义上的人的爱欲。只有当真正的人出现了，爱欲才获得完整的形象。

最后，为了摆脱爱欲所带来的混乱与毁灭，宙斯在重塑人的身体形式的时候，把有性生殖赋予人类。有性之爱欲一方面带来了身体的愉悦和精神的满足，另一方面也带来了生命的孕育和生产。生殖并不必然带来爱欲，圆球人圆满自足，通过无性生殖自我繁衍。但半球人在宙斯诸神的改造下已经面目全非，“世人要在另一个中繁衍后代，亦即通过男性在女性中繁衍后代”（*Symposium* 191c）。于是，生命的孕育与生产不再是一个人的事情，而是两个人的共同作为。两性的结合并藉此生产子嗣就成为爱欲的另一向度。当然，阿里斯托芬告诉我们，正如人的存在不只是为了生育一样，爱欲的存在也不只是为了生殖。生产子嗣只存在于男女之间，但爱欲则面向所有人，既存在于男女之间，也出现在男与男、女与女之间。既然爱欲呈现不同的样态，那么，生殖维度就不能构成爱欲的本质规定。生育与其说是爱欲的自然原因，还不如说是爱欲的自然结果，甚至可以说只是爱欲的伴生物。男男女女之间的爱欲，虽然不能生产子嗣，但可以让人们“靠这种在一起满足一下，然后他们会停下来转向劳作，关切生命的其他方面”。愉悦身心，安于劳作，休养生息，尊礼守法，构成了人生的全部内容。这一切，都有赖于爱欲来实现。由此可见，爱欲与人息息相关，同样是进化与选择的结果，只有真正的人的出现，爱欲才是可能和必要的。正如半球人不是圆球人，半球人的爱欲也不同于圆球人的原始欲望。爱欲与其说是一种与生俱来的自然天性，不如说是一种后天伦理选择的结果，最终是由宙斯诸神所象征的文明礼法塑造、引领和教化的。不惟如是，阿里斯托芬的爱欲洞见还在于，他把爱欲与生死联系起来。爱欲既具有创生的一面，也具有向死的一面。爱欲的生死向度，无疑在弗洛伊德那里获得了遥远的回应（《自我与本我》60-63）。

那么，爱欲到底是什么呢，什么才是爱欲最本质的规定性呢？阿里斯托芬说：“很久很久以前，对另一个的爱欲就在世人身上植下了根”，这种爱欲就是要“修复（世人的）原初自然，企图从两半中打造出一个（人），从而治疗世人的自然。”（*Symposium* 191d）纵观阿里斯托芬的爱欲讲辞，他的爱欲观念至少包含着三个层面。

首先，爱欲体现为一种关系性和唯一性。爱欲指向另一个人，是对另一个人的爱欲。不论是男男，女女，还是男女之间的爱欲，都表现为走出自身，走向对方。既然是走向对方，那爱欲就不是一个人的独白，关系性是爱欲的重要维度。不仅如此，由于爱欲双方有着唯一的创伤痕迹和完整记忆，理想的爱欲就不是随意的，也不是多样化的，而是唯一的，排他的。正所谓“弱水三千我只取一瓢饮”，两半相合才能成为一体，一个人找到了自己的另一半，

就会心无旁骛，从一而终。在阿里斯托芬所列举的三类爱欲关系中，成年男子与少年人之间的极具男子气概的爱欲关系受到特别的赞扬，而其他两类爱欲关系则受到贬损。不过，从起源上说，其来有自，每一种爱欲都是对于唯一的另一半的爱欲，都是出于天性，只是形态不同而已，本身无所谓高下贵贱。进而言之，与其他人的说法不同，阿里斯托芬笔下的人，既然同属于对等的一半，就没有所谓的爱人与被爱之分，彼此都可以是爱者或被爱者。就此而言，阿里斯托芬对于男童恋的褒扬就具有反讽意味，无法从爱欲本身获得根据。

其次，爱欲本质上就是合二为一，建构一体和整全。人不是为爱欲而活着，但人不能没有爱欲。那么，彼此之间的相拥与渴望，到底所追寻的是什么呢？就是“欲求和追求整全”（Symposium 193a）。阿里斯托芬笔下的人，是饱尝创伤，怀念往昔，心怀恐惧的人。相对于原始圆球人而言，这样的人是残缺的，病态的，身体上保留着创伤的痕迹，内心里满是创伤记忆。爱者与被爱者之间的爱欲，也就表现出医治创伤，寻求原初的整全。如同一分为二的符片，切割的印记成为人们彼此追寻、确认的信物，成为人怀念过去，正视现实的凭证。每个人都试图恢复过去的整全状态，满足内在的双性同体渴望。爱欲所爱欲的，就是本来属于自我，现在失去的另一半，而不是任何与己无关的人或物。人们遇到自己的另外半个身体，就会黏在一起，不仅享受阿芙洛狄特式的云雨之欢，而且获得一种整全与一体感。阿里斯托芬借用火神赫斐斯托斯之口来揭示解释爱欲的这一本质，就是把爱者与被爱者熔成一体，合而为一（Symposium 192e）。

再者，爱欲对一体与整全的追求，与其说是复归过去的渴望，不如说是对抗现实的唯一依靠。爱欲不是疾病，而是治疗疾病。如果说爱神是治病救人的医生，那爱欲也就是医治创伤的技艺。这也意味着，爱欲不是一种自然力量，而是一种文明创造。爱欲虽然显示了人类对于原始状态的复归渴望，但本质上它是无关乎原始圆球人，它是伴随着人的生成而生成的，是来自于人，属于人，而又为了人。人不仅是残缺的，而且是软弱的。“我们此前是一个，现在处于不义，被神分开”。只有接受文明和礼法的规训，人才成为人，否则“恐怕会被再劈一次，……成为半截符片”（Symposium 193a）。规训和惩罚如影随形，始终笼罩在世人面前，令人心生畏惧。而要战胜这种软弱和恐惧，摆脱被规定的命运，除了爱欲，人无所依凭，除了爱欲，人也无法承受生命之沉重。而要遇到自己心仪的另一半，实现爱欲的圆满，唯有借助爱神的引领。爱神因人而生，既保全人类，又给人类带来福乐与希望。不论能否获得整全，爱欲至少让人心满意足，在文明礼法的世界里获得慰藉，哪怕可能只是暂时的满足，虚幻的迷梦。对于阿里斯托芬来说，芸芸众生虔敬爱神，具有双重意义，就是要摆脱恐惧，满怀希望。当然，如果复归自然意味着摆脱文明束缚，爱欲对于文明礼法乃至宙斯诸神的反抗精神也就不言而喻。

三、想象的乌托邦：爱欲的突围

阿里斯托芬借助圆球人的双性同体意象以及半球人复归整全的渴望，彰显了爱欲的关系性、唯一性与一体性，视之为爱欲的基本规定。这种爱欲观与其人性论互为表里，实质就是人的自我实现。既然人受制于自然与文明的双重规训，那么，人的爱欲就不可避免的带着自然与文明的烙印。此外，阿里斯托芬既强调了身体上的云雨之欢，也没有忽视灵魂上的渴望与满足，尽管对于后者他语焉不详。这些都是阿里斯托芬爱欲观的鲜明特色与可贵之处，为无数人想象、思考和追求爱欲提供了重要启示。无论是奥维德笔下的忒瑞西阿斯（Tiresias）、那耳喀索斯（Narcissus）和赫尔玛芙罗狄特斯（Hermaphroditus）等雌雄同体形象（奥维德 55-59, 73-76），还是弗洛伊德的双性意识（弗洛伊德，《爱情心理学》1-18），抑或伍尔夫的双性化写作（伍尔夫 128），都可视为阿里斯托芬爱欲观念的一系列注脚。不过，柏拉图并不满意阿里斯托芬的表现，认为这种爱欲观陷入智者派的窠臼，既不及阿迦通，更遑论苏格拉底了（列奥·施特劳斯 204）。假如这种说法是成立的，那么阿里斯托芬爱欲观的局限性在哪里？假使爱欲如同被层层围困的猛兽，它如何实现自身的突围？

首先，阿里斯托芬看到了爱欲的关系性，但这种关系性是不彻底的。阿里斯托芬认为爱欲双方均是残缺的一半，爱欲就是爱欲原属于自己的另一半，唯一的另一半。但另一半在哪里，如何寻找，何以确认，始终是个难题。“众里寻他千百度，蓦然回首，那人却在灯火阑珊处。”但那人如何就是自己的另一半？虽然阿里斯托芬看到了身体的重要性，强调了身体上的切割印记，但这种印记经过一代代人的轮替，早已扑朔迷离，无从辨识，只能是一种原始记忆或精神想象。人不仅不能够通过身体的印记确认对方是自己的另一半，也无法确认自己是对方的另一半，遑论彼此共同的确认。于是，爱欲的唯一性就会变成随意性。无穷的追逐，每一次深情，都可能是真实的谎言。“人越爱，荒谬就越牢固”（加缪 97）。进而言之，既然把所爱者视如己出，而不是异己的他者，那么爱欲就成了对于属己之物的爱欲（列奥·施特劳斯 198）。这样的话，爱欲就从他者转向自身，成为一种自爱。爱欲既然成了自我独白，爱欲最终只能是作茧自缚，无路可逃，爱欲的关系性随之消解，爱欲的开放性与异质性也就不复存在。阿里斯托芬未能正确的认识自我与他者，也就不能正确的看待爱欲的关系性。实际上，虽然每个人都是残缺的半球人。但这半球人既然存在于世，接受了文明的规训，那他就获得了自身的独立性。作为独立的个体，他虽然在形式上是残缺的，但主体性却是毋庸置疑，也无法消解的。他既不能成为他人的所谓整体的另一半，也不能视他人为自己的整体的另一半。因此之故，莎乐美固然可以把约翰视为自己的另一半，但约翰却无视她的存在，拒绝属于任何人。只有当莎乐美轻吻约翰血淋淋的头

颇，感受爱欲滋味的时候，约翰才成为莎乐美的属己之物，但爱欲也随之土崩瓦解（王尔德 47-49）。同样，在电影《摇滚芭比》（*Hedwig and the Angry Inch*）中，海德薇那切割之痛，与其说是复归过去的印记，不如说是告别过去，走向未来的起点；是彼此确认的印记，不是确认彼此互为对方的另一半，而是确认彼此都是独立的互不隶属的个体。这些人都怀着阿里斯托芬笔下的半球人的爱欲，但最终都是爱欲的幻灭。所以，爱欲不可能退化成对于属己之物的爱欲，而只能是对异己的他者的欣赏与馈赠。爱欲要走出对于属己之物的迷思，确立自我与他者的独立性与关系性，才能重新建构爱欲的关系性。

