

ISL

文学跨学科研究

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

Vol.1, No.1, March 2017

ISSN 2520-4920

# Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 1, Number 1  
March 2017



Published by  
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited  
Hong Kong

# **Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature**

**文学跨学科研究**

**Volume 1, Number 1  
March 2017**

**Editor**

**Nie Zhenzhao, Zhejiang University**

**Published by**  
**Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited**  
**Hong Kong**



**About:** *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* (“ISL”) is a peer-reviewed journal published by Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited (Hong Kong). With a strategic focus on literary, 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.

*Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* is registered with ISSN 2520-4920, and is indexed by *Arts and Humanities Citation Index*.

**Submissions and subscription:** 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 and subscription should be sent to: [isl@163.com](mailto:isl@163.com).

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

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

# Advisory Board

**Massimo Bacigalupo** / Università di Genova, ITA

**Michael Bell** / University of Warwick, UK

**Charles Bernstein** / University of Pennsylvania, USA

**Vladimir Biti** / University of Vienna, AT

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

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

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

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

**Khairy Douma** / Cairo University, EGY

**Barbara Foley** / Rutgers University, USA

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

**Luo Lianggong** / Central China Normal University, CHN

**Byeongho Jung** / Korea University, KOR

**Anne-Marie Mai** / University of Southern Denmark, DEN

**Wolfgang Müller** / Friedrich-Schiller University Jena, GER

**Marjorie Perloff** / Stanford University, USA

**John Rathmell** / University of Cambridge, UK

**Claude Rawson** / Yale University, USA

**Joshua Scodel** / University of Chicago, USA

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

**Inseop Shin** / Konkuk University, KOR

**Wang Songlin** / Ningbo University, CHN

# Contents

- 1-16 Complexities and Limits of Ethical Literary Criticism  
*Tomo Virk*
- 17-26 Self-referential Aspects of Ethical Literary Criticism  
*Knut Brynhildsvoll*
- 27-44 Prisoners of Ethical Predicament: The Ethical Metaphors of Ian McEwan's *Nutshell*  
*Shang Biwu*
- 45-54 The Desert Island of Human Nature: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of Men and Beasts in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*  
*Wang Xiaohui*
- 55-63 On the Ethical Paradox in Edward Albee's Plays  
*Zhang Lianqiao*
- 64-73 The Interplay of Ethics, Emotion and History: Unnatural Narrative in *Angels in America*  
*Zheng Jie*
- 74-89 Ethical Appeal in Philip Larkin's Love Poems  
*Chen Xi*
- 90-98 After Ethics of Freedom: Shi Tiesheng's Religious Ethics in His Late Works  
*Ye Liwen and Du Juan*
- 99-108 The Conflict Between Rational Will and Free Will: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of *Idylls of the King*  
*Zhang Chengjun*
- 109-119 Dark Forces, Identity Crisis and Ethical Choice in Growing up: An Ethical Literary Study of *I was a Rat!* and *The Amber Spyglass*  
*Bai Ling*
- 120-134 A Study of the Formation of Japanese Language Literature in Colonial Korea: Japanese Magazines, Japanese Translations of Joseon Literature, and Traditional Japanese Poetry  
*Inkyung Um, Byeongho Jung and Hyosun Kim*
- 135-143 A Study on Miyamoto Yuriko's Ethical Choice in Her Novel Writing  
*Jooyoung Kim*
- 144-148 A Review of *Conflict and Integration of Art and Morality: An Ethical Study of Oscar Wilde*  
*Nie Zhenzhao*

# 目 录

- 1-16 文学伦理学批评的复杂性与有限性  
汤姆·沃尔克
- 17-26 文学伦理学批评视阈中的自我指涉  
克努特·布莱恩希沃兹威尔
- 27-44 《果壳》：伦理困境的囚徒  
尚必武
- 45-54 人性的荒岛：《莫罗博士的岛》中人与兽的文学伦理学阐释  
王晓惠
- 55-63 爱德华·阿尔比戏剧中的伦理悖论  
张连桥
- 64-73 伦理、情感和历史的关系：论《天使在美国》中的非自然叙事  
郑 杰
- 74-89 菲利普·拉金爱情诗的伦理诉求  
陈 晞
- 90-98 走出自由伦理之后  
——论史铁生后期作品中的宗教伦理思想  
叶立文 杜 娟
- 99-108 理性意志与自由意志之争  
——《国王之歌》的文学伦理学解读  
张成军
- 109-119 黑暗势力、身份危机与成长中的伦理选择：  
文学伦理学批评视域中的《我过去是只老鼠》与《琥珀望远镜》  
柏 灵
- 120-134 朝鲜被殖民期间日本语文学的生成研究：  
日语杂志、朝鲜文学的日语翻译和日本传统诗歌  
严仁卿 郑炳浩 金孝顺
- 135-143 论宫本百合子小说创作的伦理选择  
金周英
- 144-148 评《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》  
聂珍钊

# Complexities and Limits of Ethical Literary Criticism

Tomo Virk

**Abstract:** Although the so-called ethical turn in literary studies happened in the eighties and nineties of the twentieth century in North America, the topic “Literature and Ethics” in its various forms and denominations has been present since the beginnings of the reflection on literature. This treatise summarizes the most prominent research directions of this topic and attempts to point out their strengths and weaknesses. As the most burning deficiency, it identifies the so-called cacophony of ethical approaches to literature (mostly in Western literary criticism, but also globally; Nie Zhenzhao’s well elaborated proposal of ethical literary criticism seems to be a bright exception in this respect), characterized by the lack of theoretical and methodological self-reflection. In order to overcome this deficiency, it proposes to scrutinize some basic concepts and relations of ethical literary criticism, such as the range of terms “ethics” and “literature”, the relation between ethics and morality and between ethics and politics, the problem of aesthetic autonomy in relation to the ethical evaluation, the problematic issue of aesthetic re-evaluation on the ground of ethical evaluation, etc. In the conclusion, the treatise stresses the general importance of ethical research in literary studies and points out (the ethical) obligations of researchers engaging in Ethical Literary Criticism.

**Key words:** Ethical Literary Criticism; literature and ethics; ethics and morality; literature and politics; aesthetic autonomy and ethics

**Author:** Tomo Virk is Professor of comparative literature and literary theory at the Department of Comparative Literature and Literary Theory at the Faculty of Arts at the University of Ljubljana (999151, Slovenia). His interests and publications encompass the methodologies of literary science, postmodernism, magic realism, and theory of the novel, literary hermeneutics, world literature, contemporary Slovenian literature, and ethical literary criticism. Email: tomo.virk@guest.arnes.si

**标题：**文学伦理学批评的复杂性与有限性

**内容摘要：**尽管文学研究中的伦理学转向发生于北美 20 世纪 80、90 年代，然而以“文学与伦理”为主题的探讨早在文学研究之初就以多种方式在各色学派中存在。本文旨在汇总与该论题有关的重要研究，试图指出这些研究中的优势与劣势。就其最显著的缺陷而言，文学伦理学批评对文学之伦理分析



的强调因缺乏理论与方法论的自我思考而显得有些刺耳（这一现象多在西方文学伦理学批评领域发生，在全球范围内也时有发生。聂珍钊教授详尽阐释的文学伦理学的提议却是个例外，读后令人感到眼前一亮。）为了克服这一缺陷，本文将从某些基本概念如“伦理”与“文学”、伦理与道德之间的关系、伦理与政治之间的关系、审美自律与伦理评价、道德评判基础上的审美评判等问题入手阐释相关概念以及文学伦理学批评中的诸多关系。总而言之，本文在强调文学伦理学批评在文学研究中的重要性的同时，指出文学伦理学批评研究者自身的伦理责任不容忽视。

**关键词：**文学伦理学批评；文学与伦理；伦理与道德；文学与政治；审美自律与伦理

**作者简介：**汤姆·沃尔克，斯洛文尼亚卢布尔雅那大学比较文学与文学理论系教授，其研究领域包括文学研究科学方法论、后现代主义、魔幻现实主义、小说理论、文学诠释学、世界文学、当代斯洛文尼亚文学和文学伦理学批评。

Associating literature and ethics (or literature and morality) has a long and respectable history. Plato and Aristotle, for instance, both believed that literature had a moral impact on its audience. Aristotle's theory of empathy and catharsis in *Poetics* prefigured many of the contemporary debates about the ethical value and importance of literature, as well as did his theory of *phronesis*, a practical wisdom necessary to conduct a good life, as developed in his ethical writings that deeply influenced the Neo-Aristotelian current of contemporary ethical criticism. If other classic, medieval and early modernist authors might not have been such an inspiration for contemporary research in this respect, this doesn't mean that they didn't reflect the connection between literature and ethics. On the contrary, the *literature and ethics* topic was widely discussed in the middle ages as well as later, even in such monumental works as, for instance, the four-volume *Versuche aus der Literatur und Moral*, written by Christian August Clodius in 1767. To name some other, more prominent examples: Shelley, "Shaftesbury, and the philosophers of the Scottish Enlightenment [...] anticipate[d] aspects of the contemporary philosophies of Jürgen Habermas (1990) and Martha C. Nussbaum" (Locatelli 49), concerning ethics, and understood the relationship between literature and ethics in quite modern terms, not at all in an old-fashioned moralist manner. So did some German Romanticists. The list is actually quite extensive. Yet towards the end of the 19th century and in the first decades of the 20th century, the ethical approach to literature became suspect of *moralism* and got replaced with other approaches, such as aestheticist and formalist.

This changed dramatically in the last decades of the twentieth century, when

the so-called *ethical turn* occurred, initially in North America. To be sure, the metaphor itself, evoking the “Copernican Turn” and all the subsequent “turns” (linguistic, theoretical, political etc.), seems to be a bit excessive. Since the Romanticism, the implicit and explicit theoretical discussion and criticism about values, ethics and morality in literature continued—not only in Anglo-American criticism that seems to dominate contemporary debates on ethics and literature, but also in others.<sup>①</sup> Yet it is only in the eighties and the nineties that literary criticism and theory, but also philosophy, *programatically* turned their attention to the various aspects of the topic *literature and ethics*. The most prominent philosophers and literary scholars in this respect were Wayne Booth, Martha Nussbaum, Alasdair Macintyre, Richard Rorty, J. Hillis-Miller, Stanley Cavell, Adam Zachary Newton, Lawrence Buell, James Phelan and others. A little bit later (in 2004) and basically not influenced by the Western “Ethical Turn”, a well elaborated approach to the *literature and ethics* topic emerged in China, with Nie Zhenzhao and his “Ethical Literary Criticism”. In the last decades, ethical literary criticism evolved in a variety of sub-categories, perhaps the most prominent among them being *narrative ethics*, *rhetorical literary ethics*, *ethics of reading* and *ethics of alterity*, but also *ethics of writing*, *ethics of fiction*, *ethics of criticism*, *ethics of interpretation*, *ethics of world literature*, *ethics of imagination*, *ethics of hypertext* etc. The list of potential further candidates seems to be inexhaustible and the field widely open to such an extent that it gives the impression of rather chaotic enterprise. It is no surprise that some scholars got worried about this state of affairs. In my view, Dagmar Krause rightly observed that

ethics denotes very different things to different people, and the task of clarification is made even more difficult by the fact that only very few people who partake in the debate deign to define ethics and morality, although most people freely use both terms. Moreover, it is only rarely made clear on what level exactly the presumed ethical influence of literature is supposed to take place and what counts as ethical influence in the first place. The entire debate, for example, between Nussbaum, Booth and Posner suffers from this misunderstanding. (Krause 36)

A similar point was made by Lawrence Buell:

In any event, since no specific model for inquiry into ethics is shared by more than a fraction of the scholars working in the various domains of

literary theory and criticism, it is more than ordinarily perplexing when, as often happens, avowed practitioners of “ethical” criticism neglect to relate their brand of ethics to its alternatives or to antecedent traditions of moral thematics, the ideology of genre, the deconstructive ethics of reading, the politics of canonicity, and so forth. / To date, nobody seems to have worried much about a problem of cacophony, however. (Buell 11)

In order to regulate this “cacophony” at least to some extent, attempts have been made to explain the driving forces behind the “ethical turn” and in addition to propose a kind of its genealogy, typology or classification. Concerning the reasons for its rise, most often the opposition to deconstruction and “textualism” or “the law of periodical turn” in this case away from the text to the context are mentioned. Some attention has also been paid to the assumption that the turn to ethics in literary studies and humanities in general is due to the humanities’ need to socially legitimize themselves (see for instance Nussbaum in *Love’s Knowledge, Poetic Justice, and Not for a Profit*). As for the genealogy-typology-classification attempts, the majority of them stress three strains of contemporary ethical criticism: Neo-Aristotelian (Nussbaum, for instance), deconstructionist (de Man, Hillis Miller, Derrida), and the one inspired by Levinas (or Blanchot) (Attridge and a legion of others). To my knowledge, the fullest account so far can be found in Buell’s 1999 article “In Pursuit of Ethics”. There he identifies the following six “genealogical strands”: 1) traditional criticism dwelling “on the moral thematics and underlying value commitments of literary texts and their implied authors” [Parker, Booth] (Buell 7); 2) the use of literature for philosophical-ethical purposes [Nussbaum, Rorty] (8); 3) deconstruction with “two specific [...] ethical currents” (9), the *ethics of reading* [B. Johnson, Hillis-Miller] and the *ethics of alterity*, emerging from Derrida’s dialogue with Levinas; 4) “the intensified attention [...] given subjectness and agency” under the influence of “the later work of Michel Foucault” (9); 5) another late-Foucauldian strand, criticising “out-and-out cognitive scepticism”<sup>②</sup> (10), and 6) “increased self-consciousness about professional ethics” (10). In addition, Buell proposes “[f]ive [...] distinctive contours” of ethical criticism (12): 1) the “recuperation of authorial agency in the production of texts”; 2) the “readerly responsibility”, deriving from “a conception of literature as the reader’s other” (12); 3) “[t]he approach to literary texts as arenas of ethical reflection by reason of their formal or generic contours” (13); 4) the distinction between ethics and morality (14), and 5) “the relation or distinction between the personal and the socio-political” (14). A little bit different—and in my view a much more systematic—set

of possibilities to approach ethics in literature from the standpoint of literary studies proposes Nie Zhenzhao with the “following five aspects: (1) in terms of writers and their writings, it attempts to investigate moral values of the writers and their historical background, and the connections of the writers’ own moral values and those ethical values projected in those writings; (2) in terms of the works produced by the writers, it tries to investigate the relations between moral phenomena existing in works and in reality, the moral inclinations of the works, and social and moral values of the works; (3) in terms of the relations between readers and works, it intends to examine the effects of the works’ moral values upon readers and the society, and readers’ evaluations of the moral thoughts of the writers and the works; (4) it also needs to evaluate the moral inclinations of the writers and their works from an ethical perspective, the influence of the moral inclinations of the writers and their works upon their contemporary writers and literature as well as those of the later period; (5) it not only aims at uncovering the moral features of the writers and their works but also aims at exploring various issues concerning the relations between literature and society, literature and writer, and literature and writer from an ethical perspective (Nie, ‘Ethical Approach’ 19-20)” (Shang 29). In contrast to Buell, who offers a classification concerning the entire “cacophonic” corpus of contemporary ethical criticism, Zhenzhao’s well considered proposal concerns only his own approach, one of the few integral ethical approaches to literature so far.

In spite of their disturbing “cacophony”, ethical approaches to literature seem to share some common ground. For instance, if we are engaged in ethical literary criticism, we supposedly presume that literature—apart from other values, such as aesthetic or cognitive—also has an ethical value. Literary scholars are indeed not quite unanimous in what this value consists; there seems to be a large agreement, however, about what makes literature so suitable for ethical research. In the first place, the distinguished feature of a great deal of artistic literature is its *singularity* which is typical also of the ethical situation and decision-making. Here we are dealing with a kind of a structural analogy between the both domains. No less important seem to be some other features, detected not only by philosophical or literary-critical investigations, but supported also by, for instance, psychology and cognitive sciences. In this respect, the great value of literature for ethical research, but also for ethical education, consists in its ability to evoke emotions, to stimulate empathy, and to develop our imagination, which are all cognitive modes characteristic also of moral or ethical judgment that is by no means propositional or only reflective, as some other types of judgements are.

These views about literature are more or less commonly shared. The

differences arise, however, in the evaluation of what literature does—or can do, or even should do—with this ability from the point of view of ethics. Some critics believe that literature offers moral examples to follow (or to refuse), and that it is particularly effective in doing so just because of the features described above. Others maintain that literature stages *particular, singular* moral situations, characters and their decisions, and in this way strengthens our moral capacities, while we read it, since it is a kind of exercise in moral imagining and reasoning. From this perspective, when we read *Antigone*, *Hamlet*, *Crime and Punishment* or any novel of Henry James or George Eliot, we ourselves, *pace* Borges, temporarily become Antigone, Hamlet, Raskolnikov, or the protagonists of James' and Eliot's novels, and in this manner get experiences we probably wouldn't get otherwise. Others, again, stress that literature fosters our ability for empathy and knowledge and recognition of alterity, which is a pre-condition of ethics (at least in Levinasian sense).

These three positions of ethical criticism which are all very much alive and present in contemporary literary studies and in my view can be seen as its three prevailing typological strands: the *moral, ethical and meta-ethical* are so heterogeneous that they don't allow consensus about literature-ethic relationship and even generate very different answers to some basic questions of ethical criticism, such as: Does literature teach morality or not? Does it offer instructions to conduct a good or moral live? Does it make its readers better persons? Or, to move to more complex issues: Can a literary work be immoral at all? Do moral flaws of a work of art diminish its aesthetic value (and *vice versa*)? Or even: can a morally defective work of literature be called artwork at all? And finally: What about the canonized classical literary masterpieces (Shakespeare, Twain) that from the point of view of at least some of contemporary readers have serious moral flaws? Disparity of potential and actual answers to these and other related questions seems to imply some kind of ethical relativism and, consequentially, even nihilism. To be sure, ethical relativism—which is not the same as pluralism!—is a legitimate stand in ethical theory. Yet I believe that it is not a very promising and helpful theoretical background for doing ethical literary criticism. In order to avoid the implication of relativism, I propose a critical reflection of some crucial terms and concepts on which the ethical criticism is based. In my view, this might bring some clarification to the disturbing accidental “cacophony” of the literary ethical criticism and turn it into a pluralist, albeit not sufficiently self-reflected field of inquiry.

I want to begin with a general claim that is not quite devoid of certain paradoxicality: when discussing *literature and ethics*, we should avoid as much

as possible generalizations and strong statements. Their validity can be easily impugned by counter-examples. For instance, many ethical critics, such as for instance Hillis Miller, agree that literature doesn't offer explicit (or even implicit) moral instructions or "moral guidance" (Posner, "Against Ethical Criticism" 11). Such a view rests on a certain notion of literature associated with familiar concepts such as *aesthetic autonomy*, *open work*, *fictionality*, *quasi-reality*, *endless semiosis*, *polyvalence convention*, *writerly text*, *polyphonic novel*, *semantic aporia*, *slippage of the signified under the signifier* etc. A legion of close readings of literary texts, particularly from the part of New Critics and Deconstructionists, but also practitioners of some other approaches to literature, seem to confirm the basically non-instructive, non-didactic nature of literature. However, even if such a view is pertinent to the most of modern literature, it certainly doesn't cover all of it, let alone the pre-modern literature which admittedly functioned under very different conditions and criteria than the modern one. To claim that at least one of the functions of Sophocles' tragedies, Dante's *Divina Commedia*, medieval *exempla* etc. was not to morally instruct and educate their readers is to be blind for the facts. Yet this doesn't hold true only of the pre-modern literature, but also of Voltaire's *Candide*, *littérature engagée* and the works of great Russian novelists of the 19th century which, for instance, were perceived by their audiences as a moral guidance. There can be no doubt that many other modern literary works can also edify their readers.

However, the opposite general claim, namely that literature *gives* us moral instruction, is obviously equally too exclusive. Quite often such a claim, tied to the referential reading of literature, which is to say, to a strong concept of mimesis, remains implicit, hidden under the cover of ideological or political criticism. To the western scholars, such a claim is probably too remindful of old-fashioned moralism to be brought to explicit statements or principles. Nevertheless it is there. Eastern scholars are less scrupulous and more sincere in this respect. For Nie Zhenzhao, the initiator and the driving force behind the Chinese—one could even say Eastern—variety of the Ethical Turn, "[t]he basic function of literature is instruction and education to teach man to be a moral being" (Kim 398). Again, even if Nie offers fine examples in support of his thesis, which certainly holds true in the context of his own well elaborated proposal, many arguments and examples (such as, for instance, some novels of George Perec and other members of the Oulipo group, experimental poetry, visual and concrete poetry, the non-referential literature in general, etc.) of the proponents of the first general claim undermine it.