其次，阿里斯托芬把爱欲视为对于整全性的追寻，但这种整全性渴望最终也是徒劳的。如前所述，阿里斯托芬的整全性是以原始状态的圆球人为范本的。圆球人的完满自足同时也意味着自我封闭，无需外求，因而也就是一种毫无爱欲的非人的自然状态。如果是这样的话，追求整全就意味着最终走向了无欲，走向了自我毁灭。爱欲所指向的终点其实是个死胡同，这是爱欲与人性的双重丧失。何以如此？因为半球人及其爱欲虽然保留着原始的记忆，有其自然天性的一面，但根本上却出于宙斯诸神的规训与怜悯，是由文明礼法塑造和决定的。人之为人，爱欲之所以为爱欲，说到底，都是一种伦理选择和文明教化的结果。不论我们把这种文明礼法的烙印视为馈赠还是惩罚，都不能改变人及其爱欲的这一本质。而复归于原始状态，实际上就是对于文明世界的背离，是从文明返回自然，从人性退化到天性，从人走向了非人。不仅如此，既然爱欲使人得以苟活于世，则爱欲反过来也就构成了文明的全部。假使半球人的整全渴望得以实现，则整个文明世界必然再次陷入混乱和动荡。进而言之，这种整全性到底是身体上的片刻温存，还是精神上的一种幻象？阿里斯托芬对此未加思辨，也未能言明（Symposium 192d）。火神赫斐斯托斯的铁链与烈火所打造出来的整全状态，是否是爱人们真心实意寻求的目标？或许不过是一个摧毁了彼此独立性的可怕怪物。就此而言，阿里斯托芬意识到了整全性的虚幻，却没有破除这种虚幻，不免陷入自我麻醉，乃至自欺欺人的困境。如果阿里斯托芬认识到了复归的徒劳，那么或许他就能够藉此解构了爱欲的自然属性，从而彰显了爱欲的文明属性。但是爱欲的出路在哪里，文明的未来又将如何？这些问题都是阿里斯托芬没有提及和明确的。诗人的保守、悲观与非理性倾向在此显露出来。这也正是柏拉图对文学进行伦理批判的原因所在（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》108-109，126-128）。

那么，如果复归自我，回归自然，对抗文明都是徒劳的，那么只有超越自然与文明的双重对峙，摆脱自恋的陷阱和整全的幻象，爱欲才有出路和方向。爱欲与其说是一种自我整全性的复归，倒不如说是走出自我束缚走向自由的一种突围。为了解决阿里斯托芬的困境，柏拉图借助苏格拉底的哲人形象，超越作为诗人的阿里斯托芬，试图为爱欲指示新的方向。借助异乡女祭司第俄提玛的教诲与指引，爱欲走向了爱智向善之路（Symposium 210）。对

于苏格拉底来说，人是爱智者，爱欲不是对于属己之物的爱，“既非寻求一半，也非寻求整体”（*Symposium* 205e），而是欲求至美至善，乃至永恒的理念世界。由此，爱欲作为一种居间状态，不是平行的指向他者，而是垂直的指向上方（阿兰·布鲁姆 81）。在西方思想史中，美善相融相通，至美亦至善（聂珍钊、王松林，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》104,110）。苏格拉底强调的是爱欲的理性维度与伦理属性。既然人具有理性与德性的规定，则爱欲也必然是人的理性和德性的体现。爱欲既不能囿于自然本能的束缚，也无法逃避文明礼法的规定，它只能通过道德的教化而得以实现。如果说苏格拉底把爱欲与理智联系起来，那么奥古斯丁则从理智转向信仰，确立了爱欲的神圣维度。后者认为，爱就是出世归主，“拾阶上升”，直抵上帝之“安宅”（奥古斯丁 294）。在基督教的语境下，人是受造者，爱欲源于上帝也归于上帝，是上帝爱人，所以世人彼此相爱（John 13:34-35）。无论是苏格拉底的爱智之路，还是奥古斯丁的信仰之路，都意味着一种“升阶之歌”，为爱欲的突围提供了思路与方向。但这种向上的超越之维，同样意味着分离与复归，同样保留着某种合二为一的模式：或者与至善合一，或者与上帝合一（Charles M. Stang 251）。如此看来，它们和阿里斯托芬分享着相同的理论范式，不过是阿里斯托芬爱欲观的变种或延伸。进而言之，阿里斯托芬的讲辞也昭示后人，人不仅是一个有知者，一个有信者，更是一个有爱欲者（马礼荣 16）；不仅是学以成人，信以成人，更是爱以成人。对于一个爱欲者来说，爱欲首先意味着走出自身，走向他者，然后才可能指向至美至善至圣。但爱欲之为爱欲，就在于它的无规定性、无条件性和不可化约性，既不能归之于自然，也不可归之于至善至圣。就此而言，爱欲不是爱人如己，不是爱人如善，也不是爱人如神，而是爱人如人。爱人如人就意味着爱欲一个全然相异的独立个体。爱欲不是把对方纳为己有，也不是了如指掌，而是保持彼此的陌生与距离（Giorgio Agamben 61）。当爱欲走向他者，也就走向了未知和不确定，走向了陌生的林中空地，敞开而又遮蔽。爱欲因此就是一种自由的探险、创造与表演。

总之，剧中人阿里斯托芬的讲辞注重爱欲与人性的内在关联，凸显了爱欲的自然与文明属性及其内在张力。他关于爱欲的关系性、唯一性与一体性的肯定，成为我们思考和实践爱欲的重要支点。但他始终在自然与文明，过去与未来，自我与他者之间摇摆不定，具有自身的悖论与虚幻色彩。苏格拉底与奥古斯丁的升阶之歌，开辟了爱欲的理性与信仰维度。但爱欲是不可化约的，只有如其所是，从自我走向他者，从独白走向对话，从封闭走向开放，从对于属己之物的自恋转向对于他人的欣赏与馈赠，爱欲才能化蛹为蝶，实现突围与解放。然而，无论如何，阿里斯托芬的故事始终激动人心，他的声音始终回响在人类的心灵深处。

Works Cited

- 阿兰·布鲁姆：《爱的阶梯：柏拉图的〈会饮〉》，秦露译。北京：华夏出版社，2017年。
[Allan Bloom. *The Ladder of Love: Plato's Symposium*. Trans. Qin Lu. Beijing: Huaxia Publishing House, 2017.]
- 阿里斯托芬：《阿里斯托芬喜剧六种》，罗念生译。上海：上海人民出版社，2004年。
[Aristophanes. *Six Comedies*. Trans. Luo Niansheng. Shanghai: SPPH, 2004.]
- 奥古斯丁：《忏悔录》，周士良译。北京：商务印书馆，1997年。
[Augustine. *Confession*. Trans. Zhou Shiliang. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1997.]
- Berg, Steven. *Eros and the Intoxications of Enlightenment: On Plato's Symposium*, Albany. NY: State U of NY P, 2010.
- 加缪：《西西弗神话》，杜小真译。北京：商务印书馆，2017年。
[Camus, Albert. *Le Mythe de Sisyphe*. Trans. Du Xiaozhen. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2017.]
- 奥维德：《变形记》，杨周翰译。北京：人民文学出版社，2008年。
[Ovid. *Metamorphoses*. Trans. Yang Zhouhan. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2008.]
- Plato. *Complete Works*. Ed. John M. Cooper. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 1997.
- ：《柏拉图四书》，刘小枫编译。北京：三联书店，2015年。
[—, Four books of Plato. Ed. & Trans. Liu Xiaofeng. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2015.]
- Charles M. Stang. *Our Divine Double*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2016.
- Dover, K.J. "Aristophanes' Speech in Plato's Symposium." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 86 (1966): 41-50.
- 第欧根尼·拉尔修：《名哲言行录》，徐开来，溥林译。桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2010年。
[Laertius, Diogenes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Trans. Xu Kailai & Pu Lin. Guilin: Guangxi Normal UP, 2010.]
- 弗洛伊德：《自我与本我》，车文博主编。北京：九州出版社，2014年。
[Freud, Sigmund. *The Ego and the Id*. Ed. Che Wenbo, Beijing: Jiuzhou Press, 2014.]
- Giorgio Agamben. *Idea of Prose*. Trans. Michael Sullivan and Sam Whitsitt. New York: State U of NY P, 1995.
- ：《爱情心理学》，车文博主编。北京：九州出版社，2014年。
[—, *The Psychology of Love*. Ed. Che Wenbo. Beijing: Jiuzhou Press, 2014.]
- 林志猛：“柏拉图〈会饮〉论喜剧诗人的爱欲观”，《海南大学学报》（人文社科版）5（2017）：21-27。
[Lin Zhimeng. "The Concept of Eros of the Comic Poet in Plato's Symposium". *Humanities & Social Sciences Journal of Hainan University* 5 (2017): 21-27.]
- 马礼荣：《情爱现象学：六个沉思》，黄作译。北京：商务印书馆，2014年。
[Marion, J. L. *Le Phénomène érotique*. Trans. Huang Zuo. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2014.]
- 马特：《柏拉图与神话之镜：从黄金时代到大西岛》，吴雅凌译。上海：华东师范大学出版社，2011年。

[Mattéi J. F. *Platon et le miroir du mythe de l'Age d'or à l'Atlantide*. Trans. Wu Yaling. Shanghai: ECNU Press, 2011.]

Neumann, Harry. "On the Comedy of Plato's Aristophanes." *The American Journal of Philology* 87. 4 (1966), pp420-426.

聂珍钊 王松林:《文学伦理学批评理论研究》。北京:北京大学出版社,2020年。

[Nie Zhenzhao. Wang Songlin. *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

聂珍钊:“文学伦理学批评:伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子”,《外国文学研究》6(2011):1-13。

[Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Ethical Choice and Sphinx Factor." *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2011): 1-13.]

——:“文学伦理学批评:人性概念的阐释与考辨”,《外国文学研究》6(2015):10-19

[—."Ethical Literary Criticism: The Exposition and Textual Research on the Definition of Human Nature." *Foreign Literature Research* 6 (2015): 10-19.]

——:《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, 2020.]

锡德尼:《为诗辩护》,钱学熙译。北京:人民文学出版社,1964年。

[Sidney, Philip. *An Apology for Poetry*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 1964.]

雪莱:《雪莱全集》(第五卷),江枫主编。石家庄:河北人民出版社,2000年。

[Shelley, Mary. *The Complete Works* (vol.5). Ed. Jiang Feng. Shijiazhuang: Hebei People's Publishing House, 2000.]

Singer, Irving. *The Nature of Love: Plato to Luther*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2009.

列奥·施特劳斯:《论柏拉图的〈会饮〉》,邱立波译。上海:华东师范大学出版社,2012年。

[Strauss, Leo. *On Plato's Symposium*. Trans. Qiu Libo. Shanghai: ECNU Press, 2012.]

王尔德:《莎乐美》,苏福忠译。北京:人民文学出版社,2015年。

[Wilde, Oscar. *Salome*. Trans. Su Fuzhong. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2015.]