The lesson taken from both extremes is quite simple; no *general* claim about

the “moral instruction”—or “moral guidance”—of literature issue is quite adequate. Literature *can* morally instruct its readers, but it *can* also not do it. The answer to the question, whether it has a morally-didactic function or not, depends on several circumstances, regarding the recipient’s horizon of expectation, his literary culture, his reading skills and education, the historical moment, the type of literary text (“readerly” or “writerly”, self-reflective or engaged, “poetic” or “mimetic” etc.) and many others.

Insistence on such general claims can be seen as one reason for the irreconcilable “cacophony” of the ethically/morally motivated approaches to literature. Another reason seems to be the arbitrary range of the concept of literature itself. Booth, for instance, uses the term in a very broad sense, synonymous with *narrative*. Similarly Eskin claims that “use literature in a broad sense, including film, etc.” (557). A case of different use can be found in Locatelli: “I have qualified literature as ‘artistic’ to indicate that I am not using the term ‘literature’ in the general sense of any kind of written texts, but rather in the restricted sense of texts either possessing or aiming at some artistic quality or effect” (Locatelli 47). Nussbaum’s reading of literature as a part of moral philosophy has even narrower focus: it pertains only to a certain type of modern novels.

It goes without saying that these different sets result in very different views of what “literature” in the *literature and ethics* syntagm *means* and of what literature *does* in terms of ethics. For instance, many scholars are inclined to believe that *artistic* literature’s “meanings” and “messages” are too complex to allow a straightforward paraphrase, while the so called “trivial literature” is not so resistant to it. If we use the term literature in this sense (as artistic), all varieties of ethical criticism, ascribing to literature explicit morally instructive function, are excluded. Many critics also believe that realist literature is more referential than high-modernist literature of, let us say, Joyce and Virginia Woolf, and for this reason more suitable for the moral-learning-from-literature approach as carried out by Nussbaum, for instance. Many other critics, however, particularly those influenced by Levinas’, Blanchot’s or Derrida’s views, quite contrarily assign higher ethical potential to the *open works* of high modernism. All these examples demonstrate that the way we understand literature or define its range, essentially influences our views on its ethical range and mode.

The complementary issue is the variety of uses of the term *ethics* in ethical literary criticism. Martha Nussbaum, for instance, draws from the Aristotelian conception of ethics (yet partly also, I believe—even if she would probably deny it—from utilitarianism) which essentially designs her approach to a very limited

scope. For her, the basic ethical question is how to conduct a good life, and she finds this “instructions” better exemplified in literature (in a certain type of modern novels) than in philosophy. On the other hand, the broadest—and therefore the most confusing—understanding of ethics can be found in Booth who understands ethics etymologically from the Greek *ethos*, meaning a “character”, a “collection of habitual characteristics”, “whatever in a person or a society could be counted on to persist from situation to situation. I express my ethos, my character, by my habits of choice in every domain of my life, and a society expresses its ethos by what it chooses to be”. In this way, ethics includes “the entire range of effects on the ‘character’ or ‘person’ or ‘self’” (Booth 8). Richard Posner rightly observed that “Booth defines ‘ethical’ so broadly that it largely overlaps what I consider ‘aesthetic’” (Posner, “Against Ethical Criticism: Part Two” 359). Posner’s observation is fully confirmed by many passages in Booth’s *The Company We Keep*, for instance this one:

Expanding our terms in this way exposes the falseness of any sharp divorce of aesthetic and ethical questions. If “virtue” covers every kind of genuine strength or power, and if a person’s ethos is the total range of his or her virtues, then ethical criticism will be any effort to show how the virtues of narratives relate to the virtues of selves and societies, or how the ethos of any story affects or is affected by ethos—the collection of virtues—of any given reader. Obviously this means that a critic will be doing ethical criticism just as much when praising a story or poem for “raising our aesthetic sensibilities” or “increasing our sensitivity” as when attacking decadence, sexism, or racism. (Booth 11)

From the point of view of ethical literary criticism, this seems to be a rather questionable standpoint, blurring what is distinctively *ethical* in works of literature (but also in general) and consequentially implying that the moral defects of literary works are to the same extent also aesthetic flaws, and also the other way around. I’ll briefly discuss this problem a little bit later. For now, I want to add that the most elaborated, widely applied use (but also misuse) of the term *ethics* in contemporary literary ethical criticism derives from Levinas (sometimes accompanied by Blanchot or Bakhtin) and is integrated and upgraded (with Derrida’s, Badiou’s, Bauman’s and other readings) in several forms of the so-called *ethics of alterity*. This kind of ethical criticism, when performed correctly, addresses mostly the issues of the reader’s *responsibility* and of *literariness* as a *model-alterity*, in the



latter case being an approach that passes into a kind of *meta-ethical* criticism. It needs to be noted, however, that Levinas' ethics is particularly vulnerable to misunderstandings and false simplifications, if not studied carefully enough. In such cases, Levinasian *alterity* is not understood in connection to *saying* (le dire), but to *said* (le dit), which can make such an approach quite often in the postcolonial context suspicious.

Another important issue that needs to be subject to my scrutiny is the relationship between ethics/morality and aesthetics, already briefly touched upon above. To make it as short as possible: in spite of the famous Oscar Wilde's claim that "there is no such thing as moral or an immoral book", very few people would seriously deny that at least some works of literature—if not all—have certain moral or ethical dimension. The crucial question in this respect, however, is, what kind of relationship is there between the aesthetic and ethical value. To repeat some of the questions already posed before: *Does literature teach morality or not? Can a literary work be immoral? Do moral flaws of a work of art diminish its aesthetic value (and vice versa)? Can a morally defective piece of literature be called artwork at all?* The aesthetic autonomists defend the conviction that art is separate from ethics and that ethical values in no way affect the aesthetical value. Quite often they have good reasons to believe this (for example, the defence of literature's artistic freedom from legal prosecution). Yet many critics practicing ethical criticism disagree with this position. Their arguments are too numerous and much too heterogeneous to be listed here; let me instead concentrate on a specific and very important issue in this respect: the aesthetical re-evaluation of canonized masterpieces on the ground of their ethical re-evaluation. Booth deals extensively with this issue in *The Company We Keep*, referring to some examples of his own re-evaluating experience in cases of *Huckleberry Finn*, *Gargantua and Pantagruel* and some others.

Booth is aware of the complexity of the problem he deals with. He admits, for instance, that even as a professor, he wasn't aware for a long time of certain ethical flaws in Twain's or Rabelais' novels. Yet once he was confronted with their ethical defects, this also influenced his aesthetic evaluation of these works. Some scholars criticised Booth for such an attitude, accusing him of tendentious and shallow, ideologically pre-determined reading, and also reminded him that he wrongly evaluated these works from his own historical ethical and moral horizons, not respecting the historical and cultural circumstances or moral standards and conditions, under which these works had been written. Nie Zhenzhao would label Booth's re-readings *moral* and not *ethical criticism*. However, Booth seems to be

aware of these possible objections and has a well prepared answer. For him, to read literature does not only mean to let himself being totally immersed in the textual world, but at the same time also to keep some distance, to remain the person he is in his actual social and historical world.<sup>③</sup> Consequently, Booth denies the possibility of total acknowledgment of the otherness.

This is quite a delicate issue, still acute and in my view one of the most important conceptual problems of ethical criticism, re-emerging in new variations. To remain with the Booth's example, I see three different possibilities within the ethical criticism to take position in this debate. I have already briefly presented Booth's arguments. In extreme cases they can be graduated up to the complete denial of artistic value of such canonized works that are morally flawed from the perspective of actual moral and ethical standards. Some of the politically engaged contemporary literary criticism takes this course. Booth's opponents, on the other hand, stress the autonomy of literature or rely on *close reading* of works in question, claiming that recipient's personality should not be included in the reception process, demonstrating Booth's too diligent over-interpretation and misreading, and also his supposed ignorance of historical circumstances or at least incapability to evaluate the work according to the ethical or moral standards of its own historical and cultural moment. In my view, none of these options is satisfactory, since it is not far reaching enough. For a balanced response to this demanding challenge we need a third perspective, perhaps the one offered without allusions to the particular case Booth deals with by Hanna Meretoja who states:

Reading narrative fiction about a particular historical world can contribute to the reader's sense of history as a sense of the possible in two interconnected ways. Firstly, it provides the reader with a sense of the space of experience in which it was possible to experience certain things and difficult or impossible to experience other things—a space of experience that encouraged certain modes of action and thought and discouraged others. Cultivating a sense of that kind of space of experience can make actions comprehensible to us that might otherwise remain incomprehensible. Secondly, a sense of what kind of space of experience a past historical world was can provide the reader with a new perspective on his or her current historical world, allowing him or her to see its limits and blind spots and to perceive other possibilities of experience, thought, and action. (Meretoja 44)

To put it shortly and straightforwardly, with regard to Booth: Booth doesn't occupy

an absolute moral position from where he could deliver absolute judgements. Similarly as he would—perhaps due to the political correctness—probably avoid to judge moral standards of some *other, subaltern* contemporary culture by the standards of his own culture, he ought to avoid criticising historically *other* cultures' standards from the standpoint of his own historical standards. From the point of view of a not-yet-attained moral/ethical level, his views could be no less unethical than the ones he is criticizing. To the same extent that Rabelais' possibilities of experience were limited by his historical horizon, Booth's possibilities of experience are limited by his own historical horizon that is by no means the *absolute one*. Therefore, the most undiscussable ethical lesson Booth can take from his example is the experience of provisionality of his (and everyone else's) moral standards. Such an experience can contribute to our self-understanding and help us to "conduct a better life" in both Booth's and Nussbaum's senses of the word. Such an experience also prevents us from the incorrect aesthetic re-evaluation on the ground of our own moral standards.

With the last case we come close to another couple of terms that cry for clarification of the relationship among them: *ethics* and *politics*. Here, too, we are faced with the two opposed opinions: for some ethical critics, there is no substantial difference between ethics and politics—or at least, for them, they are "inextricably linked".

I do not deny a certain relationship between ethics and politics. It would be unwise to do so. There is, for instance, a basic connection between them in a sense that—in a manner remindful of the Aristototele's *homo politicus*—everything has something to do with politics, and also that they sometimes actually address same issues. However, I claim that not all varieties of this relationship are fruitful for the ethical criticism. Some of them may even inhibit it. Let me pose for the clarity's sake two such possible relationships: 1) a view that politics is based on ethics and derives from it, and 2) the opposite view, that ethics is based on politics (which can be seen as a sort of macchiavelism). I believe that the second view doesn't allow for an ethical criticism proper, because from this perspective, ethics is always a political construct, and if we want to go to the core of character's actions and decisions (or of "author's intentions"), we land in the political criticism, and not ethical.

So in my view, from the perspective of ethical literary criticism, it is only consistent and fruitful to clearly distinguish ethics from politics. They are not at all the same; in some respect they are even opposed to each other (*Antigone* would be a good example). While politics is always about power, the ethics *proper*

never is, even if power relations may raise also ethical questions. Nevertheless, the distinction remains. For instance, in practice, the politics is an attempt *to gain power over others*; this is also characteristic of political discourse. Not so in ethics. Ethics is not about gaining power over the others, but about *respecting others*. This is also how ethical discourse—in literary criticism or elsewhere—essentially differs from the political criticism. In my opinion, the ethical criticism should not serve as a cover for a political or any other criticism; I agree therefore with Eugene Goodheart that “the ethical critic must resist the language of power” (qtd. in Henriksen 490) as characteristic of political criticism.

For practical reasons, I am only now turning to a terminology issue that ought to accompany—and, actually, even introduce—every piece of ethical criticism, literary or non-literary: the relationship and distinction between *ethics* and *morality*. Philosophers and literary critics often use them interchangeably (for instance Devereaux 2004,<sup>④</sup> Eskin 2004, Nussbaum 1990), even if sometimes they are aware of their different meanings. Some others make a clear distinction here. Nie Zhenzhao, for instance, understands ethics as “a general term encompassing both moral terms and immoral terms, while morality is a specific term excluding immoral terms” (qtd. in Ross 8), and explicitly distinguishes between moral and ethical criticism:

Unlike moral criticism, ethical literary criticism does not simply evaluate a given literary work as good or bad on the basis of today’s moral principles. Instead, it emphasizes “historicism,” that is, the examination of the ethical values in a given work with reference to a particular historical context or a period of time in which the text under discussion is written [...] Though some traditional ethical critics have attempted to unpack ethical elements in literature, they have usually analyzed literature from their personal ethical values and moral principles or, at best, the moral principles of their contemporaries [...] Theoretically, their point of departure should have been to analyze literature from an ethical perspective, or to put it differently, the ethical value of the literary text should have been the target of their research, and their moral principles should have merely served as toolkits in that process. However, in practice, the analysis of literary texts ceases to be their target of investigation and their personal moral principles take priority. By contrast, ethical literary criticism represents a particularly strong call for objectivity and historicism. Grounding itself in specific historical contexts or ethical environments, ethical literary criticism sees the contemporary value of

literature as the rediscovery of its historical value. (10)

To be sure, clear distinction between the ethical and moral is not a matter of literary studies; it is rather a challenge for philosophy which is burdened with historical heritage of the interchangeability of both concepts. Yet for the sake of clarity, necessary to confront the disturbing cacophony, mentioned above, at least the awareness of the difference between the two domains would be useful. “The moral of the story” means something else than “The ethics of the story”.

Here my listing of topics indispensable for the methodological self-reflexion is at the end. What remains is to propose a kind of conclusion. To use a moral vocabulary again: what lesson can one take from the issues briefly touched upon in my presentation?

In the first place, I would say that ethical criticism—in my view the most important branch of literary criticism—consists in an innumerable variety of approaches. This variety can be seen as an *anything-goes-cacophony* or as a *healthy plurality*. The distinction between both lies in self-reflection. If ethical literary criticism is rightly seen by some as a cacophony, then it needs more self-reflection in order to become a plurality. Zhenzhao’s proposal, for instance, is one of a very few such systematic, integral and methodologically self-reflected approaches, in this respect a good example also for western scholars to follow, when doing ethical literary criticism.

The variety of ethical approaches to literature, that perform extremely important work also in terms of social welfare, is in principle limitless. Nevertheless, there are, at least in my opinion, some limits for ethical criticism that need to be respected. Critics engaged in the ethical criticism ought to respect the principles of the *ethics of criticism*. They should not, for instance, use ethical criticism as a cover for some other sort of criticism. They should behave responsibly towards the literary works, which means that they should respect their singularity and not misuse them for their own purposes, as in the case of, for instance, ideologically burdened criticisms of various colours. The ethical dimension and potential of literature is so precious that ethical literary criticism should not blur it with an irresponsible treatment. The word “ethical” in the term “Ethical literary criticism” should therefore signify both: the specific research topic as well as the way how the research proceeds. In my opinion, these two responsibilities mark the only eventual limits to the ethical criticism I can think of.

### 【Notes】

① To name only a couple of cases preceding the Turn in North America: in his *Anatomy of Criticism*, published in 1957, Northrop Frye even devoted an entire chapter to what he called “Ethical criticism”. (It is true, however, that with this title he didn’t really discuss what we nowadays understand under this term.) Another such case is John Gardner’s controversial *On Moral Fiction* (1978). More examples can be found in French, German, Russian (pre-Soviet and Soviet) and probably many other literary criticisms.

② For the sake of clarity I am adding a bit longer description: this strand derives from Foucault’s “incipient critique of his earlier evaluation of ‘the idea of truth as nothing more than a ruse in the service of an epistemic will-to-power,’ as a mere discursive artifact” (Norris 124, 126). This strain of recent theory concerns itself with exposing the intellectual reductionisms and moral hazards of the ‘out-and-out cognitive skepticism’ that supposedly characterized poststructuralism (Norris 3), while avoiding old-fashioned models of mimetic realism” (Buell 10).

③ Booth approaches a hermeneutical issue here. The similar point has been done, for instance, by the Gadamer-influenced Aesthetic of reception with its claim that a proper understanding always includes the entire variety of historical horizons of expectation, including, of course, the reader’s one. Yet such a starting point can also lead to different conclusions regarding the aesthetic value than the one proposed by Booth.

④ Devereaux’s use is not problematic only due to the non-distinction, but also due to the very broad conception of the term ethics/morality: “A note on terminology: in the context of this paper, I am using ‘moral’ and ‘ethical’ interchangeably. I am also using these terms in a very broad sense, including more than might ordinarily be counted under the label ‘moral.’ For my purposes, the label ‘the moral’ includes the political, the ideological, the religious, and so on. Lastly, I am not committed to the claim that the terms ‘moral’ and ‘immoral’ are the fundamental terms of moral evaluation. Here I use these terms as stand-ins for all kinds of moral language (ordinary talk of justice, happiness, virtue and vice, terms such as ‘duty,’ ‘obligation,’ and ‘right’ in ethical theory)” (Devereaux 10).

### 【Works Cited】

- Booth, Wayne C. *The Company We Keep. An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley. London: U of California P, 1988.
- Buell, Lawrence. “In Pursuit of Ethics.” *PMLA* 114.1 (1999) (Special Topic: Ethics and Literary Study): 7–19.
- Devereaux, Mary. “Moral Judgments and Works of Art: The Case of Narrative Literature.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 62.1 (2004): 3–11.

- Eskin, Michael. "Introduction: The Double 'Turn' to Ethics and Literature?" *Poetics Today* 25.4 (2004): 557–72.
- Henriksen, Bruce. "'The Real Thing': Criticism and the Ethical Turn." *Papers on Language and Literature* 27.4 (1991): 473–95.
- Kim, Youngmin. "Sea Change in Literary Theory and Criticism in Asia. Zhenzhao Nie, Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism." *English Language and Literature* 60.2 (2014): 395–400.
- Krause, Dagmar. *Timothy Findley's Novels between Ethics and Postmodernism*. Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann, 2005.
- Locatelli, Angela. "The Moral and the Fable: A Fluid Relationship in Artistic Literature." *Values of Literature*. Ed. Hanna Meretoja, Saija Isomaa, Pirjo Lyytikäinen, and Kristina Malmio. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2015. 47–62.
- Meretoja, Hanna. "A Sense of History — A Sense of the Possible: Nussbaum and Hermeneutics on the Ethical Potential of Literature." *Values of Literature*. Ed. Hanna Meretoja, Saija Isomaa, Pirjo Lyytikäinen, and Kristina Malmio. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2015. 25–46.
- Posner, Richard. "Against Ethical Criticism." *Philosophy and Literature* 21.1 (1997): 1–27.
- . "Against Ethical Criticism: Part Two." *Philosophy and Literature* 22.2 (1998): 394–412.
- Ross, Charles. "A Conceptual Map of Ethical Literary Criticism: An Interview with Nie Zhenzhao." *Forum for World Literature Studies* 7.1 (2015): 7–14.
- Shang Biwu. "The Rise of a Critical Theory: Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism." *Foreign Literature Studies* 36.5 (2014): 26–36.

责任编辑：徐 彬

# Self-referential Aspects of Ethical Literary Criticism

Knut Brynhildsvoll

**Abstract:** In the discussions about the role of ethics in literary texts one has frequently focused on the content of the texts and the attitudes of the involved figures. In my paper I intend to turn my attention to the self-referential components of literary representation and consider their role as constitutive factors in establishing a “good” work of art. Hereby I take my point of departure in the contradiction “good”/”bad”, which are terms adopted from moral philosophy and used as criteria in the evaluation process. It is my intention to show that when ethical categories like “good” or “bad” are applied to artistic writing they turn into aesthetical designations which function according to changing taste systems. Furthermore my paper discusses the role of self-referential judgements in the establishing and maintenance of canonical formation. With reference to Immanuel Kant’s and David Hume’s conceptions I finally conclude with statements, due to which the evaluation of art works is reductive if one limits the judgement to the self-referential aspects and neglects that works of art are interacting with a variety of other functions such as contextual, designative and cognitive.

**Key words:** self-referential; good; bad; moral philosophy; code switching; canonical formation

**Author:** Knut Brynhildsvoll is Professor of Nordic literature at the University of Cologne (Köln 50923, Germany), guest professor at the Universities in Hamburg, Bochum, Marburg, Giessen and Zürich, 2000-2007 director of the Centre for Ibsen Studies, University of Oslo. He has published more than 200 articles in national and international research journals on topics from romantic literature to postmodernity including literary theory and comparative literature, and numerous scholarly books in Norwegian and German. Email: knut.brynhildsvoll@ibsen.uio.no

**标题:** 文学伦理学批评视阈中的自我指涉

**内容摘要:** 伦理在文学文本中的角色通常限定在文本的内容和相关人物角色的态度。本文旨在分析文学作品中的自我指涉，探究其作为基本要素在一个“好”的艺术作品中扮演何种角色。据此，笔者从道德哲学评价的术语“善/恶”出发，阐释当诸如“善”或“恶”的伦理分类运用于艺术创作时，常常转向



美学意义且根据不断变化的审美体系而发生作用。本文还将进一步探讨自我指涉对建立和巩固经典作品的权威性产生的作用。笔者运用康德和大卫·休谟的哲学思想，说明如果文学研究仅限于自我指涉，忽略艺术作品与其他诸如语境、指称和认知等方面的关联，艺术作品的价值会被严重低估。

**关键词：**自我指涉；善；恶；道德哲学；语码转换；经典形成

**作者简介：**克努特·布莱恩希沃兹威尔，科隆大学北欧文学系教授，汉堡大学、波鸿大学、马尔堡大学、吉森大学和苏黎世大学等高校客座教授，2000-2007年奥斯陆大学易卜生研究中心主任，已在国内外国际学术期刊发表论文逾200篇，研究领域包括浪漫主义、后现代文学、文艺理论和比较文学，用挪威语和德语写作出版多部学术著作。

This paper connects to ideas I developed previously and pays attention to questions regarding the self-referential aspects of ethical literary criticism. Every time when one emphasizes the specific poetical function of language one focus at the same time on its self-referential usage. The concept of auto-referential inquiry has now a day won through as important research subject in great many scientific disciplines, not least inspired by Niklas Luhmann's system theory. In the metafictional prose of postmodern writers one finds numerous examples of self-referential presentations. In the following I intend to elaborate some of the ethical implications which follow from the inner-textual perspective on literary texts. It strikes me that there frequently is a tendency to argue in a far too distant relation to the core questions of ethics. It is worth-while to keep in mind that ethics is dealing with moral concerns, with matters concerning good or bad, right or wrong. In order to distinguish between the antagonisms one need moral criteria, which may differ from one culture to another. There are however moral standards that are regarded to be common for everybody, independent of political, ideological and religious convictions, principles implemented in conventions and orders like "The Declaration of Human Rights" or "The Ten Commandments." As far as values are related to taste there are however no obliging standards equally valid for every human being. The citizens of ancient Rome used to say: *De gustibus non disputandum est*, which means that it is useless to quarrel about matters of taste. Like language taste is closely related to the origin of the human existence. Your language is your mother tongue, and your taste is developed under influence of maternal and paternal instructions, which in combination with cultural stimulations help constructing a standard system which enables value judgments. It is thus evident that taste is far from being an objective quality, especially not when related

to a work of art. You can spontaneously agree on that a meal is good, that the weather is good, that somebody's behavior is good, but it is far more complex to decide if a poem is good. When ethical categories like good or bad are applied to artistic writing they turn into aesthetical values, which function according to changing taste systems. Every time when a reader evaluates a written text he turns the ethical terms good or bad into aesthetical ones. That means when an evaluating act turns self-referential and directs its statements towards the text itself, we have to do with a code switching, informing about the aesthetical status of the text. It is good as far as it is elaborated according to the taste system prevailing at a certain time, in a certain place under certain circumstances, it is bad if not. Throughout the centuries the quality measures have changed; what once was regarded good, may later be considered insufficient. Value judgments are, unless they are totally subjective or provoking, mostly derived from general rules and norms regarding artistic expression or later, as aesthetics was separated from the philosophical discourse and established itself as a separate research discipline, from the various concepts of aesthetical systems, which serve as advisory sources for critics.

The self-referential aesthetical standards comprise all interconnected poetic components and functions of the artwork, not only the rhetoric and stylistic composition, but also structural features like coherence, openness, confinement, harmony, completeness, complexity, polyvalence, intertextuality, etc. When the evaluation act is based on some of the mentioned internal properties the designations "good" or "bad" are dependent on the successful adaptation of poetical standards. It seems quite obvious that the poetical realization requires of the author that he is familiar with the peculiar principles of poetry. He cannot write blank verses without being familiar with the iambic pentameter and he cannot write a sonnet without knowing the metrical form of a sonnet. And vice versa: the critic cannot evaluate in a proper way a literary text unless he is well acquainted with the artificial ways of expression characteristic of the poetical genres. In order to avoid misunderstandings I want to underline that I in the following don't intend to value the autonomous character of literary texts, but their capacity to successfully realize or help realize the applied aesthetical guidelines according to the qualities "good" or "bad." From the point of view of ethical literary criticism the self-referential aspects of literary artworks are the more effective the more they support the impact on the reader and his ability to increase his power of judgment concerning social and individual *mores*.

As far as aesthetics is defined as the study of the beautiful it deals with the properties which provide it with these features. When a work of art satisfies

the specific demands of beauty the critics usually calls it a “good” work hereby recirculating a quality classification originally rooted in ethical research. The designation “good” as opposite to “bad” to day serves as an aesthetical quality marker and as such it functions better than the characterization “beautiful” because the depiction of ugliness may prove to be “good” as well, but never “beautiful.” Barbara Herrnstein Smith in her influential book *Contingencies of Value. Alternative Perspectives for Critical theory* asks what teachers and academic critics mean by recommending a work as “good literature” before having clarified the reasons for their evaluation.

At least two developments have challenged the stability of aesthetical systems and questioned their usefulness. Since the beginning of modernity writers rebelled against the tyranny of aesthetical regulations and established new ways of expression void of general validity, the result of which was a huge increase of new aesthetical programs, mostly with an anti-artistic and provoking affront. The parole was: the more expansive the less obliging. Until in postmodernity authors won acceptance for their ideas that everything goes. Art recirculates the formal and thematic repertoire of previous periods and epochs, hereby making art to a playground for experiments with the writing traditions of the past. The main mentality behind this renunciation of innovative creativity is expressed in the following sentence: Everything is said, consequently it remains saying it in another way. This mode of resignation suggests that literature has arrived at its final stage, where the permanent reuse of the literary heritage suffocates every attempt at artistic renewal. This turning on the spot gradually evoked dissatisfaction among readers and authors. The Norwegian author Jan Kjørstad brought it to the point with the following statement: It is not sufficient to copy postmodernism, it is necessary to rewrite it with regard to the rapidly increasing standards of knowledge and rethinking it at the background of the contemporary political and ecological crises. It is likely to believe that the upcoming questioning of postmodern preferences marks a turning point, where the documentation of formal skill gives way to a reinforced focusing on what in a seldom before noticed way threatens the survival of human beings. This may be considered the date of birth of an ethical literary criticism, where the adjectives good and bad primarily again refer to the content of literary works and regain a quality linked to the moral standards of the involved literary figures and their activities and conflicts. The moving of the focus from the form to the content of a literary work consequently implies that complete different aspects of literary expression are subject to quality evaluation. Faced with a complex literary plot it may be challenging to differ between good and bad,

even on the level of direct confrontation between contradictory figures like Othello and Iago, Faust and Mephistopheles. From the point of view of ethical criticism it seems to be completely clear that Iago and Mephistopheles represent the principle of evil. Still they have a positive function in the presentation of goodness; without their presence in the plot it would have been impossible to elaborate the horizon of what goodness is not. Nie Zhenzhao has coined the designation the Sphinx factor in order to illuminate that human beings are trapped in an existential dilemma and exposed to the contradictory powers of human and bestial attitudes. In his interpretation the lower capacities of bestiality form the horizon against which the higher values of human attitudes and ethical behavior appear. That means: the function of the evil is to make the good and the valuable visible. On the other hand it remains a paradox that the presentation of the evil from the viewpoint of ethical literary criticism may be evaluated as good or successful as far as it deals with the phenomena in an excellent way.

Obviously there is also another reason why attention has been drawn away from the postmodern rewritings of the aesthetic canon and directed towards questions concerning the reader's response to the literary text. The modern reception theory moves the focus from the text to the reader, who is the one that on the background of his literary competence through the reading act completes the comprehension of the text and as such proceeds to a co-creator of it. As far as it is up to the reader to fill in the lacunae or the space left open by the author it depends to a certain extent on him to attribute to the work the values good or bad. The author delivers the single textual elements, the reader and the critic arrange them with regard to what they consider the ethical intention of the elaborated text materials. In so doing it is by far enough to trust one's feelings. When the quality judgment has no roots in reliable theoretical frames the evaluation threatens to be accidental. In order to counteract miss-readings and to ensure scientific credibility it is necessary to use as a basis adequate evaluation standards, both in the field of forms and contents. A literary work of art can be evaluated not only in relation to aesthetical features like beauty, compatibility, ambiguity, but also in relation to measures linked up to subject matters like freedom of opinion, exchange of information, increase of knowledge etc. as well. The validity of this kind of criteria changes throughout the centuries and depends on normative principles derived from philosophical, sociological and theological frame theories. Supporters of ethical literary criticism, be it authors, be it scientists, are all more or less indebted to the theoretical sources of moral reflection.

It is however a fact that modern reception theory has reevaluated the standards

of literary excellence. A literary work of art is not necessarily good because it obeys the prevailing aesthetic rules and corresponds to them, but on the contrary because it breaks the rules and transcends what is estimated to be the valid norm. Inspired by Thomas Kuhn's theory of the paradigmatic shift the adherents of modern reception theory introduced the concept of the expectation horizon, which marks the borderline between traditional and innovative literature. This implies that that all kind of avant-garde writing offends against the accepted paradigms and insists on establishing the good of tomorrow beyond the good of today. According to this concept the ethical oppositions good/bad, right/wrong are permanently subject to replacements and adjustments. The inevitable consequence of this process is the loss of the text as an autonomous object. The research interest is exclusively directed towards the text's impact on the reader. The text constitutes itself in the reader's mind as a network of appeal impulses and completes itself through the interaction with the reader. Due to this understanding the text is not any more a limited material object, but an aesthetic artefact that evokes more or less controlled responses and paves the way for subjective impressions instead of elaborated knowledge. Thus the reader actualizes the inherent potentialities of textual meaning according to his educational presuppositions, his reading experiences and his feelings. In articles from the late 1940s the American critics W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley vehemently refused the concept because it abandoned the proper object of literary analysis, the reified text.

Anyhow, the efforts of modern reception research have doubted the concept of a static, correct and eternal validity and meaning of literary texts. The result has shaken the very foundations of canonical thinking. How is it possible to put together a list of representative artistic writing when the works in question are deprived of substantial consistency and solely exist as a source of individual taste display? An intact canonical system requires at least an agreement on the ontological status of a literary work and on the main principles of structural coherence. The history of canon formation shows indeed the need for quality guidelines and curriculum recommendations. What good is, however, and of lasting importance is liable to be judged in the retro-perspective. Consequently most canonical lists consist of texts from the past, which have proved their durability throughout generations. According to Harold Bloom "canonical prophecy needs to be tested about two generations after a writer dies" (522). Because artistic excellence is subject to taste fluctuations and change of conventions there is a current urge for canonical revisions. Due to Harold Bloom the crucial propulsion by secular canon formation is the "aesthetic choice" (22). According to my understanding the "aesthetical

choice” is an ethical one as far as it uses aesthetical measures in order to decide what is canonical and consequently good. He admits however that he himself has a pre-scientific reason for ascribing to literary works the attribute of canonicity. “The only pragmatic test for the canonical” is, he claims, “only what I have read and think worthy of rereading” (518).

In the last year’s discussions one has argued for a democratization of the literary canon formation: equal number of males and females, equal number of young and old, equal number of literary genres, equal cultural and national representation. This egalitarian principle threatens to transform the canonical system into a statistical one, hereby losing the elitist character of the canonical out of sight, then according to Harold Bloom “literary criticism always was and always will be an elitist phenomenon” (17). In so far he concurs in David Hume’s opinion that by judging good and bad works men have very different views and not everybody is equally fit to judge art. According to Hume a man who has no opportunity of comparing the different kinds of beauty is indeed totally unqualified to pronounce an opinion. Addressing beauty Hume refers to the poetic and rhetoric components that cooperate in creating the artistic effects of art language. Hereby he understands the surplus of aesthetic qualities that separate the language of art from daily life language. Nobody has underlined this artistic difference in a more precise way than has Jan Mukarovsky, one of the most influential members of the Prague circle. Due to him the language of everyday communication serves practical purposes; therefore it is rule-bound and automatized. The poetical language is by comparison characterized by a deviated use of the standard language and a systematic violation of its norms. Accordingly the poetical language is good because of its de-automatized utilization of the daily conversation language. However, in the context of aesthetic expression the signification good has lost its immediate moral value, but it regularly regains an ethical dimension “when literary works are conceived of as the means of transmitting specific values” that means when the aesthetic construction appears as a semantic arena in the service of decoding ethical values (Bloom 22).

I have so far underlined the auto-referential elements of text-constitution as essential for the canonical formation. This position has however been contested and its theoretical basis, the idea of aesthetical values, vehemently attacked. There are obvious reasons for doubting the objectivity of aesthetic value judgment. Baumgarten in his introduction to aesthetics (1750) emphasized the sensory rather than the rational nature of such judgments, likewise Kant, who considered aesthetic judgment as non-conceptual and entirely based on pleasure or displeasure. One

of the reasons why aesthetic values are lacking constancy and endurance has to do with the nature of the aesthetic object and the changeability of the evaluating subject. Taking the constitutive elements of a literary work of art into consideration, its “structure,” “features,” “qualities” and of course its “meanings”—one may recognize that these properties are not fixed given, or inherent in the work itself, but are at every point the variable products of particular *subjects*’ interactions with it.

It belongs however to the paradox structure of the Kantian taste judgment that it, although subjective, still demands general validity. This intermingling of subjective and objective reasoning may seem to be a challenge to the common sense, but Kant bridges the contradiction by introducing the term “*Gemeinsinn*,” meaning “our common capacity for shared cognition.” Accordingly “*Gemeinsinn*” involves a claim of universality, which ensures that taste questions are not only a matter of personal preferences.

Kant’s concept of the aesthetic value has been disputed, not least because of its disinterestedness, which dissociates the aesthetic from moral values hence paying less attention to the aspects of good and bad. However, in recent years one can observe an extended understanding of the category of the aesthetic. Hereby it is striking that the aesthetic value of a work of art is not restricted to its formal features, but increasingly are conceived of as interacting with a variety of other aspects, namely contextual, cognitive and moral elements. One may explain the connection between the self-referential and moral connections within the artwork in the following way. A work of art is “good” when it is in accordance with the valid norms of the beautiful. In so far I agree with Bery Gaut, who asserts that “art can teach us about ethical values through linking cognition to imagination” (252). The “good” is essentially a judgment that something is ethical, the judgment that something conforms with the moral law. It would however be a mistake to think that the interplay between the “good” on the level of formal skill and on the level of content is drawing in the same direction. The contrary may prove to be the case when the content of a work of art in a perfect way is glorifying the ugly and the bad. The clash between the structural and the moral usage of the opposition good/bad shows that the interactive display between the two functional levels don’t necessarily work according to the theoretical concepts. Radical autonomists reject the moral contamination of aesthetic values because of their intrinsic contradictions. They maintain that “moral assessment presupposes that the object assessed has mental qualities and capacities. Yet works of art do not possess minds; so they cannot be subject to ethical assessment” (Gaut 69). This extreme view may be valid in case of abstract and experimental texts, but all kinds of representational art

forms transcend their formal expression and are subject to ethical criticism, simply why words, isolated or in artistic contexts, are semantic units with denotative and connotative designations. It may however prove difficult to apply ethical measures to text types which like non sense poetry and *l'art pour l'art* fiction underline the intrinsic value of art and refuse to serve any didactic, moral, or utilitarian purpose. Only as far as one adapt the self-referential model of evaluation discussed in this paper one is able to judge whether the text is good or bad with regard to its ambitions.

Before concluding I want to make some additional remarks to the self-referential aspects of literary works and to their connection with the semantic levels of expression. It is striking that Wayne Booth ascribes to aesthetic qualities ethical ones as well because they possess the capacity “to write stylishly, beautifully or elegantly and possessing an acute aesthetic sensibility” (42). Booth underlines that “a critic will be doing ethical criticism just as much when praising a story or poem for raising our aesthetic sensibilities or increasing our sensitivity as when attacking decadence, sexism, or racism” (49). The self-referential act of evaluating literary texts is nevertheless reductive because it ignores that they are situated in a communicative situation and are conceived of as the means of transmitting specific meaning and values. Thus artworks composed in verbal signs differ from those made in color or marble because they are not only components in an artistic design, but primarily carrier of a diversity of supplementary symbolic, allegoric, cognitive, contextual and moral functions. I agree with Berys Gaut when he emphasize that “Ethicism is the doctrine that a work of art is aesthetically meritorious in so far as it has an aesthetically relevant ethical merit” (138).

Not surprisingly one finds “ethical merits” in many literary genres. In my concluding comments I want to focus on the criminal novel, in which the spirit of ethical care is jeopardized through the dissemination and infiltration of criminal minds and networks. There are many reasons why the criminal novel attracts so much attention in the Western societies. Sociologists consider the phenomenon as a compensation for the boredom and lack of tension in everyday life. In an ethical context it is worth-while noticing that the detective, the main figure of the criminal novel, is a person who fights the evil in order to restore the ethical balance in society and through his intervention helps protect decent people from falling victims to the powers of badness. His professional job is to remove the bad and shape the presupposition for the recovery of social peace. The criminal novel is mostly characterized by the dominance of what has been called “forward tension” (*Vowärtsspannung*); it favors straight actions, complementary characters



and a strict separation between good and bad figures. It is based on the idea of a final solution through which the bad is defeated, very much like in the fairy tale, where the underdog finally escapes his oppressors through violating or killing them. The concept of the criminal novel has in so far a structural similarity with that of restoration ecology because it aims at fighting the pollution of the social surroundings through appropriate steps. The concept of the criminal novel focus on content and attitudes and as such it is a counter-concept to the strategies of the self-referential approach to literary texts. It is likely to draw the conclusion that the aesthetic value of a criminal novel is independent of its formal features and that the critical evaluation mostly don't pay attention to the self-referential aspects of the texts. Very seldom I have found authors of criminal novels that are aware of the interrelation between form and content and reflect the formal patterns of the genre. Among the few renewals of the genre I want to mention Jan Kjørstad's novel *Verge*, in which the author deconstructs the traditional patterns of the criminal genre and turn the narrative into a book on how to be a greater and better human being, without abandoning the forward tension of the average criminal novel. This may serve as a good example how one can change and extend the genre from inside, from the very sources of the self-referential components of the literary text.

### 【Works Cited】

- Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994.
- Booth, Wayne. *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction*. Berkeley, CA: U of California P, 1992.
- Gaut, Berry. *Art, Emotion and Ethics*. Oxford, New York: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Smith, Barbara Herrnstein. *Contingencies of Value. Alternative Perspectives for Critical Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1991.
- Wimsatt, W. K, and M. C Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 54.3 (1946): 468-88.

责任编辑：蒋文颖

# 《果壳》：伦理困境的囚徒

## Prisoners of Ethical Predicament: The Ethical Metaphors of Ian McEwan's *Nutshell*

尚必武 (Shang Biwu)

**内容摘要：**麦克尤恩新作《果壳》以非自然叙事和听觉叙事为笔法，以重写莎士比亚《哈姆雷特》为噱头，生动刻绘了身处伦理困境的囚徒群像：他们或迷失固有的伦理身份或受困于现有的伦理身份，难以做出正确的伦理选择，由此导致了伦理悲剧的产生。论文从文学伦理学批评视角出发，重点解读“果壳”所蕴含的三重伦理隐喻，即“私欲的果壳”、“诗歌的果壳”以及“子宫的果壳”。“私欲的果壳”围绕胎儿叙述者“我”的叔父克劳德和母亲特鲁迪展开。他们片面追求物质的欲望和对性欲的满足，迷失了自己的伦理身份，合谋下药毒害了“我”的父亲，触犯了弑亲的伦理禁忌。“诗歌的果壳”围绕“我”的父亲约翰展开。针对妻子特鲁迪和弟弟克劳德之间的不伦关系，约翰试图用朗诵诗歌来挽回自己的婚姻，恢复错位的家庭伦理身份，而其努力的失败凸显了特鲁迪对伦理教诲的排斥。“子宫的果壳”围绕叙述者“我”展开，尽管“我”还是一名尚未出生的胎儿，但是“我”亲耳听到了母亲和叔父试图毒害父亲的图谋。在无力行动的胎儿身份与有心复仇的儿子身份之间，“我”在客观上无可奈何、未能拯救父亲于危难之际，同时“我”又受制于自己同母亲的亲情关系，在主观上导致了复仇时的犹豫与延宕。

**关键词：**麦克尤恩；《果壳》；伦理身份；伦理选择；伦理两难

**作者简介：**尚必武，教育部首批青年长江学者，上海交通大学外国语学院教授、博士生导师，主要从事叙事学、文学伦理学批评和当代英美文学研究。本文系国家社科基金一般项目“麦克尤恩小说的叙事艺术与伦理思想研究”【项目批号：14BWW039】、国家社科基金重大项目“文学伦理学批评：理论建构与批评实践研究”【项目批号：13&ZD128】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** Prisoners of Ethical Predicament: The Ethical Metaphors of Ian McEwan's *Nutshell*

**Abstract:** In his most recent novel *Nutshell*, Ian McEwan, through using unnatural and audial narrative strategies, rewrites Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and portrays a group of prisoners of ethical dilemmas in a metaphorical sense, who are imprisoned either by their existing ethical identities or by their changed ethical identities, which

restrains them from making the right ethical choice and cause ethical tragedies. This paper, from the perspective of ethical literary criticism, attempts to decode three ethical metaphors implied by *Nutshell*, namely the nutshell of desire, the nutshell of poetry, and the nutshell of womb. Specifically, the nutshell of desire is mainly concerned with the narrator's uncle Claude and his mother Trudy, who lost their ethical identities because of their persistent pursuit of sex and money. They break the taboo of murdering their kinship by poisoning the narrator's father John. The nutshell of poetry is mainly concerned with the narrator's father John. Aware of the extramarital affair between his wife and his brother, John tries hard to restore his ethical identity and to make peace with his wife by reading poetry to her and by bringing a female poet home as his pretended lover. Trudy's rejection of his poetry reading indicates her blunt rejection of moral teaching, which fails to stop her from poisoning her husband dead. The nutshell of womb is mainly about the unborn foetus, who overhears his mother and his uncle's plot of poisoning his father. Stuck between his identity as an unborn foetus in his mother's womb and his identity as a dutiful son of his father, he is unable to save his father from the incoming danger on the one hand, and he delays his revenge for his father on the other hand.