弗吉尼亚·伍尔夫:《一间自己的屋子》,王还译。北京:三联书店,1989年。

[Woolf, Virginia. *A Room of One's Own*. Trans. Wang Huan. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1989.]

吴雅凌:《神谱笺释》。北京:华夏出版社,2010年。

[Wu Yaling. *Hesiod Theogony: A Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Beijing: Huaxia Press, 2010.]

论建设中国叙事学的学术路径问题：以傅修延《听觉叙事研究》为例

On the Academic Path of Building Chinese Narratology: Taking Fu Xiuyan's *A Study of Auditory Narratology* as an Example

刘亚律 (Liu Yalu)

内容摘要：复数形态的中国叙事学呼唤建设路径的多样化。在与世界的对话中凸显民族特色，探究人类叙事活动的某些共通规律，是建设与发展中国叙事学的重要目标。“听觉叙事研究”为此贡献了方法论范例，主要表现在：1. 在研究角度上，从人类叙事活动中的听觉感知入手，冲破视觉中心主义一统天下的研究格局，恢复了叙事研究的“感觉生态”，更好地体现叙事即为讲述故事的基本特征。2. 在理论框架上，强调阅读活动中主体体验的优先性，以“音景”和“聆察”为核心概念搭建起“听觉叙事研究”的理论系统，为阐释与批评提供了有效的理论武器。3. 在研究范式上，以穷根溯源式的问题意识为先导，通过人类学、传播学、心理学、历史学与文学等多学科知识的深度融合，构筑起研究的知识谱系。“听觉叙事研究”标志着中国叙事学螺旋式发展进入了新的历史阶段。

关键词：听觉叙事；中国叙事学；方法论；发展

作者简介：刘亚律，文学博士，江西师范大学文学院副教授，江西师范大学叙事学研究中心研究员，主要从事叙事学、文学理论研究。本文系江西省社科规划课题“西方现代听觉美学研究”【项目编号：15WX10】、江西省哲学社会科学重点研究基地项目“欧美文学经典中的声响叙事”【项目编号：15SKJD12】的阶段性成果。

Title: On the Academic Path of Building Chinese Narratology: Taking Fu Xiuyan's *A Study of Auditory Narratology* as an Example

Abstract: Chinese Narratology in plural patterns calls on the diversity of building-routes. They are the important goals of building and developing Chinese Narratology: to highlight Chinese national characteristics in the talk with the world, and to explore some common laws of human narrating activities. Many methodological examples in *A Study of Auditory Narratology* have been contributed

to such goals. And they are mainly shown as the following: 1. From the research angle, the study of auditory narratology has broken through the research pattern of visual centralism when it begins with the auditory feelings in human narrating activities. Moreover, it has resumed the “feeling ecology” in the narrative research, so it can better show the basic feature that narrating is telling the stories. 2. On the theoretical frame, it has emphasized the priority of subjective experiences in the reading activity. The theoretical system of *A Study of Auditory Narratology*, building on the core concepts of “Soundscape” and “Auscultation,” has provided the effective theoretical weapons for expounding and criticizing. 3. In the research paradigm, led by the problem awareness of tracing to the sources, it would build up the research genealogy of knowledge, through the deep multi-disciplinary integration, such as anthropology, mass communication studies, psychology, history, literature and so on. *A Study of Auditory Narratology* symbolizes that the spiral development of Chinese narratology has entered a new historical stage.

Keywords: auditory narratology; Chinese narratology; methodology; development

Author: Liu Yalu, Ph.D., is Associate Professor at School of Literature, Jiangxi Normal University (Nanchang 330022, China). His research mainly focuses on Narratology and Literary theory (Email: 472734596@qq.com).

近年来，中国的叙事学研究已经成为一门“显学”，其突飞猛进之势有似钱江潮涌，动地而来。中国学人已不满足于鹦鹉学舌式简单引进、介绍与搬用西方叙事理论，而是开拓进取，主动作为，积极思考与探索若干深层次问题。譬如说，如何继续深耕西方悠久的叙事传统，从中开掘新的理论空间；怎样突破既有叙事学研究的体裁局限，把广告、影视、直播、游戏、访谈、预测等叙事形式统摄起来，探究具有普遍意义上的广义叙事学；如何把诗歌纳入叙事学研究轨道，实现叙事与抒情“互鉴”的可能；¹等等。此中建设既具学理基础又有民族特色，且能与世界进行有效对话的叙事理论，一直是学界高度关注的话题。目前，学界的注意力大多集中在建设的意义与原则探讨上，对建设的操作路径则程度不同地进行虚化处理。构建中国话语和中国叙事体系，讲好中国故事，当前已经上升为国家意志，因此，指明中国叙事学的建设意义固然重要，探究其建设路径尤为迫切。由是之故，本文旨在以傅修延“听觉叙事研究”为主要例证，结合国内建设中国叙事学的相关探讨，通过分析“听觉叙事研究”的角度旨趣、知识范型及其问题意识等，从一个微观的角度阐述其于中国叙事学建设的方法论启示。

1 具体可检阅北京大学申丹教授、四川大学赵毅衡教授及云南大学谭君强教授等人近年来的相关研究。

美国学者戴卫·赫尔曼(David Herman)在其《新叙事学》一书中曾提出复数形态的叙事学之说,用以指称世纪之交欧美出现的叙事学复兴现象。当前中国叙事学的建设热忱其实不遑多让。中国叙事学建设迄今还是一项尚在行进中的事业,研究成果仍在不断涌现之中。学术创新的道路永无止境,决定了单数形态的中国叙事学永难出现。如果复数形态的中国叙事学是建设目标的合理选项,那么其实现途径的多样化也就具有学理依据,此中更为需要的是学界的共同推动与持续努力。“听觉叙事研究”成果斐然,然于中国叙事学建设的方法论探索而言,其操作路径终究还是启示性而非决定性的。这一点需要特别加以强调说明。

一、“听觉叙事研究”:中国叙事学复数形态之一种

何谓“中国叙事学”?从学理来说,“中国叙事学”可能包括三种含义形态。第一种是指以若干概念范畴搭建起来的、对中国叙事规律具有普遍概括力与涵盖性的知识体系;第二种是指以中国叙事为对象的学问或研究,以突出中国叙事特色为己任;第三种力求兼顾前两种形态的基本特点,同时更为强调通约性与兼容性,能跟世界进行有效对话,显现人类叙事活动的某些普遍规律。

建设“中国叙事学”不能不参考西方叙事学的发展经验。经典叙事学受结构主义语言学的影响,将万千叙事作品视作表层“言语”,试图通过不断的分类处理来挖掘秩序井然的“深层语法”,最终实现对于叙事规律的“普遍涵盖”。这种研究理路具有强烈的科学主义色彩。由于叙事学从一开始就既与符号学结缘又与诗学联姻,这种动态的学缘特质为其后续的变异发展埋下伏笔。后经典叙事学以经典叙事学创设的理论术语为武器,通过重新打通叙事文本的“内”“外”关联,把叙事与社会历史、意识形态及学科知识等接续起来,由此生成被赫尔曼称为复数形态的“新叙事学”。后经典叙事学不再刻意创制专属概念而是对其前辈理论成果持“拿来主义”,它作为“ology”的学科特性较经典阶段大有淡化,但其作为“学问”或“研究”的性质则显著增强。

“橘生淮南则为橘,生于淮北则为枳”。西方叙事学发端于西方现代语言学,表达习惯与汉语有着霄壤之别,无论用来总结中国叙事传统还是分析中国叙事现象,总有隔靴搔痒不得要领之感。同理,机械套用经典叙事学的学科范式以构建相应的中国理论,技术上也只会是缘木求鱼,更何况经典叙事学的式微本身就已经证明此路不通。这就意味着,在“中国叙事学”的义项里,从一开始就没有给纯粹科学主义的学科建构留下多少腾挪的空间,或者说,建设以逻辑范畴和知识体系见长的“中国叙事学”不是一项便捷易为的工作。惟其如此,方能解释从浦安迪、杨义到傅修延的三位《中国叙事学》作者,何以不约而同地倾向于以限定描述性而非直接定义性方式来研究“中国叙事学”。

这样一来，建设“中国叙事学”就由本体追问“是”什么而被实际上回答“做”什么所取代。华莱士·马丁（Wallace Martin）说得好，与其仿效或嘲笑“普遍涵盖律模式”的叙事学，不如“来共同形构一种能够更好地说明人类活动的叙事理论”（华莱士·马丁 193）。对中国叙事进行经典重释、文化溯源、现象归纳与特征总结等，相比建立范畴精确、逻辑整饬的叙事学科而言更具实践操作性。前述三人的“中国叙事学”研究颇有相通之处：都强调回望自身，突出中国古代文化传统的根基地位；都主张不断延伸中国叙事研究的目标方法，拓展研究材料的范围来源，以期以点带面，通过涟漪状的扩展来实现中国叙事学研究的整体推进。

先看目标方法的延伸。浦安迪（Andrew H. Plaks）偏于描述列举，坦承中国叙事与西方叙事各有其赖以支撑的文化传统，“简单地把西方传统的叙事理论直接套用于中国明清小说研究的探讨，将会出现许多悖谬之处”（浦安迪 12）。当他用比较文学的方法来讨论中国叙事现象时，其重心不在求同而在显异，即彰显中国叙事传统的若干独特之处。杨义的方法首在溯源。在他看来，归纳与总结中国叙事现象的特征固然重要，而建设中国叙事学的首要任务则在追溯生成这些特点的文化动因，给“何以如此”提供原初性解答。惟有将始自《易经》《道德经》的、以流动变化为特征的圆形思维确立为中国叙事学的逻辑起点，借鉴西方叙事学的分类原则（主要从结构、时间、视角等）来解释中国叙事现象，后续操作才能顺利展开。这种方法，即是杨义“还原、参照、贯通与融合”建设思路的具体表现。傅修延对如何建设“中国叙事学”也有个认识的深化过程。如果说 2014 年他将“中国叙事学”界定为“以‘中国叙事’为研究对象的学问”（傅修延：“从西方叙事学到中国叙事学” 14），尚未实质性触及操作途径的话，那么在 2015 年出版的同名专著中，他则较为详细地指明了“中国叙事学”的创新路径：“调查范围的扩大”、“考察时段的提前”、“研究范式的转换”、“既有观念的‘裂变’”、“‘地方性知识’的介入”等（傅修延：《中国叙事学》29-36）。鉴于这些方法后文还会程度不同地涉及，在此先不做过多展开。

再看材料范围的拓展。浦安迪其实早就注意到中国叙事存有史传叙事与虚构叙事两大主流，不过，他将剖析的重心放在以《西游记》《金瓶梅》《水浒传》《三国演义》为代表的明代“四大奇书”之上，表现出对中国虚构性叙事的明显偏好，那些具有丰富叙事性的史传材料只是作为佐证才被偶尔提及，从中不难辨析浦氏意识深处不自觉的、重虚构的西方意识。在杨义那里，既然建设“中国叙事学”是一项必须穿越历史烟尘、还原文化面貌的刨根究底式工作，那么仅仅依托四大古典奇书自然难以匹配其目标容量，因此必须将材料范围扩充至先秦诸子经典以及此后的丰富历史文献那里，如此方能求得更为扎实的、有说服力的结论。