**Key words:** Ian McEwan; *Nutshell*; ethical identity; ethical choice; ethical dilemma

**Author:** Shang Biwu is a Changjiang Distinguished Professor of English at Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai 200240, China). His scholarly interests include narratology, ethical literary criticism, and contemporary Anglo-American fiction. Email: biwushang@sjtu.edu.cn

2016年是莎士比亚逝世400周年,世界各地纷纷举行盛大的庆祝活动。为大力宣传作为英国文化符号的莎翁,英国文化委员会更是推出了“永恒的莎士比亚”(Shakespeare Lives)活动,在全球进行了为期一年的莎士比亚戏剧巡演,引发轰动。笔者感兴趣的是,在众多的纪念活动中,作家如何向这位伟大的文学家致敬?英国知名小说家伊恩·麦克尤恩(Ian McEwan)在其最新小说《果壳》(*Nutshell*, 2016)给出了答案:重写或重新演绎莎翁的经典作品似乎是纪念他的最好方式。小说题名直接取自《哈姆雷特》第二幕第二场中哈姆雷特与罗森格兰兹、吉尔登斯吞两人之间的一段对话:“上帝啊,倘不是因为总作恶梦,那么即使把我关在一个果壳里,我也会把自己当作一个拥有着无限空间的君王的”(莎士比亚 325)。小说中,一个即将出生的胎儿讲述了母亲和叔父如何毒死了自己的父亲,以及他如何为父复仇的故事。不过,有趣的是,麦克尤恩本人在接受采访的时候却一再否认对《哈姆雷特》的刻意重写。他坚持说:“我真没有打算写另一个版本的《哈姆雷特》。它

就这么不知不觉地写好了”(qtd. in Neil)。笔者赞同当代英国学院派小说家亚当·马尔斯—琼斯(Adam Mars-Jones)的观点。马尔斯—琼斯在《伦敦书评》杂志上撰文指出:“尽管小说没有明确提到哈姆雷特或者莎士比亚,但是却有很多关于它们的典故,有些典故非常直接,简直可以被视同为明确提及”(Mars-Jones)。

露丝·斯科尔斯(Lucy Scholes)认为:《果壳》是麦克尤恩“近年来最好的作品”(Scholes)。斯科尔斯的评论在凯特·克朗奇(Kate Clanchy)那里被进一步细化。克朗奇认为:《果壳》是“麦克尤恩近来的杰作,它重写莎士比亚,刻意带着哀伤,如同T.S.艾略特诗歌‘玛丽娜’(Marina),发挥出了麦克尤恩的所有艺术才华”(Clanchy)。确实,就艺术手法而言,在《果壳》中,麦克尤恩极尽其创作笔法之能事,将作品披上斑斓的叙述外衣,如以人物叙述的笔法来讲述发生在“我”家庭中的故事,以听觉叙事的手段来再现“胎儿”所感知的人类世界,以非自然叙述者“胎儿”来凸显小说的虚构性与非自然性,等等。问题在于,为什么说《果壳》又“刻意带着哀伤”(deliberately elegiac)?导致哀伤的原因是什么?哀伤的寓意何在?或许,《果壳》的哀伤寓意直接指向德卡·艾特肯黑德(Decca Aitkenhead)所言的“寓言式控诉”(allegorical indictment)。艾特肯黑德认为:《果壳》“实际上是一个对所谓情感比真相更重要的‘后一事实’时代的寓言式控诉。”(Aitkenhead)遗憾的是,艾特肯黑德既没有明确指出作品所包含的“真相”(truth)或事实,也没有详细论及“情感”(feelings)与“真相”之间的关联。

笔者认为,克朗奇所言的“哀伤”和艾特肯黑德所论及的“真相”皆与《果壳》所呈现的伦理悲剧相关,即一个即将出生的“胎儿”亲耳听到了母亲和叔叔谋害自己父亲的事实。小说别出心裁地以“果壳”为题名,隐射小说人物尽管渴望成为“拥有着无限空间的君王”,但实际上都沦落为逼仄如“果壳”的有限空间的囚徒。倘若果壳是一个关于小世界的伦理隐喻,那么小说最耐人寻味的是这些人物如何受困其中,难以解脱。本文试图从文学伦理学批评视角出发,重点解读“果壳”所蕴含的三重伦理隐喻,即“私欲的果壳”、“诗歌的果壳”以及“子宫的果壳”。“私欲的果壳”围绕叙述者“我”的叔父克劳德和母亲特鲁迪展开,他们片面追求物质的欲望和对性欲的满足,迷失了自己的伦理身份,合谋下药毒害了“我”的父亲,触犯了弑亲的伦理禁忌。“诗歌的果壳”围绕“我”的父亲约翰展开针对妻子特鲁迪和弟弟克劳德之间的不伦关系,约翰试图用朗诵诗歌来挽回自己的婚姻,恢复错位的家庭伦理身份,而其努力的失败凸显了特鲁迪对伦理教诲的排斥。“子宫的果壳”围绕叙述者“我”展开,尽管“我”还是一名尚未出生的胎儿,但是“我”听到了母亲和叔父试图毒害自己父亲的图谋。在无力行动的胎儿身份与有心复仇的儿子身份之间,“我”在客观上无可奈何、未能拯救父亲于危难之际,同时“我”又受制于自己同母亲的亲情关系,在主观上导致了自己复仇时的

犹豫与延宕。

### 私欲的果壳： 斯芬克斯因子的组合和伦理意识的迷失

提姆·亚当斯 (Tim Adams) 说：“尽管因受到《哈姆雷特》启发而创作出来的小说，不胜枚举，如默多克的《黑王子》、厄普代克的《葛特露和克劳狄斯》、华莱士的《无穷的玩笑》，而用子宫中的胎儿叙述者来作为叙述声音的小说至少也有一两部，如卡洛斯·富恩特斯的小说《尚未出生的克利斯朵夫》，但是麦克尤恩这部技艺非凡的作品绝对算得上是对二者的首次结合” (Adams)。小说伊始，一个尚未出生的胎儿叙述者便出人意料地做了如下开场白：

我就这样头朝下在一个女人的肚子里。双臂交叉，耐心地等待着，等待着，想知道自己是谁，以及在这里是为了什么。我闭着眼睛，怀旧式回忆起我曾经是如何漂流在半透明的肉袋中，在思想的泡泡中，我慢慢地翻着筋斗，做梦似地漂浮过只属于我一个人的海洋，与我活动范围的透明边界轻柔地碰撞，尽管我被厚厚的胎膜所包围，但是它们与在从事邪恶计划的密谋者的声音一起颤动，不免吐露了秘密。那时，我年轻而又漫不经心。(McEwan 1)

一个在母亲腹中尚未出生的胎儿通过胎膜与外界声音的共同颤动，听出了密谋者们试图进行的邪恶计划。谁是密谋者？他们又在密谋什么样的邪恶计划？值得注意的是，此处胎儿叙述者使用了“密谋者” (conspirators) 和“邪恶” (vile) 两个具有高度伦理性质的词汇，进而对他们的行为和本质做了负面的伦理判断。这无疑引发了读者的好奇心，激起了他们的阅读欲望。

与《哈姆雷特》的情节类似，在《果壳》中，胎儿叙述者同样也讲述了一个父亲如何被母亲和叔叔毒害，自己如何试图复仇的故事。但是，与《哈姆雷特》有所不同，“我”一直就是父亲被害事件的见证者，而非后来通过父亲的鬼魂来得知其被害的真相。在小说中，忧郁的哈姆雷特王子被换成了尚未出生、能言善辩的胎儿。英明神武的老国王被换成了诗人约翰·凯恩克罗斯。克劳迪斯王被换成了房产开发商克劳德。葛楚德王后被换成了孕妇特鲁迪。故事的发生地点由古老的丹麦王国被换成了当代英国伦敦的一所古宅。

这座乔治王时期的古宅以及生活在古宅中人物之间的复杂关系是我们解读《果壳》的重要伦理环境。文学伦理学批评尤其注重对伦理环境的分析，认为“对文学的理解必须让文学回归属于它的伦理环境或伦理语境中去，这是理解文学的一个前提” (聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》256)。在很大程度上来说，正是这座古宅酝酿了约翰殒命的悲剧。颇有讽刺意味的是，就

财产而言，“他没有特鲁迪有钱，更是不能和克劳德比。但是他可以背诵上千首诗歌” (McEwan 11)。约翰在外租房居住，负债累累，经常靠从弟弟克劳德那里借债为生，但实际上他又是一个有钱的富人。约翰从其母亲那里继承来的那座乔治王时期的古宅在当代英国房地产交易市场的价格高达 700 万英镑。由是说来，约翰被妻子赶出属于自己祖宅的举动，颇为令人费解。对此，叙述者评论道：“很多男人，很多人，永远都不会让自己的配偶把他们从自小居住的房子中赶出来。约翰·凯恩罗斯和别人不一样” (McEwan 12)。当善良真诚的诗人约翰遇到一个肆意背叛、被私欲所控的女人，他不切实际的浪漫思想被无情的现实击得粉碎。尽管他一次次地希望自己可以留下来照顾身怀有孕的妻子特鲁迪，但一次又一次地被妻子拒之门外，而她冠冕堂皇的理由是为了腹中的孩子。实际上，特鲁迪在敦促丈夫尽快离开家门的真实原因，是为了迎接即将到来的情人。尽管约翰在诗歌创作事业上，雄心勃勃，但他为人善良热情，完全不在意自己从母亲那里继承来的老房子的价值，没有贪图金钱的欲望。他将平日里从弟弟克劳德手里借来的钱，无偿赠给其他需要帮助的诗人。这无疑与克劳德对金钱的态度形成了鲜明的对比。

特鲁迪的情人克劳德是其丈夫约翰的弟弟。他的另一重身份是一名地产开发商。在叙述者“我”看来，克劳德显然就是一个不劳而获的寄生虫，因为他“没有建造任何东西，也没有发明任何东西” (compose nothing, and invents nothing) (McEwan 5)。克劳德继承的 7 位数的财产，现在也被他挥霍的不到四分之一。或许，正是希望不劳而获才导致他越发产生更大的私欲，不惜夺取自己亲生哥哥所继承的家庭老宅，据为己有。由此而言，在房地产市场上价格高昂的古宅就具有了诱人的私欲色彩，而无论母亲特鲁迪还是其情人克劳德，在某种意义上，都是受困其中的囚徒。小说中，特鲁迪几乎没有离开过这座市价不菲的老宅，无异于成为这座房子的囚徒，在主观上失去了自由。因为贪图这座房子和它背后的经济价值，特鲁迪前半生成为房子的囚徒，而后半生则会成为监狱的囚徒，在客观上失去了自由。

特鲁迪劝说丈夫搬出房子，以便自己堂而皇之地和情人，即丈夫的弟弟住在一起，理由是彼此给对方时间与空间。克劳德也劝说哥哥离开嫂子，理由希望他们的婚姻有好的结果。克劳德伪善地要借钱给哥哥约翰，并且劝说道：“约翰，她真的很爱你，但是她让我作为一个可信任的家庭成员要求你离开一段时间。给予你婚姻的最大希望。嗯。会有好结果的。我猜你又欠房租了吧。但是，请你同意，把钱拿走，然后给她一些空间” (McEwan 35)。虚伪的克劳德明明是为了让哥哥离开，以便自己随时和嫂子一起鬼混。他暗地里和嫂子密谋毒害自己的哥哥，嘴上却说他们的婚姻会有好结果。具有讽刺意味的是，他还把自己视作是“可信任的家庭成员” (trusted family member)。实际上，他不仅私通嫂子，破坏哥哥的婚姻和家庭，而且还试图毒死哥哥，图谋其房产，完全背弃了建立在家庭成员之间的信任感。

在与妻子特鲁迪、弟弟克劳德相处的时间里，父亲的惯常行为就是给他们朗诵诗歌，但是均遭到他们的漠视和拒绝。比如，约翰试图给克劳德读自己最近收到的关于猫头鹰的诗歌，但是这一举动惹怒了克劳德。他收回了原本打算借出的钱，继而愤然离去。与克劳德的莫名愤怒和迅速收钱的举动相比，约翰不慌不忙地专注于检查修改即将印刷的诗歌：“他并不在意，几乎都不知道自己并不在意”(McEwan 36)。诗歌中关于“聪明绝顶而令人致命的敲钟人，我们为了一个尖叫的残忍而莫名激动”(Blood-wise fatal bellman, we quaintly thrill to a shrieking cruelty)(McEwan 36)。诗歌中的“致命”(fatal)、“惨忍”(cruelty)等都是具有伦理性质的词汇，具有一定的暗示性。如果我们联想到克劳德正在谋划的毒害亲兄弟的恶行，则不难理解他为何感到“窒息”(strangled)和“愤怒”(furious)。实际上，克劳德拒绝聆听诗歌可被解读为对伦理教诲的拒绝。聂珍钊认为：“文学在本质上是关于伦理的艺术，文学的价值通过文学教诲功能的作用予以体现。在伦理选择的过程中，人的伦理意识开始产生，善恶的观念逐渐形成，而这些都是通过教诲实现的。文学是人类文明进步的结果，它是人类进行和获取教诲的重要形式”(聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：论文学的基本功能与核心价值”11)。克劳德拒绝和放弃文学对他的教诲，在思想和行动上缺乏应有的伦理指引，导致他在堕落道路上越走越远，最终导致伦理犯罪的发生。

私欲就像一张巨大的网，吞噬了特鲁迪和克劳德，使得他们在私欲的诱惑下，迷失理性，在堕落的道路上，越陷越深、难以自拔。实际上，克劳德和特鲁迪并不需要约翰同意他们在一起，因为约翰早就知道了他们的不伦关系，而且压根就没有拆散他们的意思。他们坚持毒害约翰的主要原因就是为了谋取约翰价格不菲的房产。换言之，他们二者之间的苟合并不是因为彼此相爱，而在本质上是为了金钱，不过他们彼此之间同床异梦。比如，当特鲁迪不小心划破脚的时候，克劳德首先关心是否要清理地摊上的血迹，而不是她的伤口；在谋杀约翰的每个阶段，克劳德都让特鲁迪来完成，自己则试图隐匿地干干净净。当他们罪行暴露，准备逃亡的时候，克劳德甚至不顾即将生产的特鲁迪，试图独自逃亡，只不过护照已经被特鲁迪收走，未能成行。为了实现占有金钱的欲望，特鲁迪不惜毒死自己的丈夫；克劳德不惜毒死自己的兄长，触犯了弑夫、弑兄的伦理禁忌。从文学伦理学批评的视角看来，“禁忌是古老人类伦理秩序形成的基础，也是伦理秩序的保障。禁忌也是道德的起源，在人类文明发展过程中，禁忌转化为道德或是道德的表现形式之一。因此，人类社会的伦理秩序的形成与变化从制度上说都是以禁忌为前提的”(聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》15)。克劳德和特鲁迪先是发生了不伦关系，后又触犯了弑夫、弑兄的伦理禁忌，破坏了伦理秩序。最终，他们为自己的恶行付出了代价，锒铛入狱，得到了应有的惩罚。

尽管克劳德是这起伦理犯罪的始作俑者，但是如果没有特鲁迪，他根本

无法实现自己的图谋。他操控特鲁迪的主要手段就是性爱和金钱。作为母亲和妻子的特鲁迪并非草木与傀儡，她又是如何逐渐泯灭良知、失却理性，最终沦落为克劳德的同谋呢？这就需要从人的基本构成和本质因素来分析。根据文学伦理学批评的观点：人是一种斯芬克斯因子的存在，兼具人性因子和兽性因子两个部分。“在文学作品中，由于每一个人都是善恶并存的生物体，因此人实际上就是一个斯芬克斯因子的存在。文学作品的价值就在于通过人性因子同兽性因子的不同组合与变化揭示人的伦理选择过程”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：人性概念的阐释与考辨”15）。特鲁迪的问题恰恰在于没有让人性因子有效地控制自己兽性因子，导致自然意志和自由意志泛滥。聂珍钊认为：“在文学作品中，斯芬克斯因子在人身上分别以自然意志、自由意志以及理性意志形式表现出来。自然意志主要是人的原欲即力比多(libido)的外在表现形式，自由意志是人的欲望(desire)的外在表现形式，理性意志是人的理性的外在表现形式”（《文学伦理学批评导论》42）。具体而言，“三种意志是斯芬克斯因子的不同表现形式。自然意志是最原始的接近兽性部分的意志，如性本能。自由意志是接近理性意志的部分，如对某种目的或要求的有意识追求。理性意志是接近道德意志的部分，如判断和选择的善恶标准及道德规范”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》42）。

在《果壳》中，小说人物特鲁迪和克劳德身上的自然意志典型地表现为她们对性欲的追求，而自由意志典型地表现为她对金钱的渴望。特鲁迪在小说中，似乎就没有离开过房子，而当她和克劳德在一起的时候，主要只做两件事情：做爱和密谋毒害其自己丈夫。必须强调的是，无论是对特鲁迪还是克劳德，他们的媾合绝对不是为了爱情。换言之，相爱和结合不是他们除掉约翰的理由。事实上，约翰甚至给妻子特鲁迪和弟弟克劳德送上他们的祝福，他说：“特鲁迪和克劳德，我为你们感到高兴。你们在完美的时刻走到一起。没有人否认这点，你们真的很般配”（McEwan 69）。让特鲁迪和克劳德真正想要的不是约翰对他们结合的许可与祝福，而是他的房子。令他们无可接受的是约翰和特鲁迪分手后对房子作出的安排：“克劳德，你在樱草山有一座漂亮的大房子，特鲁迪你可以搬到那里去。我明天会把自己的东西搬一些回来。你搬出去后，我会再把房子装修下，然后再和埃洛迪搬进来”（McEwan 70）。可见，真正刺痛特鲁迪的不是她对约翰新情人埃洛迪的醋意和嫉妒，而是约翰让她在分手之后搬出去。因此，特鲁迪坚定了自己毒害约翰的决心：“我要他死，要他明天就死”（McEwan 71）。颇具反讽意味的是，特鲁迪和克劳德在计谋实施的每个阶段都各自心怀鬼胎，相互提防。克劳德完美计划的一部分就是在获得巨额经济利益的同时，自己彻底与这桩谋杀案“脱离关系”(disassociated)。特鲁迪一眼就看穿了他的意图。她直截了当地说：“一个大问题就是，你会承担什么风险？你既然想分得一部分钱，那么你又怎样暴露自己？如果事情不顺利，我被捕了，我一旦把你在我卧室的痕迹消除干



净，你又会出现在什么地方？”换言之，她想和克劳德挑明的是“你与这件事是扯在一起的，是完全扯在一起的。如果我失败了，你也失败了” (McEwan 59)。

麦克尤恩本人在接受访谈的时候，明确指出：“就像克劳狄斯和葛楚德一样，克劳德和特鲁迪也是密谋杀害他人的恶棍，因此不值得同情” (qtd. in Neill)。在《哈姆雷特》中，克劳狄斯对于自己杀害王兄的恶行，还有片刻的忏悔行为，但是在《果壳》中，克劳德完全没有任何悔意。为了金钱，他执意要毒杀自己的兄长。与克劳德不同的是，特鲁迪的伦理意识并非完全泯灭，她也偶尔怀疑过自己不良动机，时而会反悔和自责，也曾拒绝毒杀丈夫的计划。毕竟，用她自己的话来说，“我曾爱过他” (McEwan 55)。曾几何时，特鲁迪也会夜半醒来，在丈夫的书房中大喊“我们不能这样做”，但是在克劳德的利诱下，她瞬间又改口说“我们可以” (McEwan 9)。遗憾的是，由于克劳德的利诱和鼓动，特鲁迪暂时醒悟的伦理意识再度被其蓬勃的原始欲望所压制，迷失了自我，最终做出错误的伦理选择。

看着约翰拿走克劳德准备的添加了乙醇的水果冰沙驱车离去后，克劳德和特鲁迪非但没有丝毫的悔意，完全不顾及随时都可能失去生命的约翰，相反他们因为谋杀计划的成功实施而情欲勃发，疯狂做爱。换言之，在约翰宝贵的生命和他们旨在追求的金钱、性欲之间，特鲁迪和克劳德选择了后者。沉沦于性欲和财欲中的他们迷失了自己的伦理意识，不仅给约翰和胎儿带来了不幸，而且也为自己的罪行付出了代价，得到了应有的惩罚。等待他们的是前来拘捕他们的警察和另一重空间狭小的“果壳”：监狱的囚室。

### 诗歌的果壳：

#### 伦理身份的错位与伦理悲剧的产生

尽管小说关于胎儿父亲约翰·凯恩·凯恩的篇幅并不太多，但他无疑是作品中非常重要的一个人物，而小说情节在很大程度上也都围绕他而展开。约翰究竟是什么样的人物？什么原因导致了他惨遭妻子和兄弟的毒手？如何解读约翰的悲剧？对这些问题的回答，需要从约翰的伦理身份入手。文学伦理学批评认为，“在文学文本中，所有伦理问题的产生往往都同身份相关” (聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》263)。根据胎儿的叙述，约翰拥有多重身份：从职业上来看，他是一名诗人和出版商，是诗人梅洛迪的精神导师；从其家庭身份来看，他是特鲁迪的丈夫，是地产商克劳德的哥哥，是胎儿叙述者的父亲。由于妻子特鲁迪和弟弟克劳德发生了不伦关系，引发了自己的婚姻危机，同时还因为二者觊觎自己的房产，导致了自己被谋害。不过，与戏剧《哈姆雷特》的不同之处在于：哈姆雷特的父亲在生前和妻子葛楚德的关系并没有破裂，并不知道自己的妻子和弟弟克劳狄斯之间存有奸情，而在《果壳》中，约翰在生前就已经和妻子特鲁迪分居，而且知道妻子和弟弟克劳德之间

的不伦关系。由于克劳德的介入，约翰和妻子特鲁迪之间的关系出现了裂痕，其身份正在朝着由特鲁迪的丈夫到特鲁迪丈夫的哥哥的方向转化。在约翰伦理身份发生错位之后，值得考究的是约翰为恢复其错位的家庭伦理身份所付出的努力，而其努力的失败和无效非但没有挽回破裂的婚姻关系，甚至加速了其被害的进程。纵览全书，我们不难发现：约翰为恢复自己错位的伦理身份所采用的途径经历了由“朗诵诗歌”到“激将法”再到“朗诵诗歌”的一个循环过程。

作为一名诗人，约翰试图挽回婚姻的主要手段就是对特鲁迪和克劳德朗诵诗歌。胎儿叙述者这样描述自己的诗人父亲：“他靠诗歌活着，依然向我母亲背诵诗歌，教诗歌，评论诗歌，帮助年轻诗人的成长，参加评奖委员会，在学校里宣传诗歌，为小杂志撰写诗歌评论文章，在电台上谈论诗歌”(McEwan 11)。对于约翰而言，诗歌不仅是他的职业，也是倾其一生所要奉献的事业。他在经济上无偿援助初入文坛的诗人，苦苦支撑即将倒闭的发行诗歌的出版社。他不遗余力地培养了大批诗人和文学青年，帮助他们守护文学梦想。诗歌不仅是约翰的职业与财富，同时也是他在爱情、婚姻和家庭遇到危机时的艺术避难所，成为他唯一信赖的艺术手段和挽回婚姻的武器。在每次回到住所看望特鲁迪时，约翰的一个习惯性行为就是对妻子朗诵诗歌。对于约翰的这一行为，胎儿叙述者做出这样的解释：

如下是我的合理推断。他天生就是一个乐于助人的明星，热衷于取悦他人，过于善良，过于真诚，虽然野心勃勃地要成为一名诗人，却一点也不贪婪。事实上，他认为，通过写诗来赞美我的母亲（她的眼睛、她的头发，她的嘴唇），然后大声地把它们朗诵出来，会缓和她的情绪，使他能自己的房子里受到欢迎。(McEwan 12)

在胎儿对约翰的评论和解释中，我们不难发现他对父亲高贵品行的赞扬，即“善良”、“真诚”、“不贪婪”。父亲内在的高贵品质与母亲邪恶的心灵形成了鲜明对比。胎儿叙述者在文本中的多个地方夸赞特鲁迪姣好的容貌，但是在其美丽外表下潜藏一个丑陋的灵魂。特鲁迪不顾及腹中的胎儿和与丈夫的感情，一味地为了满足个人的私欲，不仅和丈夫的弟弟克劳德发生不伦关系，而且还密谋害死丈夫，霸占其房产，谋取非法经济利益。从文学伦理学批评的视角来看，父亲对母亲朗诵诗歌的行为可以被看作是一种伦理教诲的手段，是劝其从善的一种途径。聂珍钊指出：“文学伦理学批评从起源上把文学看成是伦理的产物，人文文学的价值就在于它具有伦理教诲功能。只要是文学，无论是古代的还是当代的，西方的还是中国的，教诲都是它的基本功能”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》7）。诗歌作为最主要的文学样式之一，自然也承载着重要的教诲功能。约翰通过向特鲁迪朗诵那些赞美她

美貌的诗歌，希望可以平复她不安的情绪，让她回归理性，继而让特鲁迪接受自己回家的请求并同自己重归于好，从而恢复自己在家的伦理身份。

遗憾的是，特鲁迪对约翰诵读的伦理教诲反感和厌倦。当父亲朗诵诗歌的时候，胎儿可以感受到母亲特鲁迪的厌倦已经结成了“壳”(crust)，从而“使她无视这个悲怆的场景——一个心胸宽厚的男人对自己的追求失去了希望，但他依然用一种不再流行的十四行诗的形式来陈述自己的理由”(McEwan 13)。对于约翰向自己朗诵诗歌的做法，特鲁迪无动于衷，表现出厌倦和反感，无视约翰作为一个男人“心胸宽厚”的高贵品质，即他明知他们已经没有复合的希望，但还是没有放弃努力。与之相反，约翰“宽厚”的优点反倒成了被特鲁迪利用的弱点。对于约翰希望搬回来照顾自己的请求，她拒绝同意他搬回来，理由竟然是“请体谅我。我正怀着你的孩子，记住好吗？现在不是只考虑你自己的时候”(McEwan 18)。颇具讽刺意味的是，不为孩子着想、只考虑自己的不是丈夫约翰而正是特鲁迪自己。倘若她如果真是为了孩子而不是为了自己，就不会违背伦理禁忌，和丈夫的弟弟发生不伦关系，甚至谋害自己的丈夫，使腹中胎儿尚未出生就没有了父亲。特鲁迪错误的伦理选择在很大程度上是因为她迷失伦理意识，拒绝伦理教诲的结果。

当朗诵诗歌的手段没有起到任何效果的时候，约翰试图采用激将法，为婚姻复合和挽回自己的伦理身份做最后一次努力。他在被害之前，带着年轻的女诗人埃洛迪来到被特鲁迪所居住的老房子，谎称埃洛迪是自己的情人，希望可以激起妻子的嫉妒之心，使她回心转意和自己重归于好。女诗人埃洛迪的到来在某种程度上似乎确实激起了特鲁迪的嫉妒。这从她们二者之间关于猫头鹰的对话可以看得出来。

- 特鲁迪：“猫头鹰是邪恶的。”  
 埃洛迪：“就像知更鸟一样。就像自然一样。”  
 特鲁迪：“显然是不能吃的。”  
 埃洛迪：“孵蛋的猫头鹰是有毒的”  
 特鲁迪：“是的，孵蛋的猫头鹰可以杀死你。”  
 埃洛迪：“我不这么认为。她只是让你感觉恶心。”  
 特鲁迪：“我的意思是，如果让她的双脚抓到你的脸的话。”  
 埃洛迪：“从来不会。她太过害羞了。”  
 特鲁迪：“如果被惹怒，就不一样了。” (McEwan 66)

表面上看来，特鲁迪和埃洛迪的对话仅仅是关于猫头鹰的习性，而实际上则暗含两人不同观点的较量和交锋，远远超出了普通闲谈的意味。胎儿对她们二者的交流，做出这样的解释和判断：“对话轻松，语气无足轻重。闲谈，或者我的社会经验所不足以明白的互相威胁与伤害……现在作为竞争者，对

埃洛迪的厌恶可能是保持清醒的良药”(McEwan 66)。很显然,胎儿对埃洛迪和特鲁迪之间对话轻松的理解与她们之间的暗中较劲和相互敌意形成了有趣的张力。根据埃洛迪后来的叙述,约翰说她是自己的情人完全超出了她的意料。他这么做的原因主要是为了激起特鲁迪的妒忌,让她重新想起他们在一起的美好时光,使她回心转意,因为他还爱着特鲁迪,尽管他早已知道妻子对他的背叛。

约翰为了最后一次挽回特鲁迪的心意,可谓强装镇定、费尽心思,对特鲁迪和克劳德之间的不伦关系表现得颇为宽容大度。对此,胎儿叙述者也似乎有点意外。他说:“我父亲看起来并没有因为发现他的弟弟在厨房里,打开香槟,扮演主人的角色而感到苦恼。因此,约翰·凯恩罗斯从来都没有上当受骗,并非被人戴了绿帽子还不知情”(McEwan 63)。换言之,约翰并非一直都被蒙在鼓里。他知道妻子和弟弟欺骗、背叛自己,但他始终在为重建被打乱的家庭伦理关系和恢复错位的伦理身份而努力,朗诵诗歌和激将法就是其努力的一部分。当着埃洛迪和克劳德的面,约翰开始追忆自己和特鲁迪相处的点点滴滴,毕竟他们也曾炽热相爱。用约翰的话来说:“我们做爱是我们聊天的延续,我们聊天也是做爱的延续”(McEwan 68)。同约翰在一起的时候,他们的“做爱”(lovemaking)可以与“聊天”(talking)等量齐观、相提并论,是肉体与灵魂的沟通与交流,精神之爱与肉体之爱实现了融合;而同克劳德在一起的时候,他们的疯狂做爱只是为了让特鲁迪沉溺肉欲、日渐堕落,在伦理意识迷失的道路上愈陷愈深。遗憾的是,约翰此番动情的言论并没有打动特鲁迪。无奈之下,约翰将激将法进行到底。他表示愿意和特鲁迪分手,祝福特鲁迪和克劳德在一起,而自己也将和埃洛迪开启自己的生活。如果读者据此认为特鲁迪是因为丈夫约翰有了情人埃洛迪,她出于嫉妒而坚定了自己毒害丈夫的念头,那就大错特错了,毕竟无论相爱还是分手都不是特鲁迪最在意的事情。真正使得特鲁迪下定决心谋害丈夫约翰的原因是,她被要求在分手后从约翰的房子里搬出去。

在约翰、特鲁迪、埃洛迪、克劳德四人会面的时候,约翰提出分手之后的安排和打算,其中一条就是他和埃洛迪要搬回来住,让特鲁迪搬去克劳德那里。正是这点戳中了特鲁迪的痛处,加速了约翰被害的进程。对丈夫的安排和打算,特鲁迪的反应是:“约翰·凯恩罗斯终究不是她的蠢货。他很快就要把她踢走。她必须今天就行动”(McEwan 76)。特鲁迪的这一暗下决心宣告了约翰试图利用激将法挽回自己婚姻关系、恢复伦理身份的失败。

值得指出的是,约翰并没有轻易放弃为恢复自己错位的伦理身份而付出的努力。哪怕是在激将法失败,最后一次和特鲁迪见面的时候,他还是心存打动特鲁迪的幻想,而他把自己最后一次努力的机会交给了诗歌。诗歌之于约翰,就如房子和金钱对于特鲁迪,是其唯一的执念。或许,这也是他作为一名诗人唯一能做的事情。在最后一次见面的时候,约翰请求说:“特鲁迪,

就算是为了过去的时光，我可以再给你读一首诗歌吗？”(McEwan 91) 不过，对于他的这一请求，特鲁迪表现出一如既往的反感：“约翰，看在上帝的份上，请你不要读了”(McEwan 91)。尤其是当约翰不顾她的反对，坚持朗诵完诗歌后，特鲁迪斩钉截铁地说：“我这辈子都不想再听诗歌了”(McEwan 92)。特鲁迪对诗歌这一重要文学样式的厌恶和拒绝，无疑预示了约翰为恢复自己错位的伦理身份的努力的失败，表明了特鲁迪对文学伦理教诲的彻底摒弃，最终做出了错误的伦理选择，导致了丈夫约翰被害和自身入狱的伦理悲剧。

根据文学伦理学批评的观点，“伦理选择是人择善弃恶而做一个有道德的人的途径……伦理选择是通过教诲实现的，教诲是通过文学得到的”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》6）。《果壳》正是通过叙述诗人约翰重建失衡的伦理关系、恢复错位的伦理身份努力的失败，凸显了特鲁迪对伦理教诲的排斥以及由此导致的伦理悲剧，给读者带来重要的伦理警示和启迪。换言之，小说试图通过讲述反面的道德事例，通过描写伦理关系、伦理身份的变化及其引发的问题和导致的不同结果，为人类文明的进步提供经验和教诲。

### 子宫的果壳： 等待与行动的伦理两难

在莎士比亚的戏剧《哈姆雷特》中，最为引人关注和讨论的当属哈姆雷特的关于“生存，还是毁灭”(To be, or not to be)的内心独白。在聂珍钊看来，尽管“To be, or not to be”有多种理解，“但其内涵仍然指的是对正义的抉择和追问，即哈姆雷特采取的行动是对或错的问题。在他弄清了父亲死亡的真相后，哈姆雷特面对的是两种选择，即复仇还是不复仇，杀死新王还是不杀死新王，是行动还是不行动。这是一种伦理两难的选择”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》132）。在《果壳》中，主人公胎儿叙述者也受困于类似的伦理两难，徘徊在等待与行动之间，难以选择。他所面临的伦理困境及其行动的延宕主要基于他对自己家庭关系的理解、判断和思考。

作为小说中的胎儿叙述者，其“非自然性”(unnaturalness)<sup>①</sup>突出表现在他在有限的空间里拥有无限多的知识。对此，他的解释是自己勤奋好学。他说：“我保持清醒，我听，我学”(I stay awake, I listen, I learn) (McEwan 24)。尽管他精通政治、了解时局，但是却很难理清自己异常复杂的家庭关系。他通过自己的细致观察，大致做出这样的梳理：

我开始明白我的处境，我能想到也能感觉到。一个即将降临新世界的白人能不装腔作势的事情也只有这些了。如下就是我想明白的。我母亲喜欢上我父亲的弟弟，欺骗了她的丈夫了，毁了她的儿子。我叔叔从他哥哥那里偷走了他的妻子，欺骗了他侄子的父亲，极大地伤害了她嫂子的儿子。我父亲生来就毫无防备这样的事情，而我也因此自己的情况没有

防备。我叔叔有我四分之一的基因，有我父亲一半的基因，但是一点也不像我父亲，就如同我不像维吉尔或蒙田一样。究竟我身上哪一部分是克劳德的，我又怎样知道呢？我可以是我自己的兄弟，可以骗我自己就像他骗他自己一样。（McEwan 32）

胎儿对于自己三个家庭成员之间的复杂关系产生了困惑，而困惑的主要原因是母亲、父亲、叔叔伦理身份的错位与混乱：母亲不喜欢父亲，而是喜欢上叔叔，即母亲变成了叔母；叔叔和嫂子发生了关系，把嫂子变成了妻子；因为叔叔和母亲的不伦关系，结果叔叔变成了父亲，父亲也变成了叔叔。胎儿所要应对的不仅是理清家庭成员之间的关系，而且还要做出反应。特别需要指出的是，鉴于他的伦理身份是一名尚未出生的胎儿。尽管他似乎拥有无限多的知识，但是不具备在外部世界行动的能力。与哈姆雷特非常相似，胎儿在自己为父亲复仇的道路上，一直游移在等待与行动之间，迟缓不前。为此，他需要结合自身的实际情况和家庭成员的身份，需要逐一分析他们与自己的伦理关系，等待时机，并做出合适的伦理选择。

在莎士比亚的戏剧中，哈姆雷特是从鬼魂父亲那里得知其父亲被母亲和叔叔毒害。鬼魂的话是否可信，他需要核实，所以才有了“捕鼠记”这一幕。在《果壳》中，胎儿亲耳听到叔父和母亲谋害父亲的计划，从头到尾见证了这个计划的密谋和实施。从理论上说，他原本可以及时阻止这场谋杀，拯救父亲于危难。实际上，他在内心也发出这样的呼喊：“不要让通奸的叔叔和母亲毒死你的父亲。不要在空虚和反转中浪费自己宝贵的时间。出生和行动！”（McEwan 45-46）但是作为一个被动的见证者和失去行动能力的胎儿，他实际上比哈姆雷特更加无助。在接受采访的时候，麦克尤恩说：“有比哈姆雷特还要无助的人吗？是的，还有胎儿。我的叙述者不仅无助，而且还思考自杀，看到了鬼魂，还有父亲、叔叔和母亲的三角关系，不过是现代意义上的三角关系罢了”（qtd. in Neill）。

在父亲、叔叔、母亲三人之中，胎儿可以最直接发生联系、产生影响的就是其自己的母亲特鲁迪。在很大程度上，胎儿唯一可以采取行动的对象就是其母亲。胎儿叙述者对自己的母亲始终怀有复杂的情感。与哈姆雷特相似，尽管胎儿的主要复仇对象是其叔叔，但是需要不断考验和确定的却是其母亲的角色。他无法遏制母亲和叔叔谋害父亲的罪行、无法及时实施复仇的原因除了在客观上自己不具备行动能力之外，还在于他在主观上无法确定自己与母亲之间的关系，以及对自己报复母亲的行为是否妥当的怀疑。首先，他需要判断和衡量母亲对自己的爱。用他自己的话来说，“我不确定她是否爱我”（McEwan 32）。换言之，他需要通过反思和判断母亲对自己的情感与态度来确定自己对母亲的态度。对于叔叔克劳德和母亲特鲁迪的密谋计划，胎儿在母亲的腹中开始不断反思：“我们已经把孩子放在别的地方。这些话

不断重复，擦除干净后只剩真相，我被别人安排的未来再明显不过了。放置 (placed) 只是扔弃 (dumped) 的骗人同义词。孩子就是我。别的地方也是骗人的。冷酷无情的母亲！” (McEwan 42) 母亲不仅对父亲不留情面，而且对自己腹中的孩子也一样“冷酷无情” (ruthless)。在毒害父亲之后，母亲打算要和叔叔带着他们所获得 700 万英镑远走高飞，自己将会被他们以“安置”的名义“扔弃”，所谓的“别的地方” (somewhere) 就是不留在母亲自己身边的意思。换言之，母亲对自己的爱就是一场自欺欺人的骗局。有鉴于此，胎儿决定以牙还牙。他说：

并非毫无权力，我对母亲的爱有权力，而且是绝对的权力。我不同意她的弃子阴谋。我不会被流放，该流放的应该是她。我要用这粘滑的绳子拴住她，在我出生的那天用新生儿摇晃不定的眼神强迫她，用孤独的海鸥的哀号去捕获她的心脏。用强迫之爱使她同意成为我忠实的保姆，她的自由只是一个隐去的故土之滨。特鲁迪将是我的，而不是克劳德的，她既然可以丢弃我，我也可以从她的胸腔中撕裂她的胸脯，把他们摇下贼船。我也一样可以冷酷无情。(McEwan 43-44)