前文傅修延言及的“调查范围的扩大”也与材料择取有关，其含义或可

用“笔头口头比翼，文字器物齐飞”来形容。《中国叙事学》令人耳目一新的地方在于，作者没有将研究对象停留在“笔头”叙事那里，而是把独具民间意味与地方色彩的口传叙事样式如四大民间传说、羽衣仙女及许真君传说等也纳入研究范围，进而将研究推进至青铜器、瓷器这一类最具中国文化蕴含的器物载体那里，使关于中国叙事传统的追溯具有更加扎实深广的根基。叙事的本质是讲故事，与口传叙事的久远历史相比，文字叙事的出现相当晚近。中国幅员辽阔，民族众多，民间口传叙事异彩纷呈，是具有民族志功能的重要证据。在漫长的人类历史时期，“口头传承是保存知识的唯一方法。甚至在拥有书写系统的文明中，上层阶级也将其高贵的地位归因于口头沟通和知识的表达”（布鲁斯 G. 崔格尔 426），因此，仅仅将目光局限在书面文献而不将口传叙事也纳入“中国叙事学”的研究范围，结论中国特色的鲜明程度必然大受影响。

事件的讲述与接受也离不开相应的物质载体。在文字出现以前这个载体自然是口耳声波，文字诞生之后，载体逐渐为竹帛纸张等所取代。材料的种类还随技术进步而不断丰富，这一点在以微博、微信以及各式 APP 为代表的电子媒介时代表现得尤其明显。长期以来，介质的叙事研究似乎是传播学的专属领域，文学研究者依然把注意力贯注于叙事内容那里，对其物质载体的功能与意义则多有忽视。当前叙事学界正在兴起“物叙事”研究热潮，积极探讨“物”与叙事的关系。傅修延关于青铜器与瓷器的器物叙事研究可谓独着先鞭，于中国叙事学的意义与价值自不待言。

延引浦、杨、傅三人的研究成果，是因其明确标示“中国叙事学”而便于集中论说，将“中国叙事学”理解为“对中国叙事进行研究”的成果当然远不止此。譬如说董乃斌致力于揭示叙事传统与抒情传统在中国文学史中的共存互动关系；高小康竭力探究占社会统治地位的生活方式和价值观念如何渗入古代叙事观念之中；谭帆尝试通过关键词研究来对中国小说文体文法进行形式整理；张世君着意分析小说评点叙事概念与中国建筑、戏曲及书法艺术的内在精神关联等，都在此中颇具代表性，足以证明中国叙事学研究的“复数”样式与“复调”面貌。然而“中国叙事学”毕竟也是关于“叙事”的学问，有义务为探究人类叙事活动的共通规律贡献智慧。它应该也必须处理好中国性与世界性的关系，在强调民族文化精神，深挖民族文化特色的同时，还应自觉承担起探究叙事普遍规律性的任务。“听觉叙事研究”的兴起，就是在前述“中国叙事学”第三种形态的千呼万唤中的盛装出场。

二、听觉倚重：恢复叙事研究的“感觉生态”

叙事的本质即为讲述故事，听觉活动是讲述行为的基本依托。原始初民以口耳相传的听觉方式把生存的经验智慧代代相传。文字的出现以及电子传播手段的崛起之后，以视觉交流为手段的“看”书与“读”图替代了古老的

口头传播,在带来知识进步的同时也抑制了听觉活动的诸多意趣。“讲故事”的“讲”渐渐失去了它所对应的听觉性质,“听”人讲故事实际上变成了“看”人用视觉符号编程的故事画面”(傅修延,《听觉叙事研究》5),绘声绘色的集体性讲述场景从此更多为个人性静默观看所取代。“听觉叙事研究”旨在把叙事活动中因视觉崇尚而被遮蔽忽略的内容、所存在的偏颇豁显出来,通过重返叙事活动的听觉本位,发现被遮蔽的听觉世界的美好与诗意,从而为叙事学研究开辟新的领地。

听觉与视觉是人类感知世界的主要方式,其认识功能原本应该是并列而非对立、是互助而非互斥的。完满人性需要感性与理性达成平衡,人们对世界的全面理解也离不开多感官的协同配合。然而自古希腊柏拉图与亚里士多德始,中经文艺复兴、启蒙主义和近代科学主义思想的全力鼓吹,视觉与理性主义精神已然深度捆绑,被单独赋予了洞察灵魂、贯通真理的神奇功能,认为是显现理性精神的必由之途,进而确立起“视即知”观念在西方思想史上的霸主地位。后起的西方叙事理论同样烙有“视觉钦羡”的鲜明印记。列维-斯特劳斯(Levi-strallss, C.)的神话功能“排列表”、布雷蒙(Claude Bremond)的叙述可能“逻辑图”、格雷马斯(Algirdas Julien Greimas)的四角语义方阵,以及苏里奥的戏剧角色功能的图示符号等,无不表明他们对视觉图示法的偏爱。“米克·巴尔(Mieke Bal)、杰拉尔德·普林斯(Gerald Prince)以及苏珊·兰瑟(Susan Sniader Lanser)等早期叙事学家都表现出对分类学的热情”(James. Phelan 26)。结构主义者热衷的分类法,折射的仍然是对视觉优先的默认。在叙事学的术语工具箱中,还琳琅满目地陈列着贴有“视点”“视角”“视域”“眼光”“透视”“观察角度”及“聚焦”等多种标签的工具。有些术语虽然没有明确标示与视觉的直接关系,其内在含义也仍与视觉息息相关:“情节”指按因果关系进行的事件组合,引起与被引起的关系必然让它具有先后相继的视觉感;“展示”是要让“讲述”的痕迹消失,其目标自然是制造“如在眉睫之前”的“真实”性幻觉;“全景”因从远处来进行艺术呈现,便于人们掌握事件信息的全貌,所以含有“尽收眼底”之义,如此等等。

上述梳理看似占用较多篇幅,然而确有其必要性。唯其如此,我们才能明辨“听觉叙事研究”的学理意义之所在。众所周知,人类认识世界的结果与其秉持的立场和角度密切相关,固执一端必有造成认识桎梏的危险。从这个意义说,“听觉叙事研究”的价值首先是哲学层面的创新启示。即以傅修延的同名新著《听觉叙事研究》为例,该书从人的听觉感知入手,将人类学、心理学、传播学、社会学与哲学、文学等众多学科知识与文献熔于一炉,由听觉叙事的背景开端到范畴辨析,再到种类区分和功能意义,一路娓娓道来。崭新的角度、翔实的材料和绵密的论证令人信服地表明,人们对叙事问题的认识与探究完全可以多样化,视觉不是也不可能是通达叙事真谛的唯一途径,

从听觉感知（也包括从其他感知）入手来考察中西叙事现象，同样可以取得丰硕而独特的认知成果。如何跳出既有窠臼，始终保持敏锐的学术洞察力才至为重要。

“听觉叙事研究”也具有强烈的感知生态学意义。“听觉与低清晰度的、中性的视觉不同，它具有高度的审美功能，它是精微细腻、无所不包的。”（马歇尔·麦克卢汉 107）以人类听觉感知为突破口来研究叙事现象，其目的并非要颠覆和否定视觉感知的意义，人为创设一个中心以替代另一个中心，而是回归本原，返璞归真，充分尊重叙事的本质实为讲述故事这样一个基本事实，通过揭批视觉中心主义造成的“失聪”痼疾与感觉钝化现象，呼唤视觉与听觉以及其他感觉方式的多元互动，将被视觉霸权所忽略、所遮蔽的感觉重新还原，“让人的全部感官都恢复原初的敏感”（傅修延，《听觉叙事研究》5），从而恢复叙事研究领域的感知“生态平衡”，实现对既有研究的纠偏效应。

感知“生态平衡”的恢复，使叙事研究中“意义”追寻与“意味”探讨之间的良性互动成为可能。美国学者彼得·布鲁克斯（Peter Brook）曾如此论说视觉与19世纪现实主义文学的关系：“主导十九世纪的现实主义传统坚持把视觉作为人与世界之间的主要联系，因为现实主义的逻辑前提就是，不可能在人们周围的东西所构成的背景之外来理解他们，而认识这些东西就是要去观察它们，详细叙述它们，……，在现实主义里，认识就是观看，表现就是描写”（彼得·布鲁克斯 106）。这句话用于描述既有文学研究的特点也完全适用。长期以来，无论是文学经典的叙事分析还是文学传统的特征总结，抑或是叙事与社会形态的关系探讨，既有研究大多强调对于“意义”的“认识”。为了取得“意义”，人们总是对文本不断进行“挖掘”，“以发现作为真实文本的潜文本”（桑塔格 8）。对声音携带的丰富“意味”以及听觉活动拥有的艺术韵致多有忽视。按赫希的说法，“意味”是“意义与人之间的联系，或一种印象、一种情境”（P·D·却尔 21）。它不等于意义，也难以穷形尽相条文缕析，却以鲜活的艺术感受充实文本，使之立体丰满，回味无穷，某种程度上完全可以说，正是飘忽的“意味”而不是精确的“意义”成就了叙事作品的恒久魅力。听觉感知关涉人的精神活动，需要主体意识的高度参与，其主观性、模糊性特点也更为契合文学叙事的想象性与不确定性。“听觉叙事研究”也正是在此领域一显了身手。诚如傅修延所说，“对于以构筑想象世界为己任的故事讲述人来说，听觉感知的不确定性恰恰是其灵感的重要来源，它所导致的幻听、灵听和偷听等往往成为一些叙事作品中的神来之笔。感知的不确定必定造成表达的不确定，‘不可靠叙述’之成为当前叙事学领域的一大热门，一个原因是较之于可靠可信的叙述，迷离恍惚的‘不可靠叙述’能使文本内涵变得更加摇曳多姿，带给读者更大的想象空间和更多的咀嚼意趣。”¹

1 傅修延：《也谈听觉叙事之可能》，“叙事学”公众号 2021 年 6 月 7 日。

三、体验优先：彰显主体意识的概念创设

一种理论的观念内含及其区别于其他理论的地方，必须通过相应的概念、范畴来表达，某些核心范畴更是标示该理论精义的旗帜，是理解其思想内涵的钥匙。前文已经指出，“意味”是叙事作品的重要魅力所在，其获取途径主要不是“认识”而是“体验”。“听觉叙事研究”对以想象性与不确定性见长的“意味”的找寻，决定了它注重鲜活体验的学术品格。这一品格突出表现在“音景”与“聆察”这两个与阅读活动息息相关的概念创设上。