在上面的叙述片段中，核心关键词是“爱” (love)。胎儿打算报复母亲的理由并不是为父复仇，而是为了伸张自己获得母爱的正当权力，如果父亲不能把母亲从叔叔手中夺过来，那么自己应该把母亲从克劳德那里抢过来，让她成为自己忠实的保姆。胎儿叙述者之前也承认爱自己的母亲，但是理由似乎又显得不够充分，只是说“我爱她——怎么可能不爱她呢？她是我还没见过面的母亲，我只是从她的身体内部知道了她。这不够！我渴望看到她外在的自我。外表就是一切” (McEwan 7)。从母亲身体内部对她的了解让他爱上了自己的母亲，并渴望看到她的样子。他对母亲之爱索求的本质是要母亲爱他，不能抛弃他，使自己能够在出生之后可以继续活下去。这与克劳德对特鲁迪的爱有着本质的区别。克劳德在很大程度上只是为了利用嫂子特鲁迪来毒害哥哥约翰，获取经济利益，甚至是为了报复因为哥哥比自己优秀而感到受伤的自尊。克劳德和特鲁迪在一起是为了谋财害命，即毒死哥哥、侵占哥哥的房产，而胎儿自己同母亲特鲁迪在一起的原因是为了维护生命，即为了使自己出生后可以活下去。尽管两者对特鲁迪的爱占有都有自私性质，但是克劳德的行为体现出对生命的践踏，而胎儿的行为体现出对生命的尊重。

其次，胎儿需要判断自己的介入是否正确，尤其对父亲和母亲之间破裂关系的理解是否有误，以及自己能否劝阻母亲，防止其犯错的行为。“对父母分手的孩子而言，其神圣的想象的任务就是使他们重归于好” (McEwan 88)。换言之，他对父母的复合抱有幻想，认为促使他们重归于好才是自己最重要的任务，而非急于介入，急着惩罚母亲。此外，他自己需要考虑的是还

有劝说和提醒母亲，防止她犯错误的可能。她对母亲杀人行为做出了一定的伦理思考：“我的母亲从来都没有工作过，能成为一个杀人犯吗？这个工作一旦开始后，可不容易，不仅在计划和执行上都很困难，而且后果也难以承担。比如，我想和她说的是，即便在伦理之外，还有很多不便：后面的几个小时，几个周末，每个夜晚，或者一生，要么入狱，或者愧疚，或者两者都有。没有报酬，没有津贴，没有退休金，有的只是自责。她正在犯一个错误”（McEwan 79）。对于胎儿而言，他若爱父亲，就要拯救他的生命，或者在他被害死后，为其复仇。同理，他若爱母亲，就要阻止她犯错误。她显然在做一件错误的事情。遗憾的是，胎儿过度地沉溺于思考，在等待中错过了及时制止母亲毒害父亲的行为，目睹了父亲被害的过程。

虽然胎儿在客观上无法阻止父亲被害，不能挽救父亲于危难之际，但他并不消沉，没有选择哀号与哭泣。相反，他认为：“婴儿的哀号毫无意义。等待才是正确的事情。还有思考”（McEwan 47）。问题在于，胎儿等待的是什么？思考的又是什么？在笔者看来，他等待的是自己可以采取行动的时间，即自己可以平安出生的时刻，而思考的则是如何在等待与行动之间的做出选择，权衡两者的利弊。在《哈姆雷特》中，哈姆雷特也说过等待的重要性。他说：“静静地等待着吧，我的灵魂；罪恶的行为总有一天会发现，虽然地上所有的泥土把它们遮掩”（莎士比亚 297）。哈姆雷特似乎是要把希望寄托于恶人的自我反省，让时间揭示一切。与这种被动消极的等待观相比，胎儿是在等待自己具有行动的能力。如果他死去了，那么就再也无法帮助父亲复仇，因此他必须要活下去。由此，胎儿陷入了一个介于等待和行动之间的伦理两难。根据文学伦理学批评的观点，“伦理两难即伦理悖论。伦理两难由两个道德命题构成，如果选择者对它们各自单独地做出道德判断，每一个选择都是正确的，并且每一种选择都符合普遍道德原则。但是，一旦选择者在二者之间做出一项选择，就会导致另一项违背伦理，即违背普遍道德原则”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》262）。在《果壳》中，胎儿叙述者就面临如下伦理两难的境地：如果他果断采取行动，采取自尽的方式，固然有可能会迫使母亲放弃毒害自己的父亲，但是另一种可能就是自己也会搭上性命不说，而且还极为可能无法帮助父亲脱离被害的危险，毋宁说为父复仇了；如果他等待下去，则会眼睁睁地看着自己的父亲被母亲和叔叔毒害，由此在客观上成为他们毒害图谋的一分子，但是只要自己还活着，就有给父亲复仇的希望，就有机会将杀害父亲的凶手绳之于法。

在父亲死后，胎儿对于自己没有及时采取行动，未能及时阻止母亲、挽救父亲的生命而感到自责和后悔。他说：“当他把她再次诱惑到床上，称她是自己的老鼠，用力掐她的乳头，用肿胀的舌头亲吻她的脸颊，虚情假意地对她呼着气。我什么也没做”（McEwan 156）。在父亲被害之前，自己没有及时采取行动，那么在父亲被害之后，他是否应该立即采取行动，为父复仇呢？



然后，他的另一重现实困境是，惩罚母亲就等于惩罚自己。一旦离开了母亲，他也无法生存。由此，不难看出他对母亲既爱又恨的矛盾性态度：“我对母亲的爱和我对她的恨都在成正比例地增长。我的双亲就剩她一个人了。没有她，我也活不了”(McEwan 108)。胎儿恨母亲，是因为她对父亲的背叛和谋害；爱母亲是因为自己对亲情的珍视，对她作为自己唯一的亲人的眷念。更为现实的情况是，胎儿在生下来后，还需依赖于其母亲的抚养，自己能否活下去都要靠她。因此，他能做的似乎只有等待母亲和叔叔自首，等待他们的悔悟，等待自己具备行动的能力。然而，胎儿始终未见母亲和叔叔有准备自首和悔改的迹象。因此，当他们罪行暴露、准备畏罪潜逃的时候，胎儿尽管知道自己尚未足月，哪怕是冒着早产两周的生命危险，也要阻止他们。他说：

在经历所有的转折与修正，错误的阐释，缺乏洞见的疏忽，试图自我毁灭，被动的伤心之后，我已经做出了决定。够了。把我包起来的羊膜囊就是一个半透明的绸包，精细和结实，里面有液体将我从这个世界中保护起来，防止我做噩梦。不再等了。加入他们的时间到了。给结局画上句号。开始行动。(McEwan 191)

从上述段落中，我们可以发现胎儿再也无法继续等待下去了，哪怕自己出生的时机尚未成熟，但是他决定抛弃自己之前的愚蠢做法，包括试图自我毁灭，因局势被动而感到伤心，疏忽大意，理解错误等，他现在必须要做的是“**to end the endings. Time to begin**”，即给结局画上句号，开始行动。因此，他用指甲划破羊膜囊，提前出生，成功阻止了母亲的外逃，而尽管克劳德试图置母亲和自己不顾，打算独自逃亡，无奈其对母亲的不忠早被料见，护照被她藏了起来，难以成行。在被逼帮助母亲接生后，克劳德将不得不和母亲一起等待前来拘捕他们的警察。

对于这样的结局，胎儿叙述者再次做出了自己的思考和判断：“我在想等在外面的出租车。浪费了。是时候让它走了。我也在想我们在监狱中的囚室，但愿不要太小，在进入监狱沉重的大门、在踏上磨旧了的盘旋楼梯之前，还有悲伤、审判及其意义”(McEwan 197)。这样是判断和思考回应了他之前所说的“这不是一个好下场，永远也不会有什么好结果”(McEwan 197)。在评价自己提前降生及其产生的后果时，胎儿的口吻颇有调侃意味。从文学伦理学批评视角来看，胎儿是父母伦理选择的被动结果。作为一名没有出生的胎儿，叙述者可被看作是一个斯芬克斯因子，身上既体现出其母亲所遗留的兽性因子，也体现出其父亲所遗留的人性因子。母腹中的胎儿尽管没有出生，但是因为人性因子的存在而使他有了人性，因而能够做出伦理判断，即对母亲和叔父合谋害死父亲的行为进行善恶判断。善恶判断是伦理选择的前提。由此说来，胎儿的提前降生既是其作为胎儿身份的一个重要“伦理选择”(ethical

choice), 同时也是其作为一种伦理存在的人的“伦理选择”(ethical selection)的开始。对于母亲特鲁迪和叔叔克劳德的被捕, 刚刚经历从胎儿到新生儿的叙述者“我”幸灾乐祸, 为自己行动的成功而感到颇为得意和欣慰。鉴于母亲和叔叔所犯下令人所不齿的罪行, 他们注定不会有“好下场”(not a good end), 等待他们的是监狱沉重的大门、狭小的囚室、磨旧的旋转楼梯。除了上述他们应有的惩罚、悲伤、悔恨之外, 还会经历“审判”(justice)。英文中的“justice”除了具有审判之外, 还有“正义”的意思, 即克劳德和特鲁迪的被捕和审判说明正义得到伸张、坏人得到惩罚, 而这也是这起伦理事件给人以启迪和教诲的意义所在。

### 结语

麦克尤恩的崇拜者英国当红青年小说家扎迪·史密斯(Zadie Smith)曾这样盛赞心中的偶像:

他的作品行文严谨细致, 简洁有力; 他在性和性欲的话题的辩才令人折服; 他在把叙事领入科学的可能性上, 步伐坚定; 他的小说长短适宜; 他笔下的句子从来都不会像我写的这句话一样, 有这么多的分号。读他的作品时, 我会被那些我从来都不会使用的隐喻、从来都不会构思的情节和从未有过的理念, 所打动。因为这些原因, 我爱阅读他的作品, 同时也因为像数以百万计的其他读者一样, 我感觉他是一个靠得住的作家。(qtd. in Roberts 108)

从上述评论片段中可以发现, 史密斯在谈论麦克尤恩的作品时, 除了赞赏麦克尤恩的语体风格、行文布局外, 还特别折服于具有麦氏独特的“隐喻”、“情节”、“理念”。就其新作《果壳》而言, 麦克尤恩创作的独特性在于通过使用“果壳”这一隐喻, 成功刻绘了一群身处伦理困境的囚徒, 他们或迷失自己固有的伦理身份或受困于现有的伦理身份, 难以做出正确的伦理选择, 由此导致了伦理悲剧的产生。麦克尤恩以胎儿叙述者的视角重构哈姆雷特为父复仇的情节, 一方面固然是在向莎翁致敬, 另一方面也投射了其本人关于生命的伦理思考。个中缘由, 或许就像麦克尤恩所说的那样: “我们生来就是道德的存在”(qtd. in Roberts 70)。

### 【Note】

- ①关于叙事的非自然性, 参见尚必武: “文学叙事中的非自然情感: 基本类型与阐释选择”, 《上海交通大学学报》(哲学社会科学版) 4(2016): 5-16; “西方文论关键词: 非自然叙事学”, 《外国文学》2(2015): 95-111; “叙事的‘非自然性’辨微: 再论非自然叙事学”, 《外

国语文》3(2015):36-45; “非自然叙事学及当代叙事诗学”, 《文艺理论研究》5(2012): 110-114; “不可能的故事世界, 反常的叙述行为: 非自然叙事学论略”, 《外语与外语教学》1(2012):86-90。

### 【Works Cited】

- Adams, Tim. “*Nutshell* by Ian McEwan Review — A Tragic Hero in the Making.” *The Guardian*, 30 August, 2016.
- Aitkenhead, Decca. “Ian McEwan: ‘I’m Going to Get Such a Kicking’.” *The Guardian*, August 27, 2016.
- Clanchy, Kate. “Book of the Week: *Nutshell* by Ian McEwan.” *The Guardian*, August 27, 2016: 6.
- Mars-Jones, Adam. “In the Body Bag.” *London Review of Books* 38.19 (October 6, 2016): 5-9.
- McEwan, Ian. *Nutshell*. New York: Doubleday, 2016.
- Neill, Rosemary. “Ian McEwan on New Novel *Nutshell*, Hamlet, His Brother and the Bard.” *The Australian*, August 27, 2016.
- 聂珍钊: “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。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Literary Criticism: The Exposition and Textual Research on the Definition of Human Nature.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2015): 10-19. ]
- : “文学伦理学批评: 论文学的基本功能与核心价值”, 《外国文学研究》4(2014): 8-13。
- [---. “Ethical Literary Criticism: On Fundamental Function and Core Value of Literature.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 4(2014): 8-13.]
- : 《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2014 年。
- [---. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- Roberts, Ryan. *Conversations with Ian McEwan*. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2010.
- Scholes, Lucy. “Book Review: Ian McEwan’s *Nutshell* Is a Thriller Narrated by a Foetus.” *The National*, September 8, 2016.
- 莎士比亚: 《莎士比亚全集》(五), 朱生豪译。北京: 人民文学出版社, 1994 年。
- [Shakespeare. *The Complete Works of Shakespeare*. Vol. 5. Trans. Zhu Shenghao. Beijing: People’s Literature Publishing House, 1994.]

责任编辑: 陈 晞

# 人性的荒岛：《莫罗博士的岛》中人与兽的文学伦理学阐释

## The Desert Island of Human Nature: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of Men and Beasts in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*

王晓惠 (Wang Xiaohui)

**内容摘要：**人与兽的本质区别在于人有人性，兽没有。人的人性有时会表现为匮乏或倒退，如《莫罗博士的岛》中莫罗博士在荒岛上肆意解剖动物，把兽变成兽人，他的科学选择说明他对待动物缺乏人性；蒙哥马利把自己降低为兽人，用兽人的伦理来指导自己的伦理选择，他的人性发生倒退。科学选择不能代替自然选择和伦理选择。兽人没有取得人的形式，它是兽，不是人，它的选择不属于伦理选择，虚伪的人性成为兽人的枷锁和痛苦之源。在荒岛的伦理环境中，人不会退化成兽，但兽人会退化成兽。在人类的伦理环境中，人一旦失去道德，活得就像兽人一样。小说渗透着作者威尔斯对人类社会伦理乱象的深恶痛绝和困惑无奈。人性不是天生的，是经过后天的伦理教诲获得的，书是人类获得伦理教诲的最佳途径。只有人类获得理性和人性，人类社会的前途才会令人憧憬。

**关键词：**《莫罗博士的岛》；威尔斯；人性；兽；兽人

**作者简介：**王晓惠，广西大学外国语学院副教授，主要从事文学伦理学批评和英美文学研究。本文系 2015 年度广西哲学社会科学规划研究课题【项目批号：15BWW003】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** The Desert Island of Human Nature: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of Men and Beasts in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*

**Abstract:** The essential difference between men and beasts is that men have the human nature, beasts have no. Sometimes men's human nature may be lack or backwards, as on a desert island Moreau's wanton anatomy of beasts and changing beasts into beast folks in *The Island of Dr. Moreau*. His ethical choice shows that he treats beasts without human nature. Montgomery makes himself lower as the beast folks, and guide his own ethical choice under the beast folks' ethics. Montgomery's human nature has been backwards. Scientific selection can't take place of natural

selection and ethical selection. Beast folks have not gotten humans' form, they are beasts, not men, and their choices are not ethical choices. The hypocritical human nature has become the shackles of beast folks and the source of pain. In the ethical environment of the desert island, men will not degenerate into beasts, but beast folks will degenerate into beasts. In the human ethics environment, once men lose moral, they would live like the beast folks. This novel has permeated the writer Wells' hate and confusion about human society ethics chaos. Human nature is not innate, it is acquired through the moral teachings. Reading books is the best way to acquire moral teachings. Only men have acquired the ration and human nature, human society will have being promising.

**Key words:** *The Island of Dr. Moreau*; H. G. Wells; human nature; beasts; beast folks

**Author:** Wang Xiaohui is Associate Professor at the Foreign Languages School, Guangxi University (Nanning 530004, China). Her main research area is ethical literary criticism, British and American Literature Studies. Email: Athena\_hui@163.com

英国著名小说家乔治·威尔斯（1866—1946）被誉为“是科幻小说的创造者之一，或许还是最杰出的一位科幻小说家”（Christopher 866），他的科幻小说影响如此深远，以至于“此后的科幻小说都或多或少打着威尔斯的印记”（侯维瑞 李维屏 454）。威尔斯的科幻小说善于在虚幻的浪漫中孕育现实的残酷，在科学幻想中书写对人类社会的隐忧。他曾说：“大自然这本书书写着幸存的胜利、死亡和灭绝的悲剧、退化和继承的悲喜剧、寄生的可怕教训、殖民生物的政治讽刺。事实上，对于那些能够读懂其象征意义的人来说，动物学等同于哲学和文学”（Glendening 592）。

威尔斯的科幻小说《莫罗博士的岛》（1896）就是一个关于人与兽的故事。故事主人公莫罗博士利用先进的医学解剖手段，在荒岛上肆意制造非人非兽的兽人，最后被兽人杀死。有学者认为莫罗形象指出了“在人类与自然分离过程中科学如何被孕育”的问题（Vint 102）；也有学者认为小说强调了“伦理保障在所有科学研究中的重要性”（Clayton 587）；还有学者认为小说不同程度地带有“反科技主义色彩”（王一平 79）；更有学者认为莫罗是一个“帝国主义者”（肖明翰 98）。学者从文化、生态伦理、殖民、进化、艺术手法等多种角度对《莫罗博士的岛》做了大量研究，却鲜有人从人性的角度对其剖析。人与兽的根本区别除了形式之外，更重要的是人有人性，兽没有。人性是善，被称之为人的生物只有具有人性，才算得上是真正意义上的人。<sup>①</sup>无论是荒岛上莫罗博士妄想借用解剖刀改兽为人，还是普伦迪克重返人类社会时幻觉身边人如同兽人，其背后都隐藏着深层的伦理蕴意、渗透着浓重

的伦理书写。而对小说中的人性进行分析,无疑是深刻理解这部“以艺术和幻想吸引读者到最后”的小说的一把金钥匙(Wells vii)。

### 一、从人到兽:人性的匮乏和扭曲

文学伦理学认为人具有伦理性,伦理环境中的人应该是有道德的人,有人性的人。人性是“人区别于兽而之所以为人的基本特性,是人作为人而非兽存在的本质属性,因此人性就是人的本质”,人性“是人的道德属性”(聂珍钊 271)。如果人性丧失,成为一个没有道德的人,那么人就失去了为人的基本特性,等同于兽。人性通过伦理选择获得加强,也通过伦理选择表现出来。伦理选择是人趋于道德的行为选择,“是人择善弃恶而做一个有道德的人的途径”(聂珍钊 267)。有人性的人,他的伦理选择必然是有道德的;人性较弱的人,他相应的伦理选择一定是缺乏道德的。人类对有科学参与的行为进行选择是科学选择,但科学选择“在本质上属于伦理问题”(王晓惠 85),所以人类的科学选择行为都属于伦理选择的范畴。小说中莫罗违背人类的伦理规范,躲在荒岛上利用科技对豹、猪、狗等动物进行残忍的活体移植,而这一切只为满足他疯狂的试验欲望。莫罗的科学选择破坏了伦理,他对动物是缺乏人性的,他已从人沦为一部试验机器。莫罗的伙伴蒙哥马利,抛弃人类的伦理观念,从内心接受兽人的伦理,把自己降低为兽,蒙哥马利的伦理选择表明他的人性发生扭曲。

#### (一) 莫罗博士的人性匮乏

伦理的人身上同时存在人性因子和兽性因子,合起来被称为斯芬克斯因子。人性因子是善、是高级因子,兽性因子是动物性在人身上的残留、是低级因子。<sup>②</sup>人性因子是人性产生和发展的基础,兽性因子会压制和阻碍人性的发展和增强。当人性因子占主导地位时,人的伦理选择往往在理性意志的指导下完成,表现出尊崇道德、具备人性的特点;兽性因子占主导地位时,人的伦理选择通常是在非理性意志下做出的,表现为道德缺位,缺乏人性。莫罗在疯狂的研究欲和统治欲的驱使下,其兽性因子压倒人性因子,导致他非理性地认为:自己制造人性化动物的科学选择是医学创举;这种科学选择与伦理无关;这项科学选择给动物带来的灾难不是自己的错。莫罗违背伦理道德、对其他生物没有任何尊重和怜悯之心,他对动物实施活体解剖的科学选择显示出莫罗匮乏人性的一面。

莫罗认为把大批兽改造成兽人,是人类医学的创举。莫罗博士精通解剖而且谙熟生物生长法则,他认为经过组织移植,改变动物的生理化学结构,使它们能按照人类的轨迹生活,甚至可以发声说话,这种使动物人性化的做法是医学的伟大胜利。莫罗在荒岛上做出缺乏人性的科学选择:他肆意把大猩猩改造成猩猩人,把狼和猪改造成土狼猪人,把豹子改造成豹人。活体改造出来的兽人共有一百二十多个,有男兽人,也有女兽人,还有兽人的后代