自加拿大学者夏弗(Murray Schafer)那里移用而来的“音景”(soundscape)概念与“风景”(landscape)一语存有互文关系。“风景”以视觉因素为基本依托，强调“物”的艺术处理以及由此生成的意义，“看”与“被看”的二分状态特别清晰，视觉主体与客体的界限相当分明。在巴尔扎克的《高老头》里，读者从伏盖公寓偏僻、阴冷与酸腐的细致描绘中“看”出了家境寒微的拉斯蒂涅挣脱卑下环境的勃勃野心；无独有偶，《远大前程》中郝薇香小姐终年关闭的府第曾是小匹普人生梦想的起点，小说结尾处则写他在此废墟处与曾经的心上人作别，废墟成为主人公幻梦破灭的无声见证。“风景”的意义主要源自静默的理性分析，认识的客观化主张也限制了主观情感的自由参与。随着福楼拜、亨利·詹姆斯等人对客观化与“零度写作”的高度推崇，视觉主客体之间的情感距离还有越拉越大的趋势。

重视声音景观（“音景”）首先代表着一种对生活事实与常态的尊重。鲜明的视觉景象与无处不在的听觉声响，构筑起大千世界的盎然生机，它既是事实性存在也是感受性存在，人们没有理由厚此而薄彼，从这个意义来说，“音景”的叙事学移用是对既有研究偏差的一种实质性反拨。声音不能留于异域异时，在现代录音技术发明之前，人们只能通过文字来对其进行模拟记录。那些充溢于叙事作品中的声响材料让事件场景立体化，使之更具鲜活的质地和流动的意趣。正如傅修延所说，“较之于纯粹提供视觉画面的叙述，摹写音景的事件信息中多了一些来自故事现场的声音，因而能创造出更为鲜活生动的叙述效果”（《听觉叙事研究》152）。“音景”的最大学理意义在于，它不似“风景”那般在主客体之间制造清晰的情感距离，恰恰相反，它将外部世界与心灵世界勾连起来，通过“拒绝制造分裂，通过保存一个独一无二的用词维持声音作为全部现实、某种感觉伊甸园的神话，或者有意识将其作为一个过渡地带，两个维度间的一个联结”（米歇尔·希翁 64）。而且，由于声音是一种拥有品质与属性的非实体性形态，主体对其把握拥有更为主观自由的裁量权，裁量的结果取决于主体听觉体验的投入程度。

“聆察”是“音景”的逻辑延伸与必然结果。“聆”是感知手段，“察”才是终极目的。作为一个“为抵御视觉对其他感觉方式的挤压”而创设的概念（傅修延，《听觉叙事研究》159），“聆察”主要在以下三个方面为“听

觉叙事研究”确立了学术价值。

在视听关系上,“聆察”强调以听觉想象贯注充实视觉画面,发掘叙事信息中被忽视的听觉因素,通过读者的合理想象让“缺席的在场”得以复位,实现视觉艺术的听觉想象转化,某些难忘的瞬间因此血肉充盈起来。莱辛(Lessing)在《拉奥孔》中曾经提出,造型艺术家必须避免描绘激情顶点的那个时刻,理由就是一旦描绘便再也无法调动观众的想象,高明的艺术家总是选择可以让想象自由绽放的那个瞬间(莱辛 18)。傅修延也特别强调想象力的发挥,只是在想象力的前面还冠以了“听觉”这个词语加以明确。他对《清明上河图》和 1973 年普利策奖获奖照片《火从天降》的分析就是极好例证。图画与照片凝固的是某个富有趣味的时刻,它的意趣与活力必须借助听觉想象的补充才能丰满起来。

在交往伦理上,作为“高明的倾听”,“聆察”不只是一种听觉技巧,更代表着一种谦逊而真诚的交流态度。讲故事本质上是一种人际沟通行为,沟通能否取得理想效果,很大程度上取决于交流双方能否抛却既有定见,敞开心扉,以相互尊重的态度来为平等交流创造条件。伽达默尔(Hans-Georg Gadamer)曾经说过:“人们必须在相互交流中为互相理解而保持审慎与公正。此乃我们在共同生活中的问题:相互倾听,这也同样适用于单个的人以及他与其他人的共同生活,适应于各族人民。”“如果所有的人都学会排除他们自己的偏见与利益的话,将会出现一种理想的人际间共同生活方式”(伽达默尔 1-4)。这一点,还是让-路易·克里田说得更为直接,“最大的好客就是倾听”(耿幼壮 46)。

对“人”的理解与认识始终是文学批评的核心。“文学即人学”的理论命题与“好客说”的伦理取位表明,此中应该包含对人的情感、处境、欲望与心理的体验。这就要求读者克服既往批评过于抽象化与符号化的倾向,真正把故事世界中的人当作有血有肉的生命体来看待。在叙事批评中,“聆察”特别强调对人物的声音、腔调、语气进行换位代入式的体会辨察。亚里士多德(Aristotle)曾在其《解释篇》中说过,“口语是心灵的经验的符号,而文字则是口语的符号。正如所有的人的书法并不是相同的,同样地,所有的人也不是有相同的说话的声音;但这些声音所直接标志的心灵的经验,则对于一切人都是一样的”(亚里士多德 55)。德里达对此的解释是,“这是因为声音作为第一符号与心灵有一种本质的、直接的接近关系”(杨乃乔 274)。也就是说,语音总是与具体真切的个体生命状况密切相关,识人察人莫如从其天然发声开始。声调的高低、语速的缓急、声音的长短及轻重等都是折射人物情感态度的听觉符号,用细致的体察把握这些符号对于洞悉人类隐秘的精神世界大有裨益,也为进一步理解人物的意义夯实基础。受形而上学传统的巨大影响,一般文学研究往往因语音的感性特质而忽视其研究价值,片面重视人的社会身份定性或抽象性格提取,阅读的感觉意趣大受冲击。“听

觉叙事研究”则倡导以细读去“聆察”人物言语当中的情绪流动，感受人物将言未言、似言非言的行为背后潜藏的内心波澜，以及揣摩复杂微妙的人际关系等。在读者想象力的补充完善下，虚构世界中的人物不再是意义的木偶，而是血肉丰满的、有生命力的这一个“活人”。

“聆察”语音对于深刻理解西方现代派文学，以及中国文学的抒情传统也有特别意义。现代主义文学充斥的是人际沟通遭遇阻隔的“寂寞之音”，作品中的主角或喁喁独语，或放肆嚎叫，或前言不搭后语，这些看似矛盾的情形背后，隐含的正是现代人孤独隔膜的生活状态。中国文学具有历史悠久的抒情传统，以声传情是这一传统的突出表征。笔者曾将其概括为“循声察旨”“依声寻味”“因声求气”“因默入神”四种主要类型（刘亚律 201-05），从中不难看出，“聆察”在叙事阐释与批评的实践操作中所能发挥的作用。

四、“范式”超越：穷根源式的问题意识

美国科学史家托马斯·库恩(Thomas Samuel Kuhn)在其《科学革命的结构》一书中曾经指出，世界对于人类而言存在无数待解之谜，人类认识世界的过程就是个解谜过程。在此解释过程中，人们基于自身立场会逐渐形成一套相对稳固而有效的解释结构，这套结构即为“范式”。但是任何“范式”都只能解释部分问题而不是所有问题，当既有“范式”无法解释新问题时，新的“范式”就将应运而生。也就是说，“范式”的更替归根到底是由新问题的出现而引起的。列举中国叙事的独特样式，总结中国叙事的悠久传统，深挖中国叙事与传统文化的内在联系等，是建设中国叙事学的重要“范式”，取得了丰硕的成果，但也确有一些更为深层的问题为当下研究“范式”所未触及，“听觉叙事研究”的开展，则较好地解答了不少既有研究无法回答的问题。

比方说，一般意义的叙事学研究主要解决叙事“为”何问题，“听觉叙事研究”则意在思考更为本质的内容，即叙事为“何”问题，亦即追问人类为什么需要讲故事（叙事）。此前最为常见的解释是，讲故事乃是人类出于生存需要而进行的代际经验传递，这个解释应该说具有很大的说服力，只是依然无法打消以下疑问：此等经验传递想必也发生于其他种群之间，何以人类能在这个星球的物竞天择中最终胜出？因此，作为知其然的叙事“为”何固然重要，作为知其所有然的叙事为“何”才更深刻。

人类学家罗宾·邓巴(Robin Dunbar)认为，正是因为讲述故事才“创造出一种群体感，是这种感觉把有着共同世界观的人编织到了同一个社会网络之中”。“引人入胜的故事总能创造出温馨的氛围，在讲故事的人和听故事的人之间形成一种亲密的联接，也许，是因为被激发的情感会促使安多芬的分泌，有益于群体感的建立”（罗宾·邓巴 274-275）。傅修延在上述文化人类学知识的启迪下进行饶有兴味的“接着讲”，创见纷至沓来：灵长类动物互示友好的梳毛不过是人类的“前叙事”；四处散播的“八卦”与“流言”

恰似人际关系的润滑剂,协调着群体成员间的信任关系;“醉翁之意不在酒”,世人热爱宴饮恐怕不完全是出于美食的诱惑,获取珍贵的交流机会进而融入某个社群可能更为重要;“人以群分”的背后还潜藏着“群以音分”的事实,方言语音促成了生活于特定区域的人们的身份认同,同时也将另一群体排斥在外,而又正是因为人群的“凝聚”与“排斥”关系才造就了社会生活的复杂与纷争,等等。这些创见从思想到行文都异于惯常的理论研究。“听觉叙事研究”没有把目标简单地设定在文学作品的叙事分析上,而是以叙事的凝聚功能为红线,将笔触荡漾生发至人际交流的社会文化活动上来,对其进行了别开生面的阐释,即旁征博引又妙趣横生,令人莞尔之余又不得不为其严密论证而击节赞赏。更为重要的是,这些研究成果实已触及重大而严肃的时代命题。今天构建中国话语和中国叙事体系,讲好中国故事,已经上升为国家意志,其意义就在于通过美好的中国故事鼓舞与凝聚人心,激励中国人民朝着中华民族伟大复兴的方向砥砺前行。