——一种粉红色长腿的小动物。这些兽人饱受极为残忍的解剖和改造后，不过一年多的时间就可怜地死去。在莫罗眼中，动物不再是一种生物，而是一个问题。他漠视动物的生命与尊严，把一条条鲜活的生命变成满足他欲望的试验品，兽性因子主导莫罗做出恶的科学选择，他掠夺和伤害自然的暴行暴露出他对自然和动物缺失人性。

莫罗认为制造兽人无关伦理道德问题。多年前莫罗曾是一位声名卓著的生物学家，但因被披露试验过于残忍而无法立足，后逃离英国。当时他并不觉得自己违背了伦理道德，只是觉得伦理规范阻碍了自己的研究。后来他终于寻觅到这座荒岛，这里没有伦理规范，没有道德约束，他可以肆无忌惮地继续他的改造梦。当普伦迪克提出改造兽人有违伦理时，莫罗漠然回应：“迄今为止，我还没有为此事究竟合不合乎伦理道德标准而伤过脑筋。如果你想研究自然界，那么你就得和自然界一样不动感情”（62）<sup>③</sup>。在莫罗的世界里，只有科学，没有伦理，只有研究，没有道德。从这个角度来看，莫罗已完全无视伦理道德，制造兽人的科学选择已经不再受到伦理的约束。对于自然和动物来说，他的人性已丧失，他不再是道德意义上的人。

莫罗认为制造痛苦不是罪恶。他的活体改造给动物带来了巨大的痛苦，如美洲狮的哀嚎、兽人对“痛苦屋”的恐惧以及它们的残肢断臂，但在莫罗看来，这些并非自己的残忍和过错，而应归咎于生物体内不应该具备痛感的功能。他认为疼痛是一种无用的、早应该被进化掉的功能，如果哪个人还认为疼痛是罪恶之源，只能说明他还是动物，而非人类。为了进一步验证自己的观点，他亲手把刀插进自己的大腿，淡定地向普伦迪克展示人类不应该为疼痛而苦恼，更不需要因给动物制造痛苦而感到罪恶。冰冷的解剖刀不仅肢解了动物的肉体，也阉割了莫罗的人性。兽性因子的强大使莫罗无视自己罪恶的科学选择，他已经成为一部研究机器，对于其他生物毫无人类应该拥有的人性。

## （二）蒙哥马利的人性扭曲

伦理的人应该在道德层面上区分人与兽的差别，能够在理性的约束下做出道德的伦理选择。理性的人会自觉接受人类的伦理观念，维护伦理秩序，遵照伦理标准。一旦在伦理层面忽略了人与兽之间的界限，人就会失去理性，人性也会随之扭曲，其伦理选择就难以在道德的范围之内，这样的人也难以成为伦理意义上的人。蒙哥马利追随莫罗来到荒岛十余年，也脱离了人类社会十余年。他害怕人类，同情兽人，他选择与兽人为伴，并认为兽人比人类更值得信任，兽人的世界比人类的世界更安全。蒙哥马利的伦理选择充分说明他用兽人的伦理而非人类的伦理来指导自己的伦理选择，他的人性发生了扭曲，具体表现为以下三点：

蒙哥马利选择兽人作自己的仆人，生活中几乎与它形影不离。穆林是由熊改造而来的兽人，虽然它的外形比其他兽人更像人，但如鬃毛般的头发和

上长下短的身材，都暴露出它并非人类。尽管岛上居住着三个人，蒙哥马利还是选择终日与穆林为伴，他教穆林学习烹饪和其他家务活，高兴时还会跟它开玩笑或者抚摸它，醉酒后会踢打它或用石头打它。蒙哥马利把穆林当成了世上唯一关心他的“人”。人兽有别，蒙哥马利忽略了自己与兽人的差别，选择与兽人做主仆。他的伦理选择说明他已摒弃了人类的伦理，而接受了兽人的伦理，他已经把自己降格为兽，他的人性发生扭曲。

当兽人的世界即将不复存在时，蒙哥马利选择了自杀。蒙哥马利已经完全融入兽人世界，当听到莫罗被杀的消息时，蒙哥马利感觉到末日将至。没有莫罗，兽人将退化成兽，兽人的世界将毁灭。此时的蒙哥马利有两种选择：一是逃离荒岛，重返人间；二是兽人退化成兽之前，杀死兽人。然而蒙哥马利认为自己只适合与兽人生活，他既无法适应人类社会，又不忍心杀死兽人，最终他以自杀的方式宣告了自己对兽人世界的归属和捍卫。即便在自杀当晚，他也没有选择与普林迪克道别，而是与穆林等一些兽人一起进酒狂欢。蒙哥马利宁愿自杀，也不愿意回归人类，更不愿意伤害兽人，他的伦理选择说明他已经彻底拒绝了人类的伦理环境，把自己完全视为兽人中的一员，他已经退化成兽人。

蒙哥马利肯定兽人，否定人类。首先，蒙哥马利认同兽人的外形，不接受人类的外形，他认为人类的腿太长，前额过于突出，他不喜欢人类的长相。其次，蒙哥马利认为人类狡猾、冷酷，没有道德，他在人类身边感觉不到安全感和信任感。他认为兽人比人类单纯、可靠，兽人世界比人类世界更温暖更安全。再者，蒙哥马利对兽人充满同情，不忍心在这些由食肉动物改造过来的兽人恢复本性之前杀死它们，而对兽人杀人的事件，却显得较为宽宥。由此可见，蒙哥马利对兽人的情感超越了对人类的情感，他失去了一个正常人应该有的理性，非理性情感使蒙哥马利愿意把兽人当作自己的同类，排斥人类。蒙哥马利的伦理意识恰恰证明了他人性已扭曲。

科学选择关乎伦理，莫罗的科学选择和蒙哥马利的伦理选择告诉我们：虽然人性是人的专属属性，但是人类的人性在不同程度上是会匮乏或扭曲的。一旦人的本能欲望过于强大或者迷失了理性，理性的束缚被挣脱，人的兽性因子就会压倒人性因子占据上风，诱导人做出不道德的伦理选择。做出不道德的伦理选择的人是缺乏道德或道德水平低下的，具体表现为人性匮乏或人性扭曲。这样的人失去了道德价值，在道德意义上与兽没有区别，因此没有人性的人像兽人一样，等同于兽。

## 二、从兽到兽人：压抑天性的伪人性

经过漫长的进化，人类获得了人的形式，这是人类自然选择的结果。人类形式最重要的成果就是人的大脑。人的大脑之所以特殊，是因为人脑中存在人性因子，可以在后天的伦理环境中发展为人性。同时人的大脑也为人类



能够理性思考提供了物质基础，是人具备理性的物质前提。人类的形式给予人类理性和人性，理性和人性又能够通过伦理选择得以完善和加强。而兽的形式与人类的形式不同，最重要的差别在于大脑，兽没有人类的大脑，因此不存在拥有人性的可能，也没有伦理选择的能力。人能区分善恶，做出符合道德的伦理选择，兽不能。莫罗把兽的外形改造成兽人，虽然给兽披上了一件貌似人类的外衣，却给不了它们人类的形式和人类的大脑，也给不了它们人类的人性。这件人类的外衣不但剥夺了大自然对兽的赋予，而且伪装成人性套在兽人脖颈上，像一副枷锁压制着兽人的天性和自然属性。

兽的形式也是自然选择的结果，与它们的天性密切相关。自然赋予兽四肢着地，便于奔跑；爪子锋利，利于捕食；皮厚毛密，益于保护。然而经过莫罗的医学改造，兽的形式却被活生生地变成魔鬼一般：它们笨拙地直立行走，身长腿短，脊柱弯曲明显，双臂垂在身体两侧，头部前倾，头发粗硬蓬乱，大多只有两根手指。它们的专属表达甚至也被类似人类的“语言”代替。兽人的形式介于人与兽之间，非人非兽，即便形式上与人的形式有些相仿，但它们的动物性特征却十分明显，兽人的眼睛闪着绿光，耳朵形状怪异，鼻孔粗大，很容易被看出是来自于哪种动物。兽人并没有取得人的形式，它们既不属于人类，也不属于兽类，因此科学选择的手段并不能把兽便成人，科学选择达不到自然选择的目的。由敏捷的爬行改为踉跄的直立行走，由灵敏锋利的爪子变成残缺僵硬的手指，被篡改的外形在物质层面抹杀了它们作为兽的天性和自然属性，也血淋淋地铁证了莫罗对兽类和自然的残忍践踏。

兽人没有人类的形式，更没有人类的大脑，因此兽人的大脑里不储存人性因子，也就没有伦理意识。莫罗坚持“创造出来的生物一定要具有人性”（65），但是改造兽人的大脑很苦难，“因为这些家伙的智力过于低下，脑袋里经常有预想不到的空白”（65）。人类的形式决定人类的大脑里存在人性因子，能够通过伦理选择和伦理教诲使人性得以完善、理性得以发展，最终使人成为有道德的人。而兽人没有取得人的形式，兽人的头脑里没有人性因子，它们不懂得任何伦理观念，不具备人性和理性，更谈不上发展人性和理性。因此无论莫罗如何费尽心机地改造兽人的大脑，一旦他的手从兽人身上移开，“这些家伙的兽性就会露头，而且问题会越来越严重”（65）。兽人没有人性，它的兽性得不到理性的控制，所以兽人不可能进入伦理选择的阶段，也不可能成为真正的人，而永远只能作兽。由此可见，科学选择无法解决兽人的大脑问题，这说明科学选择除无法代替自然选择之外，也无法代替伦理选择。

除了科学选择，莫罗还试图采取伦理教诲的方式培养兽人的人性，结果也是徒劳无功。模仿人类的伦理教诲，莫罗给兽人空白的头脑中灌输伦理思想：“不准用四肢在地上爬 [……] 不准吃肉和鱼 [……] 不准抓树皮 [……] 不准追其他人；这就是法律。难道我们不是人吗？”（47）这段“法律”表

明莫罗想通过伦理教诲抹去兽的天性和本能，强制它们像人类进行伦理选择，但并没有起到预期的效果。兽人的大脑里没有人性因子，理解不了“四肢行走”、“吃肉和鱼”、“抓树皮”、“追赶他人”是非人性的。兽人也没有理性，无法理性地区分哪些行为属于兽，哪些行为属于人。它们机械地服从“法律”、压抑本能，并不是因为它们想做人，不想做兽，而是因为它们本能地害怕违反法律会重新接受莫罗的改造或直接被杀死。虽然兽人“古老的本能”“同莫罗的戒律发生冲突”（68），但伦理教诲并没有扼制住兽性，兽人没有习得丝毫的人性和理性，它们不久仍然会固态重演。兽人没有人性因子，它们不具备伦理教诲的基础，因而再多的伦理教诲也是无济于事的。

兽人是兽，不是人。兽没有人的形式，没有获得人类的大脑，因此它们不具备人性，不懂得伦理道德，因而无法进入伦理选择的环节。即使兽有兽的伦理，但这种伦理是建立在本能或意识基础上的，与人类建立在理性基础上的伦理道德是有本质区别的。兽人理解不了人类的伦理道德，它们的行为选择不属于人类伦理选择的范畴。即便莫罗为兽人编造了一个类似人类的伦理环境，制定了伦理制度和法律，实施伦理教诲，但兽人终究是兽，其内心的兽性得不到理性的控制，无法转化为人性，兽人注定会退化成兽，而永远无法成为人类。这也说明科学选择代替不了自然选择和伦理选择，再强悍的科技也无法挑战自然界的底线，大自然的尊严是人类不能也不应该藐视的。莫罗科学选择的兽人在真实的兽性和虚幻的人性之间充满矛盾和痛苦，明明是兽，却要苦苦压抑天性，学着做它们难以理解的人。显然，从兽到兽人，虚伪的人性压抑着兽人，成为它们的痛苦之源。

### 三、伦理环境中的人与兽人

莫罗的科学选择无法僭越自然选择和伦理选择，做不到把兽改造为真正的人，让兽人像人一样明辨善恶。所以说，人就是人，兽就是兽，大自然给人和兽设置了不可逾越的差别：即人有人性，即便有些人的人性有时会匮乏或扭曲，但人不会退化成兽。兽人不是人，是兽。兽只有兽性，没有人性，即便强行进行伦理教诲也是无果的，兽人最终还是会退化成兽。伦理教诲能够使人的天性日臻完善，却不能使兽拥有人性，伦理教诲只能暂时压抑兽的本性和兽性。无论是人，还是兽，都在一定的伦理环境中生存，人有人的伦理标准，兽有兽的伦理秩序。人的伦理强调无害或利他，表现为符合道德的伦理选择；兽的伦理强调利己，表现为弱肉强食。小说先后在荒岛和人类社会两个伦理环境中将人和兽人交集在一起，其中蕴含的伦理深意值得思考。

#### （一）荒岛伦理环境中的人与兽人

荒岛上人迹罕至，本无人性的伦理道德，但是莫罗却在岛上制定了类似人类社会的伦理秩序：他要求兽人像人一样生活，遵守“法律”，对莫罗顶礼膜拜，违者将被无情地处决。莫罗是创造者，兽人是被创造者；莫罗是统

治者，兽人是被统治者，莫罗是伦理秩序的权威，也是伦理秩序的缔造者和捍卫者，他掌控着兽人的生杀大权。在荒岛这个伦理环境中，莫罗是强者，兽人是弱者，弱者任凭强者统治和宰割，说到底这种伦理是弱肉强食的伦理，莫罗是用兽的伦理来保障人的伦理的实施，这是荒谬的。荒岛上人与兽人之间遵循的伦理，表面上是类似人的伦理，实际上是兽的伦理。

莫罗的科学选择是反自然、反人类的，在荒岛上他毫无人性地制造没有人性的兽人，使人性在这座荒岛上变异、消逝。自然界创造的各种生物都保留着与其他物种不同的特质，但莫罗妄想凭借现代科技篡改自然的定律，消除兽与人的差距。莫罗的科学选择不但违背了自然规律，更荼毒了无辜的兽。他不仅践踏了大自然的规律，还剥夺了兽的生命和尊严。莫罗作为剥削者是没有人性的，他做出改造兽人的科学选择是恶的，失去人性的莫罗像兽一样活着，等同于兽人。莫罗最终也为自己的伦理选择付出了生命的代价，得到了大自然的惩罚和兽的报复，他的惨痛代价也足以警醒世人。

## （二）人类伦理环境中的人与兽人

在人类的伦理环境中，人具有道德属性，伦理标准要求人要有道德、有人性。如果人失去人性，那么人的形式如同虚设，人就如同兽一般。当普伦迪克漂洋过海、重返人类社会后，他知道身边的人类“是有理智而永远不会退化的人。他们充满人类的欲望和温柔的感情，已经摆脱了动物的本能，与那些兽人有着根本的区别”（111）。但是普伦迪克却越来越清楚地意识到身边的人就像半人半兽的兽人一样，普伦迪克的这种看似混乱的意识隐藏着浓厚的伦理寓意。

小说中描写的那个时代，资本主义迅猛发展引发社会伦理失衡，利益驱动下的人类被分为剥削者和被剥削者，无论是没有人性的剥削者，还是人性扭曲的被剥削者，都活得不像人，不伦不类，如同兽人。经历荒岛之劫的普伦迪克警觉地找到了兽人与被剥削者之间关联：疲倦的工人目光厌倦，就像滴血的鹿；教堂里的神甫也像兽人一样在重复着“重要思想”（112）；图书馆里埋头苦读的人就像咏诵“法律”的兽人；甚至普伦迪克认为自己也是一个备受摧残的动物。荒岛的伦理环境其实是那个时代人类伦理环境的缩影，莫罗如同那些剥削者一样残暴，广大被剥削者像荒岛上被改造的兽人一样悲惨、无奈。普伦迪克清醒地意识到，如同在荒岛上，人性在人类社会中也一样在慢慢荒芜，这是他所处时代的痼疾，但他却无力纠正，只能顺应，所以觉得自己也像兽人一样浑浑噩噩地度日。

小说结尾处，普伦迪克对人类社会感觉无比绝望之时，却找到了栖身之法，那就是躲在僻静处所与书为伴，哲人的智慧为普伦迪克建立了一座人性之岛。人性不是天生的，是经过后天的伦理教诲获得的，而书是很好的教诲方式。书让普伦迪克明白“事物的根本规律和永存的法则存在于宇宙中，而不存在于琐屑的日常生活中。我们心中超越兽性的部分在它之中找到了安慰

和希望”（112）。超越兽性的部分就是人性和理性，普伦迪克在书本中找到了理性和人性，理性和人性能压制兽性因子，使人做出符合道德的伦理选择。如果人人都能顺应伦理法则，增强理性，弃恶从善，做有人性的人，那么人类就会找到灵魂栖息之所。

《莫罗博士岛》这部小说写于英国维多利亚时代，那时经济高歌猛进的同时，人与人、人与自然以及人与科技之间的伦理关系出现了畸形发展。为了满足个人的欲望，有的人对同类压迫、有的人对自然剥夺、有的人对科学褻渎，这些人藐视伦理，破坏伦理，做出违背道德的伦理选择和科学选择。人一旦失去人性，等同于兽。如果大多数人的生活得像兽一样，那么人类社会的未来将极为堪忧。作者威尔斯是一位有社会良知的作家，面对当时社会正退变成人性荒岛的症结，威尔斯通过小说人物的命运表达了自己的伦理思想：普伦迪克的幸存渗透着作者对人类与科学以及自然的伦理取向，莫罗和蒙哥马利的死亡暗含着作者对人类社会的伦理乱象的深恶痛绝和困惑无奈。普伦迪克从书中找到灵魂慰藉也反映出作者对新的伦理秩序的诉求和渴望。作者通过小说暗示：书是人类获得伦理教诲的途径，只有人类从书本中获得理性和人性，人类社会的前途才会令人憧憬。

### 【Notes】

①②参见聂珍钊：“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）：16。

③本文相关引文均出自威尔斯：《莫罗博士的岛》，袁德成 袁静好译（四川：四川出版集团 / 四川人民出版社，2005 年）。以下只标出页码，不再一一说明。

### 【Works Cited】

Clayton, Jay. “Victorian Chimeras, or, What Literature Can Contribute to Genetics Policy Today, New Literary History.” *Biocultures* 3 (2007): 569-91.

Gillie, Christopher. *Longman Companion to English Literature*. London: Longman Group Limited, 1978.

Glendening, John. “‘Green Confusion’: Evolution and Entanglement in H. G. Wells’s ‘The Island of Doctor Moreau’.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 30.2 (2002): 571-97.

侯维瑞 李维屏：《英国小说史》。南京：译林出版社，2005 年。

[Hou Weirui and Li Weiping. *History of English Fiction*. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2005.]

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.]

Vint, Sherryl. "Animals and Animality from the Island of Moreau to the Uplift Universe." *The Yearbook of English Studies: Science Fiction* 37.2 (2007): 85-102.

王晓惠：“《隐身人》中的意志分析”，《外国文学研究》3（2015）：80-86。

[Wang Xiaohui. "Studies on Wills in *The Invisible Man*." *Foreign Literature Studies* 3(2015):80-86.]

王一平：“反乌托邦小说的科技伦理反思与吁求”，《外语教学》4（2013）：78-83。

[Wang Yiping. "Ethics Appealing of Science and Technology in Anti-utopian Fictions." *Foreign Language Education* 4 (2013):78-83.]

Wells, H. G.. Preface. *Seven Famous Novels*. New York: Knopf, 1934. vii-x.

肖明翰：“英美文学中的哥特传统”，《外国文学评论》2（2001）：90-101。

[Xiao Minghan. "The Tradition of Goth in British and American Literature." *Foreign Literature Review* 2 (2001):90-101.]