又如关于中国叙事传统何以特别推崇简约含蓄、散淡悠远之美的解释。傅修延在《听觉叙事研究》一书中将此概括为“尚简”“贵无”“趋晦”与“从散”,由此构建起一个关于传统言说的“集群”。历史地看,老庄哲学“大音希声”的说法开启了国人追求听觉至境的美学之途,后世推崇“不着一字,尽得风流”“羚羊挂角,无迹可求”的“神韵”“妙悟”之说与此关联深厚。刘勰在《文心雕龙》之《谐隐》《隐秀》二篇早就注意到叙事中的戏谑婉讽与文外重旨现象,涉及的就是叙事的含蓄表达,亦即隐含的叙事问题。孔子令乱臣贼子瑟瑟发抖的“春秋笔法”以一字寓褒贬,微言大义当中不但有旗帜鲜明的伦理立场,也有以简驭繁的技巧考量,与刘知几在《史通》中提倡“叙事以简要为法”的观点心意相通,这些传统在后世“言多必失”“要言不烦”“言简意赅”“言近旨远”等成语中得以固定下来。前文已经反复强调,特征的概括列举不等于特征的原因追溯,知其然更需知其所以然。事实上,就上述部分传统的成因进行尝试性解答的不乏其人。章学诚就将《左传》“尚简”的原因解释为记录手段的艰难:“古人作书,漆文竹简,或著缣帛,或以刀削,繁重不胜。是以文词简严,取足达意而止。非第不屑为冗长,且亦无暇为冗长也。”钱锺书则认为此举实属事出无奈:“春秋著作,其事繁剧,下较汉晋,殆力倍而功半焉。文不得不省,词不得不约,势所然尔”(钱锺书 163)。再如浦安迪将中国古代叙事多有“缀段性”情节归因为中国神话叙事性的缺乏等等(浦安迪 40-47)。这些说法在解释某个单一传统时确实令人信服,但在解释作为整体的传统“集群”时则力不从心。就拿“尚简”来说,无论是章学诚的“手段说”还是钱锺书的“事繁说”,其实都很难解释何以国人如此推崇含蓄悠远的艺术韵致。“听觉叙事研究”对此“集群”的解释则是整体性的。傅修延从麦克卢汉“中国人是听觉人”的观点那里获得思想的灵感,认为听觉的转瞬即逝及其易于激发想象回味的特点,才是形成传统“集群”的根本原因。

“将‘媒介即信息’（感知途径影响信息传播）这一思路引入中国叙事学研究，许多问题似可得到更为贯通周详、更有理论深度的解答。……，传统叙事的尚简、贵无、趋晦和从散等表现，只有与听觉的模糊性联系起来，才能理得顺并说得通”（傅修延，《听觉叙事研究》298），从而将关于中国叙事传统的成因研究向前推进了一大步。2017年，刊有傅修延上述观点的论文《为什么麦克卢汉说中国人是“听觉人”——中国文化的听觉传统及其对叙事的影响》一文入选《〈文学评论〉六十年纪念文选》，可以视作学界对其独特结论的高度肯定。

“听觉叙事研究”涉及的问题意识当然远不止此，本文囿于篇幅无法逐个列举，在此更愿指明该意识的获益之源，那就是跨学科知识的积极参与和深度融合，这种多学科的互融互渗是“范式”得以有效切换的知识保证。“听觉叙事研究”的前述追问可能长久盘桓于叙事学研究内部，然对其进行有效解答实非叙事学一家所能胜任，更需要其他学科的思想启迪和嫁接培育。没有罗宾·邓巴人类学知识的启发，讲故事凝聚人心的作用以及由此迸发出来的伟大力量恐遭忽视；没有麦克卢汉传播学观点的点拨，对中国古代叙事传统“集群”的解释只怕还是点状的而非整体的；正是有了朱利安·杰恩斯（Julian Jaynes）“二分心智”理论的指引，对叙事作品中人物内在意识冲突的解释才更令人信服。

人类学、传播学和心理学知识不但是“听觉叙事研究”的思想“起爆器”，而且还与哲学、文学、历史学、语言学、考古学和社会学等学科协同配合，共同构建起关于“听觉叙事研究”的知识谱系。且以“二分心智”为例略加说明。按照杰恩斯的说法，3000年前的古人心智里存在一个负责施令、一个负责执行的双重主体。现代人自主意识的产生，是一个执行主体对施令主体从听到怀疑到挣脱的过程。采用此说来解释叙事作品中人物矛盾心理的产生，也可坐收豁然开朗之效，然而傅修延的研究并未在此止步，而是从这里起步。在他看来，当华夏初民试图从龟甲裂纹中“聆听”神明旨意时，这些殷墟出土的甲骨卜辞未尝不是二分心智的中国版；“百家争鸣”的伟大意义就在于，它标志着当此之时的人类心智开始了挣脱天命神意的主体性努力；即使身处科学昌明的今天，人类通过自我造神来获取心理倚靠的冲动也从未断绝，“虚构的权威”的强调，就是这种冲动在叙事领域的表征。这也就意味着，形成真正独立自由的主体意识依然任重道远。“听觉叙事研究”就这样将考古材料、历史事件和社会现象熔于一炉，形成有机互证，从而实现对既有文学叙事研究的超越进而烙有文化叙事学的鲜明印记。

总之，“听觉叙事研究”从人类普遍的听觉感知入手研究叙事现象，更具普泛化意义，是对国别文学与民族文学研究的超越。它强调被“意义”遮蔽的“意味”，突出阅读主体的“体验”而非纯然的“认识”，更加切近“文学即人学”的原初本性。它所创设的核心概念以及由此搭建起来的初步理论

系统，也为叙事阐释提供了极具操作性的理论武器。“听觉叙事研究”的问世，标志着中国叙事学螺旋式发展进入了新的历史阶段，是中国叙事学与时俱进的重要收获与见证。

Work Cited

浦安迪：《中国叙事学》。北京：北京大学出版社，1996 年。

[Andrew H. Plaks. *Chinese narrative*. Beijing: Peking UP, 1996.]

亚里士多德：《范畴篇 解释篇》，方书春译。北京：商务印书馆，2005 年。

[Aristotle. *Categories and De Interpretatione*. Trans. Fang Shucun. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2005.]

彼得·布鲁克斯：《身体活：现代叙述中的欲望对象》，朱生坚译。北京：新星出版社，2005 年。

[Brook, Peter. *Body Work Objects of desire in Modern Narrative*. Trans. Zhu Shengjian. Beijing: Xinxing Press, 2005.]

米歇尔·希翁：《声音》，张艾弓译。北京：北京大学出版社，2013 年。

[Chion, Michel. *Le Son*. Trans. Zhang Aigong. Beijing: Peking UP, 2013.]

罗宾·邓巴：《人类的演化》，余彬译。上海：上海文艺出版社，2016 年。

[Dunbar, Robin. *Human Evolution*. Trans. Yubin. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing House, 2016.]

傅修延：《听觉叙事研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2021 年。

[Fu Xiuyan. *A Study of Auditory Narratology*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2021.]

——：《中国叙事学》。北京：北京大学出版社，2015 年。

[—, *Chinese narratology*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2015.]

——：“从西方叙事学到中国叙事学”，《中国比较文学》4（2014）：1-24。

[—, “From western narratology to Chinese narratology.” *Chinese Comparative Literature* 4（2014）：1-24.]

伽达默尔：“论倾听”，《安徽师范大学学报》1（2001）：1-4。

[Gadamer, Hans-Georg. “Theory of listening.” *Journal of Anhui Normal University* 1(2001): 1-4.]

耿幼壮：《倾听：后形而上学时代的感知范式》。北京：北京大学出版社，2013 年。

[Geng Youzuang. *Listening: A Paradigm of Perception in the Post-metaphysical Age*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2013.]

莱辛：《拉奥孔》，朱光潜译。北京：人民文学出版社，1979 年。

[Lessing. *Laocoon*. Trans. Zhu Guangqian. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House. 1979.]

P.D. 却尔：《解释：文学批评的哲学》，吴启之等译。北京：文化艺术出版社，1991 年。

[Juhl, P. D. *Interpretation: An Essay in the Philosophy of Literary Criticism*. Trans. Wu Qizhi et al. Beijing: Culture and Art Publishing House, 1991.]

华莱士·马丁：《当代叙事学》，伍晓明译。北京：北京大学出版社，2005 年

[Martin, Wallace. *Recent Theories of Narrative*. Trans. Wu Xiaoming. Beijing: Peking UP, 2005.]

马歇尔·麦克卢汉：《理解媒介：论人的延伸》，何道宽译。南京：译林出版社，2011 年。

[McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Trans. He Daokuan. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2011.]

詹姆斯·费伦、彼得·拉宾诺维茨：《当代叙事理论指南》。北京：北京大学出版社，2007年。

[Phelan, James and Peter J. Rabinowitz. *A Companion to Narrative Theory*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2007.]

钱锺书：《管锥篇》（第一册）。北京：中华书局，1979年。

[Qian Zhongshu. *Limited Views*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company, 1979.]

桑塔格：《反对阐释》，程巍译。上海：上海译文出版社，2003年。

[Sontag, Susan. *against interpretation and other essays*. Trans. Cheng Wei. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing House, 2013.]

布鲁斯 G. 崔格尔：《理解早期文明：比较研究》，徐坚译。北京：北京大学出版社，2014年。

[Trigger, Bruce G. *Understanding early civilizations: a comparative study*. Trans. Xu Jian. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]

杨乃乔、伍晓明主编：《比较文学与世界文学》（第一辑）。北京：商务印书馆，2004年。

[Yiang Naiqiao and Wu Xiaoming. *Comparative Literature and World Literature*1. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2004.]

乐黛云、李比雄主编：《跨文化对话》（第38辑）。北京：商务印书馆，2018年。

[Yue Daiyun and Li Bixiong. *Dialogue Transcultural* 38. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2018.]

伦理之辩与艺术审美的典范融合：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》

Canonical Blend of Ethical Debate and Aesthetic Appreciation: *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*

王 爽 (Wang Shuang)

内容摘要：继《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》(2010)之后，杜娟教授新作《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》(2021)作为华中师范大学“一流学科建设文库”的丛书之一在北京大学出版社出版，这标志了作者在菲尔丁小说研究领域的又一突破。该书运用文学伦理学批评方法，力图还原亨利·菲尔丁小说伦理的思想建构过程，从历时、共时的角度阐明菲尔丁小说作品的伦理特性和体系内涵。特别值得称道的是，作者双关性地总结了菲尔丁“小说”道德的审美特质及其特殊价值，即菲尔丁小说不仅反拨与纠正了欧洲伦理学家“大说”伦理的形而上学形式，而且也通过询问个人奇遇、探究心灵奥秘、揭示隐秘情感、解除历史禁锢和缠绵于生活事件这一类的“小说”方式，真正走入了其作品中每一位人物的道德困境。总体而言，该专著勇于突破自我的藩篱，敢于突破传统和权威的禁锢，在充分研究的基础上得出真知灼见，融合了伦理之辩与艺术审美之维的思考，是近年来菲尔丁及其小说研究的典范之作。

关键词：《道德假面与伦理建构》；文学伦理学批评；“小说”道德

作者简介：王爽，中南民族大学外语学院讲师，主要研究兴趣为文学伦理学批评和叙事学。本文系国家社会科学基金重大项目“当代西方伦理批评文献的整理、翻译与研究”【项目编号：19ZDA292】和中央高校自主科技基金资助高水平科研论文培育项目【项目编号：2662019PY038】的阶段性成果。

Title: Canonical Blend of Ethical Debate and Aesthetic Appreciation: *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*

Abstract: After publishing the monograph *Ethical Narrative in Henry Fielding's Novels* in 2010, Professor Du Juan newly published her latest monograph *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels* on Fielding again in 2021, which was published by Peking University Press as one

of the series of books for “The First Class Discipline Construction” of Central-China Normal University. This new monograph is her another breakthrough in the field of Henry Fielding’s research in general, and his novels in particular. The new monograph attempts to restore the constructive process of ethical thoughts in Fielding’s novels by using the ethical literary criticism and illustrates the ethical traits and systematic connotation of Fielding’s novels from the diachronic and synchronic perspectives. What is emphatically worthy to mention that this monograph believes the unique values of Fielding lies in “novel morality,” namely, Fielding’s novels authentically approach every character’s ethical dilemma by querying the individual encounter, exploring the soul mystery, revealing the hidden emotions, removing the historical constraint and lingering the trifles in real life. On the whole, this monograph dares to break its own hedge and attempts to break through the tradition and authority. Besides, it is a canonical monograph on Fielding and his novels in recent years as its brilliant and creative thoughts are grounded on the abundant research, blending the ethical debate with aesthetic appreciation.

Keywords: *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding’s Novels*; ethical literary criticism; “novel” moral

Author: Wang Shuang is Lecturer at College of Foreign Languages, South-Central Minzu University (Wuhan 430074, China). Her academic interests are ethical literary criticism and narrative theory (Email: wangsh1105@126.com).

亨利·菲尔丁（Henry Fielding, 1707-1754）曾被沃尔特·司各特（Walter Scott）称为“英国小说之父”，也被马克西姆·高尔基（Maxim Gorky）称为“现代小说之父”。从20世纪20年代菲尔丁被引介到中国至今，已经100年了¹。一百余年来，中国学术界对于菲尔丁小说的研究热度从未消减，只不过随着“专攻菲尔丁研究的前辈大牌学者陆续淡出前沿阵地，较少发表新作，崭露头角的青年学者以及偶尔涉及菲尔丁研究的‘客军’正成为菲尔丁研究的主力军，但他们大多尚未能确立自己在菲尔丁研究方面的学术权威和学界影响力。不过正因为如此，研究者较少受到既有研究成果的羁绊，更能够寻找新的材料和研究视角来拓展研究对象和研究话题，增加其多元性和丰富性”（朱宾忠，杨文慧 82）。概而言之，近年来国内的菲尔丁研究总体呈现出“总结归纳和创新开拓并重的局面”（韩加明 378）。

杜娟教授当属这些“崭露头角的青年学者”之一，多年来她一直孜孜不

1 1920年，时在美国留学的吴宓发表《红楼梦新谈》，文中引用了哈佛大学菲尔丁研究学者G·H·麦格纳迪尔在《〈汤姆·琼斯〉导言》中提出的小说杰作的六大特点来评论《红楼梦》：即“宗旨正大、范围宽广、结构严谨、事实繁多、情景逼真和人物生动”。这既是我国比较文学研究的开拓性论文，同时也让国人对亨利·菲尔丁有了初步了解。此后，吴宓在清华大学开设的“文学与人生”课程也把菲尔丁列为了重点作家。

倦地致力于菲尔丁及其小说研究，心无旁骛，也取得了诸多标志性的成果。在继 2010 年出版了专著《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》（武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2010 年）（以下简称《伦理叙事》）之后，“十年磨一剑”，2021 年她又出版了新著《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》（北京：北京大学出版社，2021）（以下简称《道德假面与伦理建构》）。从两部著作的书名便可看出它们之间既有联系也有区别：前者“侧重从叙事的角度阐明，菲尔丁的小说如何通过叙事达到明确的道德训诫意图，并加深读者对文本内在的种种伦理问题的理解”（《伦理叙事》10-11），作者还认为，“菲尔丁在小说创作中借鉴传奇叙事的艺术结构，是为了实现消遣和教诲并重的目的，即传奇叙事是菲尔丁塑造道德英雄、展开道德建构的重要方法”（王晓兰 157）。然而，作者也毫不避讳地指出，《伦理叙事》“由于受限于伦理叙事的论证视角，该著作对菲尔丁小说中伦理体系的建构和何为菲尔丁小说的核心价值观等问题无法集中和深入地予以探讨”（《道德假面与伦理建构》6）¹，为此新著“力图全面系统地考察菲尔丁的小说创作，对作家的道德意识、伦理诉求以及承载其伦理思想的叙事艺术等问题做出详尽论述，而且还将以同时期的欧洲伦理思想史为参照，通过影响研究的方式，具体阐明菲尔丁伦理思想的价值内涵与历史变迁”（6）。

新著《道德假面与伦理建构》主要以菲尔丁的《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》（*Joseph Andrews*, 1742）、《汤姆·琼斯》（*The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*, 1749）和《阿米莉娅》（*Amelia*, 1751）三部现实主义小说为研究文本、以小说中人物的具体伦理境遇为研究对象，包括引论和结语总共分为六个章节，分别探讨了菲尔丁小说伦理的人性起点、文本脉络、思想建构和内在矛盾等重要的问题。杜娟教授在引论中开篇梳理了国内外的菲尔丁研究现状，并提出了自己的研究问题，即“菲尔丁的道德意识、伦理诉求、承载其伦理思想的叙事艺术、以及其伦理思想的价值内涵与历史变迁”等问题都亟待解决并做出详尽论述，这体现出了作者鲜明的问题意识；紧接着这些问题，作者进而阐述了自己运用的研究方法以及具体的研究思路，即主要使用文学伦理学批评方法以小说文本中人物的具体伦理境遇作为研究对象，而这则体现了作者坚实的专业理论基础、优秀的科研能力和敢于创新的学术品质。特别值得称道的是，作者在阐述研究思路时，表现出了勇于突破自我、敢于质疑权威、大胆立论、论证缜密和科学求“真”的学者精神。作者明确指出，该专著在论证过程中主要依据两条线索进行写作，即“一是因循菲尔丁的创作年表，从菲尔的小说创作历程入手，探寻菲尔丁小说中伦理建构的思路、核心价值和基本原则；二是在对菲尔丁小说的道德追问和伦理体系进行梳理时，将充

1 后文从《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》中的引文均省去书名，直接标示出页码。

分关注菲尔丁小说伦理建构的宗教问题，并对“菲尔丁基督教徒化”的研究状况做出某种程度的回应”（10）。一言以蔽之，专著一方面重点探讨了菲尔丁小说的道德和伦理建构问题，另一方面也考察了菲尔丁小说道德和伦理建构背后的社会、历史与宗教等因素影响。

在第一章中，《道德假面与伦理建构》紧扣菲尔丁小说的伦理起点，即“道德假面”这一问题深入挖掘，这也是菲尔丁小说伦理叙事的一个逻辑起点。的确，“假面”（*masquerade*）是菲尔丁观察世界的一个独特视角，从其于同一年创作的诗歌处女作《假面舞会》（*The Masquerade*, 1728）和戏剧处女作《假面后的爱情》（*Love in Several Masques*, 1728）便可看出，菲尔丁伦理思考的起点就是从观察这个现实世界的道德现象开始的。从描绘具体人物的道德假面开始，菲尔丁以批判伪善人格的方式，展开了其博大深邃的伦理之思。该专著紧扣菲尔丁如何起步于这个经验世界的道德观察以及他如何通过伦理叙事揭穿道德假面而践行了自己“扬善举德”的创作初衷这两个问题，深入剖析了菲尔丁小说伦理之思的起点。作者认为，菲尔丁走上小说创作之路与塞缪尔·理查森（*Samuel Richardson*）的书信体小说《帕梅拉》（*Pamela*, 1740）有一定联系，由于菲尔丁对《帕梅拉》中简单粗暴的道德逻辑表示很不满意，他敏锐地觉察到个中伪善的意味，激发了他的创作冲动。为此，菲尔丁从批判伪善出发，陆续创作了《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》、《汤姆·琼斯》和《阿米莉娅》等小说，通过一个个现实世界的鲜活人物，旨在深入探讨人性与道德之间的复杂关系。正如作者在专著中指出，菲尔丁“反对伪善，是出于对人的自然本性的呵护，而健康健全的伦理建构都应本着人类本于内心的生命欲求，实践个体内在生命欲求与外在道德律令的价值平衡”（81）。在反对伪善呵护自然本性和生命欲求的过程中，菲尔丁建构了其小说伦理思想的起点。

在《道德假面与伦理建构》的第二章中，作者深入分析了菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络。何谓小说伦理的文本脉络？作者认为，菲尔丁在表达自己的道德观察和伦理诉求时，不是完全寄托于对人物性格的描写之上，而是注重对人物所处真实生活环境的描绘。这里的生活环境，“既可以大至人物生活其间的社会环境，也可以小至人物在依据本性做出价值选择时所处的道德处境”（83）。菲尔丁这种将人物形象塑造置放于复杂环境的做法，恰恰体现了其较为成熟的现实主义观念。秉持这一观念，菲尔丁通过一些叙事场景的叙写来展示人物性格，进而推动小说情节发展，特别是借助个体的选择和成长提出一些重要的伦理问题。由此可见，作者认为菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络就是指菲尔丁小说的伦理结构，主要是通过小说中的伦理线把伦理结串联起来，组合成文本的完整结构。聂珍钊教授指出，伦理结（*ethical knots*）是“文学作品结构中矛盾与冲突的集中体现。伦理结构成伦理困境，揭示文学文本的基本伦理问题”（聂珍钊 258）；而文学伦理学批评的任务就是“通过对文

学文本的解读而阐释伦理线上的伦理结的形成过程，或是对已经形成的伦理结进行解构”（聂珍钊 259）。细读第二章，不难发现作者就是通过文学伦理学批评中的伦理线、伦理结、伦理冲突等概念阐述和厘清了菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络的。

在专著的第三章中，作者进一步阐述了菲尔丁小说伦理的思想建构过程。尽管“道德假面”是亨利·菲尔丁小说伦理的逻辑起点，但其“扬善举德”的创作初衷，决定了其叙述方向的道德特性——即对善的追求是菲尔丁创作的基本动力，即使小说中有对恶的严厉批判，其最终目的也是为了对比和映衬出善的美。正如聂珍钊教授所言，“如果把文学看作道德的产物，文学就是特定历史条件下的伦理表达”（*Ethical Literary Criticism* 189）。18 世纪的英国小说，大多数受到理查森“作家有责任令这个世界更美好”（Müller 212）呼吁的影响，小说都传达出强烈的核心伦理价值。作者认为，菲尔丁在《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》、《汤姆·琼斯》和《阿米莉娅》这三部现实主义小说中，“主要是借忠贞、谨慎和仁慈这三种核心价值构建了他的伦理思想”（146）。具体而言，“忠贞主要根植于菲尔丁对人物情爱故事的描写，是基于小说主人公爱人的伦理身份所提出的一种道德要求；谨慎强调个人道德理性参与的自我完善；而仁慈则隶属于社会道德层面”（146）。可见，菲尔丁小说的伦理思想并非拘囿于抽象的道德概念辨析和布道，而是通过小说人物面临的具體道德处境来展示，因此其小说伦理思想显示出明显的世俗化色彩，当然，正是这种世俗化“又使其成为重构社会伦理时急需的一种思想资源”（146）。此外，该章节还质疑和批判了学界认为菲尔丁小说是“一种不考虑心理学的假深刻的现实主义”（173）。作者认为，“菲尔丁小说伦理并不立足于先验的、形而上学的或共同的伦理体系，恰恰是从心理学的角度出发，关注了人物内心在道德行为中的重要作用，也因此具有了一种鲜明的心理学特征”（174）。通过大量研究，作者进一步指出，“从思想渊源上说，菲尔丁受到情感主义伦理学家沙夫茨伯里、哈奇森以及经验主义哲学家洛克的影响，并从对曼德维尔伦理思想的创造性转化中，从心理学视角描绘了善德的发生、保障以及报偿等问题”（174）。因此，可以这么说，菲尔丁小说中人物的道德善举往往也是从心理层面上决定的。作者对文本深入浅出的剖析以及大量挖掘相关文献资料的能力，在此章节可谓显示得淋漓尽致，彰显了其坚实的学术批判能力和深厚的逻辑思维能力。

如果说专著的第二与第三章是作者对于菲尔丁小说的伦理、道德思想的系统梳理与分析阐述的话，那么第四章则是对于菲尔丁小说伦理思想的真正意义上的批判性研究。专著的书名已然明示“道德假面与伦理建构”是该专著的核心部分，梳理和分析菲尔丁小说伦理的思想建构过程是主要目标，然而，作者并不满足于梳理和分析，而是立足于菲尔丁小说伦理叙事的审美性分析，创造性地指出了菲尔丁小说伦理内涵指涉的模糊性及其小说伦理正义达成的

传奇性特点。作者认为,菲尔丁作为一位用小说艺术来传达伦理思想的小说家,对于伦理体系是否完备、伦理概念是否明晰并不是很在意,他所在意的是小说人物所处的具体道德处境和价值选择,然而,由于大多数故事建构在一些具体的生活事件和叙述场景中,为此这种叙事方式所传达出来的伦理思想“具有一种先天的模糊性”(205)。此外,虽然菲尔丁的小说都是现实主义的的代表作,但其小说的结局却往往“体现了一种超越现实逻辑的传奇性”(205),具有十分明显的虚构性特征。那么,菲尔丁小说伦理思想的“模糊性”和叙事结局的“传奇性”是否破坏了菲尔丁小说的伦理表达和审美艺术效果呢?作者借助“同情”、“荣誉”和“自爱”三种伦理价值,阐述了菲尔丁叙事文本表现与伦理内涵指涉之间的关系,进而分析了三部小说中的虚构性叙述和传奇性结局。作者最后富有创新性地指出,“伟大的小说家并不一定要在创作实践中提出一些救世的伦理道德,反倒是他对人物现实道德处境的描绘,以及在这种道德处境下所做出的艰难的价值选择,更能反映人性的复杂与现实的广阔”(206)。在菲尔丁创造的“散文体喜剧史诗”(prosaic-comic-epic writing)中,显然融合了虚构的英雄传奇和真实的历史更迭,借鉴了传奇叙事的艺术结构。作者进而认为,“虽然传奇叙事在菲尔丁的文体改革中未必完全成功,但它却担负起了伦理救赎的重要使命”(243)。为此,作者从小说中主人公的身份发现与突转、“天意之手”的宿命安排和家庭罗曼司三个方面论述了这种传奇性叙述的现实意义和伦理价值,同时也为后来小说虚构性的合法性而正名,对于后来的文学批评也有着重要的价值和意义。

在专著的结语部分,作者阐述了菲尔丁小说伦理的艺术之维,即“小说”道德。一般认为,现代意义上的小说起源于18世纪。此前,小说一般被认为是低下的、粗鄙的体裁;直到18世纪,菲尔丁、理查森和笛福等人都在创作中专注于伦理问题,描绘了英国社会的伦理现实与道德状况。相较之下,菲尔丁则是“将艺术审美与伦理之辩结合得如此完美的作家”(274)。作者认为,正是由于菲尔丁“对小说道德功能的确立”以及对“散文体喜剧史诗的形式探索”,小说才终能以“高尚体裁”的面貌在英国文坛登堂入室(275)。菲尔丁对现实主义文学传统的继承与革新,对启蒙主义和人文主义精神的汲取,对欧洲传奇文学的创造性转化,无一不显示出他超乎同侪之上的历史与艺术眼光。作者极富创造性地用“‘小说’道德”总括了菲尔丁创作实践的“艺术审美与伦理之辩完美结合”的特点(275)。具体说来,“小说”道德是针对欧洲伦理学家的“大说”方式而言的,与哲学化、思辨化和逻辑化的“大说”伦理方式不同,菲尔丁主要是通过询问个人奇遇、探究心灵奥秘、揭示隐秘情感、解除历史禁锢和缠绵于生活事件的“小说”方式,真正走进其作品中每一位人物的道德困境。为此,作者总结说,“就这一点来说,菲尔丁这位现代小说之父也堪称是伦理学界的马丁·路德,他以艺术审美推进伦理之辩的思想方式,深刻影响了传统伦理的现代转型”(276),作者的这一论断可谓切中肯綮。

二

透过笔者对专著管窥蠡测式的简述,可以看出,杜娟教授的新著《道德假面与伦理建构:亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》不仅是她对自己在菲尔丁小说研究方面的重要突破,也代表了国内菲尔丁小说研究的重要突破,还是世界菲尔丁小说研究领域的重要拓展,它体现了中国学者对菲尔丁小说研究的智慧贡献。总览全书,不难发现新著具有如下几个典范性特征:

第一,《道德假面与伦理建构》是近年来运用文学伦理学批评研究方法进行文学研究的经典个案研究。2020年,基于国家社会科学基金重大项目“文学伦理学批评:理论建构与批评实践研究”,由聂珍钊教授、苏晖教授担任总主编在北京大学出版社出版了文学伦理学批评研究五部结项专著,分别从“理论研究”、“美国文学”、“英国文学”、“日本文学”和“中国文学”等视角阐述了近年来文学伦理学批评的理论发展和批评实践研究,然而,杜娟教授则从个案研究出发,运用文学伦理学批评方法,以文学伦理学批评的视角切入菲尔丁小说,成功地凝炼了处于英国历史变革时期的菲尔丁如何运用小说进行道德思考和伦理建构,并且深入剖析了当时的道德状况与伦理现实。可见,《道德假面与伦理建构》一方面是对五部结项丛书的拓展、延伸和补充,另一方面也进一步推动了文学伦理学批评的新发展。

第二,《道德假面与伦理建构》本身体系完整、布局合理、材料翔实、论证深入,富有真知灼见。通阅全书,作者开篇的“引论”从“问题的提出与国内外研究现状”、“主要研究方法”、“研究思路”三个方面清晰地简述了专著的问题意识、研究现状、与之对应的研究方法和研究思路等。接着专著的主体部分又从菲尔丁小说伦理的“人性起点”、“文本脉络”、“思想建构”和“内在矛盾”四个方面展开论述,四个方面层次明晰、逐步深入、有立有破、有理有据。专著的“结语”部分作者创造性地凝练了菲尔丁“小说”道德的特征,不仅总概了菲尔丁小说对于道德伦理之思,还阐述了其小说艺术审美之维。概而言之,《道德假面与伦理建构》体现了作者科学的研究态度、严谨的治学精神和坚实的学术能力,是一部不可多得的学术典范之作。

第三,《道德假面与伦理建构》紧扣菲尔丁的三部现实主义小说展开分析和论述,是理论与文本、方法与实践紧密结合的文学批评典范之作。作者在以时间为轴的纵向考察中,依次对菲尔丁的小说《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》、《汤姆·琼斯》和《阿米莉娅》中的核心道德伦理观念进行梳理和剖析,分析了小说中人物的伦理选择与当时的历史、政治、经济和文化之间的勾连,并且探讨了菲尔丁如何将社会图景编织进入主人公的个体生命历程。由是可见,《道德假面与伦理建构》是作者长期以来对于菲尔丁小说的道德追问和伦理体系梳理的成果,有助于回归到历史现场考察菲尔丁时期的伦理、道德和宗教等问题,同时这也是对于国内“文学批评远离文学,即文学批评不坚持对

文学的批评”和“文学批评的道德缺位，即文学批评缺乏社会道德责任感”（聂珍钊 4）两个倾向的有力回击，从这个意义上来讲，专著也具有重要的典范作用。

最后，《道德假面与伦理建构》文风朴实、不拘囿于前人之见、善于发现新问题、见解独到、言之成理、持之有据。作者敢于突破自己前期的研究基础和成果（特别是专著《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》），不断发现新的问题，运用新的理论方法，得出新的研究成果。细读两部菲尔丁研究专著，可以发现，较之前期研究成果，该专著旨在从文学伦理学批评的立场审视和评价菲尔丁小说中的道德现象和伦理问题，提出了“道德假面”和“‘小说’道德”等极富开拓性的见解，文字淳朴，纵横捭阖，读后让人耳目一新。

总而言之，《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》融合了伦理之辩和艺术审美之维的批评与思考，是近年来菲尔丁及其小说研究的一部典范之作。显然，对于菲尔丁小说伦理思想的系统研究具有重要的理论价值和现实意义，或许正如专著最后所指出的，它“不仅仅是为道德、宗教哲学家们提供了实践支持，更为重要的是其作品中对道德现象的考察和鲜活的文学案例同时也反过来影响了社会公众的伦理认知和人生抉择，并至今能给我们带来对于现实人生和伦理思考的诸多启示”（300）。

Works Cited

- 杜娟：《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》。武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2010年。
[Du Juan. *Ethical Narrative: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*. Wuhan: Central China Normal UP, 2010.]
- ：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2021年。
[—, *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2021.]
- 韩加明：《菲尔丁研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2010年。
[Han Jiaming. *A Study of Henry Fielding*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2010.]
- Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 13.2 (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. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- Müller, Patrick. *Latitudinarianism and Didacticism in Eighteenth-century Literature: Moral Theology in Fielding, Sterne, and Goldsmith*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009.
- 王晓兰：“菲尔丁道德密码的解译——评《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》”，《外国文学研究》3 (2012): 155-158。
[Wang, Xiaolan. "Interpretation of Fielding's Moral Codes: Review of *Ethical Narrative: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*." *Foreign Literature Studies*, 2012 (3): 155-158.]
- 朱宾忠 杨文慧：“英美菲尔丁研究近期动态述评”，《社会科学动态》2 (2020): 78-84。
[Zhu, Binzhong, Yang Wenhui. "Review of Recent Trends of Studies of Henry Fielding in the Anglo-America." *Trends of Social Sciences*, 2 (2020): 78-84.]



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920