责任编辑：何 年

# 爱德华·阿尔比戏剧中的伦理悖论

## On the Ethical Paradox in Edward Albee's Plays

张连桥 (Zhang Lianqiao)

**内容摘要:** 爱德华·阿尔比通过极端地书写有关家庭生活的矛盾, 探讨有关忠诚、背叛、隔离、虐待等伦理问题, 而这些伦理问题往往以悖论的方式展现。伦理悖论是阿尔比戏剧中伦理问题的核心。其一, 在阿尔比戏剧中, 伦理悖论作为一种价值判断, 不同的作品有着不同的伦理悖论, 其所表达的价值意义也有所不同。其二, 阿尔比戏剧中的伦理悖论源自于戏剧人物面临伦理矛盾时所作出的伦理选择, 没有伦理选择就没有伦理悖论, 伦理悖论是伦理选择的结果。其三, 阿尔比戏剧中伦理悖论的解决取决于“伦理结”是如何解开的, 在戏剧人物伦理选择的过程中, 伴随着伦理矛盾或化解、转移或终结, 伦理悖论最终都得到了解决。总之, 阿尔比在其戏剧作品中精心设置各种伦理悖论, 体现剧作家对美国转型时期有关婚恋、家庭与性爱问题的反思与批判。

**关键词:** 文学伦理学批评; 爱德华·阿尔比; 伦理悖论

**作者介绍:** 张连桥, 江苏师范大学文学院副教授, 主要从事文学伦理学批评与欧美文学研究。本文系浙江省社科规划课题“爱德华·阿尔比戏剧诗学研究”【项目批号: 15NDJC072YB】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** On the Ethical Paradox in Edward Albee's Plays

**Abstract:** As an outstanding contemporary playwright and theater director, Edward Albee focuses on describing contemporary American family life, addressing the ethical issues of loyalty, betrayal, and isolation. These issues are often present in the form of ethical paradox. This paper holds that ethical paradox is at the core of the ethical issues in Edward Albee's plays. First, ethical paradox is a kind of value judgment. There are different ethical paradoxes in different works, and their ethical values vary. Second, as the result of ethical choice, ethical paradox derives from the ethical choice of characters when facing ethical contradiction. Third, the solution to ethical paradox depends on the solution to ethical knots. In the process of characters' choice, ethical paradox is resolved eventually. Edward Albee carefully sets up various ethical paradoxes in his works, which shows the playwright's

reflection on and judgment about the American family problems during the period of transition. Employing the method of Ethical Literary Criticism, this paper aims to mourn and memorialize Edward Albee by studying the ethical paradoxes in his drama.

**Key words:** Ethical Literary Criticism; Edward Albee; ethical paradox

**Author: Zhang Lianqiao** is Associate Professor at the School of Chinese Language and Literature in Jiangsu Normal University (Xuzhou 221116, China). His major research fields are Ethical Literary Criticism and European and American literature. Email: lianqiaozhang@qq.com

2016年9月16日,当代美国剧作家、戏剧导演爱德华·阿尔比(Edward Albee)在纽约家中与世长辞,享年88岁。阿尔比生前唯一授权出版的传记《奇异之旅——爱德华·阿尔比的传奇人生》中有这样的论断:“通过阿尔比的戏剧,人们能看到他如何塑造戏剧人物的,以及能理解为什么他就是阿尔比,以及他为何成为一个剧作家的原因”(Gussow 16)。同时,美国学者拉凯什·赫勒尔德·所罗门(Rakesh Herald Solomon)通过访谈、实录等方式与阿尔比保持密切联系三十余年,对阿尔比的戏剧观念和导演才能进行全方位记录和评价,推出《舞台上的阿尔比》(*Albee in Performance*)并获阿尔比亲自撰的写序言。通过该书可以看到阿尔比作为一个导演开创的独特风格:

“阿尔比把各种导演方法糅合在一起,熟练地使用各种表演术语,能有效地给演员提供精确的指导、实用的建议、专业的诊断、安全感,以及相当多的创造空间”(Solomon 192)。鉴于阿尔比的杰出贡献,肯尼迪中心于1996年授予阿尔比“国家艺术勋章奖”,克林顿总统在颁奖仪式上高度评价阿尔比:“今晚我们的国家——在反叛中重生的国家——高度赞美你,爱德华·阿尔比。在你的反叛中,美国戏剧获得重生”(qtd. in Gussow 385)。阿尔比通过描写一幅幅荒诞不经的家庭生活图景,力图探讨有关忠诚、背叛、隔离、谋杀、虐待、逃避、自杀等伦理问题,以此实现对现代社会、家庭与个人的伦理反思。

“伦理问题即文学作品中出现的各种导致矛盾冲突的因素,伦理问题体现的是伦理矛盾或伦理冲突,总是同伦理结联系在一起”(聂珍钊 266)。有趣的是,阿尔比戏剧中的伦理问题往往以悖论的方式呈现,“伦理悖论”(ethical paradox)是阿尔比戏剧中伦理问题的核心构成。在阿尔比戏剧中,伦理悖论体现着一种价值判断,往往源自于戏剧人物所面临的伦理矛盾,而不同的矛盾可能导致不同的悖论,有着不同的价值取向,是戏剧人物伦理选择的结果,而最终伦理悖论的解决同样取决于戏剧人物的伦理选择,随着“伦理结”的解开,伦理悖论也随即化解、转移或终结。

伦理悖论是文学伦理学批评的重要术语之一，“指的是在同一条件下相同选择出现的两种在伦理上相互矛盾的结果”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》254）。伦理悖论由伦理矛盾所引发，是伦理问题的重要构成，诸如伦理设问、伦理诘问、伦理冲突等都是伦理问题的表现形式。不同于伦理学、政治学、社会学等领域所研究的逻辑悖论，伦理悖论的形式和特征都有所不同，在文学伦理学批评实践过程中，不同的文学作品中可能生成不同的伦理悖论，不同的伦理悖论又有着不同的“伦理结”（ethical knots）。“伦理悖论不同于逻辑悖论，它是一种价值判断而不是逻辑推理”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：新的文学批评选择”16）。伦理悖论以价值判断为出发点，而逻辑悖论以逻辑推演为出发点。在文学作品中，作为一种价值取向，通常表现为“该与不该”、“对与不对”、“会与不会”、“成与不成”、“值与不值”等相互矛盾的结果。

在爱德华·阿尔比戏剧中存在着大量的伦理悖论，对伦理悖论的研究是理解阿尔比戏剧的一把“钥匙”。他的早期作品《动物园的故事》（*The Zoo Story*, 1958）就是一部有关伦理悖论的悲剧。剧中主人公杰瑞由于先后遭遇三次伦理变故：其母亲参加巡回通奸活动因过度纵欲而猝死在阴沟里；其父因此倒在公交车前轮底下自杀身亡；年幼的杰瑞后被寄养在其姑妈家，但其姑母终日沉默寡言，后猝死在楼梯上。失去亲人的杰瑞沦落为流浪汉，居无定所，举目无亲。作为阿尔比的成名作，该剧往往被解读为美国式的“荒诞派”戏剧，其首次在美国演出时因与贝克特的剧作《克拉帕最后的一盘磁带》（*Krupp's Last Tape*, 1958）同台演出引发广泛关注。“作为贝克特的追随者，阿尔比开始创作有别于美国家庭民间传统的戏剧”（King 10）。作为一部独幕剧，《动物园的故事》情节简单、结构明了：杰瑞在公园里四处晃荡，与正在享受午后时光的彼得搭讪，剧本围绕着杰瑞向彼得讲述有关“动物园的故事”而展开。第一个故事是“杰瑞与狗”的故事，而第二个故事则是“杰瑞与彼得”的故事。

有趣的是，这两个故事都存在着伦理悖论。在第一个故事中，杰瑞讲述自己因长期缺乏与他人沟通的机会，而把邻居黑狗的狂叫当做知音的“礼遇”，杰瑞由此对黑狗感激无比，甚至经常去店里购买牛排“款待”黑狗。然而，由于黑狗有一阵突然对杰瑞“不予理睬”，这在杰瑞看来是一种难以承受的“背叛”。杰瑞居然决定杀死黑狗以“报复”黑狗的“欺骗”。在实施报复计划之后，他先是无比担心黑狗的生死，甚至要和黑狗一起死去，由于抢救及时，黑狗“大难不死”，他又悲喜交加，原谅了黑狗。“我们怀着既悲伤又猜疑的复杂心情相互凝视着，然后我们假装漠不关心。我们安全地从对方身旁走过；我们之间达成了谅解”。<sup>①</sup>对于杰瑞来说，“溺狗”和“杀狗”之间存在着伦理悖论：



一方面，由于杰瑞长期生活在孤寂的世界里，杰瑞把黑狗当做自己唯一的朋友，与黑狗的交流 and 接触成为他生活的一部分，这是可以理解的；另一方面，杰瑞错把狗当做人类看待，认为黑狗的“不予理睬”是莫大的“背叛与欺骗”于是决定杀之，这又是不可理解的。同样，在第二个故事里，杰瑞与彼得进行了简单的交流，由于杰瑞制造了“凳子风波”，两人发生了冲突，最终以杰瑞自杀而结束。杰瑞的自杀又是一个伦理悖论：一方面杰瑞渴望交流与分享，与彼得之间并无仇恨，通过努力实现了交流与分享，这是一种积极求生的表现；另一方面杰瑞所声称的有关“动物园”的故事就是有一个流浪汉自杀身亡的故事，这又是一种有预谋的求死的结果。

在阿尔比的晚期作品《山羊，或谁是西尔维娅？》（*The Goat or Who is Sylvia?*, 2002）中：主人公马汀年近五十，与其妻子史蒂维一起白手起家，他们长期被人赞颂为模范夫妻（model couple），是朋友眼中幸福的家庭；在事业上更是如日中天，作为建筑师，成为最年轻的“普利兹克奖”（Pritzker Prize）获得者，被选为“世界之城”的设计师，价值两万亿美元“梦想之城”即将在他手下诞生。然而，正是这样一个德高望重的建筑师，做出了与其身份严重不相符合的行为，引发家庭矛盾。马汀向其好友袒露，他不可抑制地爱上了一只被他唤为“西尔维娅”的雌性山羊，并与之发生了长达六个月的媾和关系。马汀口中关于忠贞与背叛的说法存在着伦理悖论：一方面，马汀口口声声说自己如何爱自己的妻子，以及他们夫妻之间从未彼此背叛过对方，马汀辩护说自己如何努力工作都是为了这个家，为了让她的妻子过上更好的生活；另一方面，马汀深深地爱上了郊区的山羊，并向其妻子解释山羊的眼神如何“纯洁”、“清澈”和“天真”，就像当初第一次见到他的妻子那样印象深刻，难以忘怀，最终与这只山羊发生他感到一种“联系”、“交流”和“顿悟”的性爱关系。需要说明的是，伦理悖论和乱伦是截然不同的。马汀声称爱上山羊与爱上其妻子是一样的，目的是为了缓和与其妻子之间的矛盾，从其声称的忠诚与欺骗的矛盾性来看，这是一种伦理悖论；但由于马汀与山羊之间的媾和违背了伦理，人兽“通奸”的行为又是一种乱伦。马汀与山羊之间的人兽僭越破坏了马汀与其妻子之间的伦理秩序，马汀所声称对其妻子的“忠诚”早已不复存在。在阿尔比戏剧中，出现了大量不同类型的伦理悖论，都涉及到主人公伦理选择的问题，都是戏剧人物在特定的伦理环境下进行伦理选择的结果。

## 二

文学伦理学批评强调，文学作品中人物形象的伦理悖论，源自于人物形象面临伦理矛盾时所作出的伦理选择，而其伦理选择的前提是基于伦理身份，“伦理身份的自我确认是伦理选择的逻辑起点”（聂珍钊，“经典与阐释：二十世纪欧美戏剧的文学伦理学批评”6），因为伦理身份与伦理责任与伦理

义务相联系,同时人物形象的伦理身份又与其所处的伦理环境密切相关。文学伦理学批评之所以强调在特定的伦理环境中去分析和评价文学作品,是因为不同的文学作品中具有不同的伦理环境,而不同的伦理环境之下的伦理矛盾自然也各有不同。“伦理悖论要在特定的伦理环境或语境中经过伦理选择才能产生。伦理悖论往往是伦理选择的结果,没有选择即没有悖论”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》255)。换句话说,伦理悖论取决于伦理选择,伦理悖论一定是伦理选择的结果,但不是所有的伦理选择都会导致伦理悖论。由于文学作品中的人物形象面临着不同的伦理矛盾,必然要做出不同的伦理选择,有的伦理选择让主人公陷入伦理困境(ethical predicament),甚至伦理两难(ethical dilemma),也就是伦理悖论。“伦理两难由两个道德命题构成,如果选择者对它们各自单独地做出道德判断,每一个选择都是正确的,并且每一种选择都符合普遍道德原则。但是,一旦选择者在二者之间做出一项选择,就会导致另一项违背伦理,即违背普遍道德原则”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评导论》262)。因此,伦理悖论的生成与伦理选择联系在一起,由于文学作品中人物形象所面临的伦理矛盾的不同,其伦理选择的过程与结果也各有差异,正是这些千差万别的伦理选择,才能让我们从不同的文学作品中获得不同的道德启示。

在《动物园的故事》中,杰瑞面临的伦理矛盾就是作为一个流浪汉,始终无法获得正常的人际交往、社会参与等,更谈不上结婚生子,享受天伦之乐。一言以蔽之,他是一个被社会遗弃的个体。正如他自己所说:“我是一个永远的过客,我的家在纽约市曼哈顿西区一个令人恶心的寄宿公寓里,而纽约是世界上最大的城市。阿门。”<sup>②</sup>因此,杰瑞渴望交流、渴望表达,对亲情、对友情和爱情同样心怀憧憬。造成杰瑞生活支离破碎的现实,主要源自于他所遭受到的伦理变故。杰瑞作为流浪汉的伦理身份既是他伦理选择的前提,也是他伦理选择的结果。当然,杰瑞沦落为流浪汉主要与其孤儿身份有关,而其孤儿的伦理身份是其父母伦理选择的结果:其母亲放弃了母亲的伦理责任与伦理义务而选择抛夫弃子,并导致其丈夫放弃养育杰瑞而选择自杀身亡。说到底,杰瑞甘愿做一个流浪汉,还是因为其理性意志被兽性意志所主导,放任自流而已。“在文学作品中,斯芬克斯因子的不同组合导致文学作品中人物的行为和性格复杂化。斯芬克斯因子的不同变化导致不同的伦理冲突,体现出不同的道德教诲价值”(聂珍钊,“文学伦理学批评:人性概念的阐释与考辨”15)。不过杰瑞实施“杀狗”之后所表现出的悔恨与自责说明杰瑞“与狗为友”但并未与“与狗同类”,他身上的人性因子依旧在发挥作用。因此,杰瑞“溺狗”与“杀狗”之间的伦理悖论正是他伦理选择的结果。同时,杰瑞积极地寻找交流的机会、处心积虑地求死的悖论也是其伦理选择的结果。

在《山羊,或谁是西尔维娅?》中,主人公马汀在山羊与其妻子之间的伦理悖论同样是其伦理选择的结果。按理,功成名就的马汀不应该做出如此

有违其身份和地位的行为。根据马汀的讲述，为了减轻工作上和家庭上的压力，他非常常到郊区山顶看风景，站得高，看得远。而正是在这样站在高处的时间里，他才遇到了“西尔维娅”，并最终被“西尔维娅”所征服。作为一流的建筑师，马汀在工作和生活中有机会让自己沉醉于各种“风景”之中，金钱、美色都可以比常人更容易获得。马汀伦理选择的过程正是人性因子与兽性因子相互博弈的过程。文学伦理学批评指出，“一个人一旦听凭原始本能的驱使，在理性基础上建立起来的各种道德规范就会被摧毁，人又将回到兽的时代，这不仅不是人性的解放，而是人性的迷失”（聂珍钊，“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”19）。

然而，在马汀看来，他的行为是为了更好地处理他们夫妻之间的关系，他声称依旧爱着他的妻子，依然对其妻子忠诚如初。他之所以情不自禁地爱上山羊是因为他希望借助“人兽恋”（bestiality）解决他的压力和他与妻子之间的矛盾。阿尔比也“成为百老汇舞台上第一个提供‘兽恋症’‘同情疗法’（sympathetic treatment）的剧作家”（Bottoms 1）。马汀袒露，他曾经参加过一个名叫“特别理疗会所”（peculiar therapy session）的秘密小组，参加的人都分享了自己通过“人兽恋”得到了康复或痊愈。因此，马汀辩解，爱上山羊和爱上妻子一样，甚至与山羊的媾和让他找回与妻子新婚之夜的感觉。在马汀看来，他与山羊之间的关系是那么的自然、那么的融洽，就像是在与另一个史蒂维在一起。马汀表示，通过与山羊在一起，他更加爱他的妻子史蒂维。如此荒谬的论断在马汀看来却是合情合理的选择。如果马汀爱上的不是一只山羊，而是一个名字叫“西尔维娅”的女子，马汀会作何解释？或者说，“西尔维娅”根本就不是一只山羊，亦或不是一个女人，而是象征着其他的美好事物，一种在现实生活中祈求不到的美好事物，这也许就是阿尔比要探讨的话题。但是就马汀与山羊之间的纠葛而言，说到底，这样的伦理悖论恰恰是马汀伦理选择的结果。多年以来马汀恪守道德规范，努力工作，提升自己，这是人性因子发挥作用下积极的伦理选择；当马汀功成名就之后，却因为放任自己的欲望，竟然与一只山羊发生不洁关系，这是自由意志失控的表现，是兽性因子发挥作用下消极的伦理选择。

### 三

文学伦理学批评认为，研究伦理悖论关键在于形成伦理悖论的“伦理结”是如何解开的，不同的伦理悖论会产生不同的伦理结，伦理结解开的过程同时也是伦理选择的过程。“由于悖论导致的是两个相互对立的选择结果，因此悖论进入伦理选择的过程后即转变为伦理两难。逻辑悖论是绝对的，无法解决的，而伦理悖论不是绝对的，无论结果怎样，往往最终都得到了解决”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》255）。伦理悖论之所以最后得到了解决，是因为在文学作品中随着人物关系的变化，形成伦理悖论的伦理矛盾或化解、

转移或终结了：有的伦理矛盾随着人物伦理关系的变化便迎刃而解，有的伦理矛盾因为人物关系的变化而发生了转移，最终得到了圆满的解决或生成了新的矛盾，有的伦理矛盾则难以解决而是伴随着人物形象的死亡而终结，人物形象的死亡意味着伦理选择的完成，而伦理悖论自然也就终结。“在文学作品中，由于悖论是可以解决的，无论解决的结果如何，都能给读者带来有益的思考和道德启示。正是因为这一特点，文学作品中的悖论才具有伦理价值”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》255-256）。无论结局如何，伦理悖论因为解决的方式不同、解决的效果不一样，文学作品才因此丰富多彩。

在《动物园的故事》中，伦理悖论的生成源自于杰瑞的伦理选择，而最终伦理悖论的解决伴随着杰瑞“自杀身亡”的伦理选择而结束。在古希腊神话中，斯芬克斯的“自杀身亡”同样是一个有启发意义的伦理悖论：一方面，作为“人兽狮身”的斯芬克斯，吃人的行为说明她与动物无异，不能分辨善恶，但她设下的谜语又说明她在思考何为“人”；当她知道关于何为“人”的答案之后，她毅然跳下悬崖自杀身亡。可以说，斯芬克斯用最后的死来证明了自己的伦理存在，完成了自己的伦理选择。同样，杰瑞积极地寻求交流的机会，但作为流浪汉的他要找到这样的机会是如此困难，以至于他要用处心积虑地赢得彼得的回应，完成一次真实、友好的交流。杰瑞开始与彼得搭讪便要告诉彼得“一个动物园的故事”，并多次提及这一点，但却不告诉具体的故事内容，目的是吸引彼得的关注和回应。同时，杰瑞告诉彼得：“如果今晚你在电视上看不到有关动物园的消息，你明天会在报纸上读到。”<sup>③</sup>这意味着杰瑞存心求死，因为他别无选择。值得提及的是，杰瑞求死同样是其人性因子发挥作用的结果，是其经过深思熟虑后的伦理抉择，因为死亡对他来说是摆脱现实困境的最后选择。

相反，在《山羊，或谁是西尔维娅？》中，马汀作为一个成功人士，无论他遇到了多大的工作压力和家庭压力，他完全可以选择其它方式排解，诸如体育项目、艺术鉴赏等，但他的选择却是与一只山羊在一起，这不比选择一个名叫“西尔维娅”的真实女人带给他妻子的伤害要少。实际上，无论马汀如何强调他陷入伦理困境以及在山羊与史蒂维之间如何难以抉择，都掩盖不了他与山羊之间所谓的纠葛其实是人兽关系的僭越。正如史蒂维所说：“你占到便宜，从这个……动物的身上！？你……强奸了这个……动物，却劝服自己那一切都是因为爱情？”<sup>④</sup>最终，马汀的妻子史蒂维找到郊区的那只山羊，亲手杀死后扔在马汀面前。对于马汀夫妇而言，马汀因为自己错误的伦理选择造成了伦理悖论，而史蒂维用她自己的伦理选择终结了这种悖论。“深深痛苦的感觉和绝望的共鸣通过马汀的忏悔场景和史蒂维的宣称展现出来，而伤痛不可能弥合”（Dircks 64）。兴许马汀夫妇之间会发生新的矛盾，甚至仇恨，但他们之间的关系会如何演变这已经不是阿尔比想要继续探讨的问题。

在阿尔比戏剧作品中，类似的伦理悖论随着主人公的伦理选择而终结的

例子有不少, 比如《欲望花园》(*Everything in the Garden*, 1967) 中, 理查德得知家里的“意外之财”乃是其妻子到会所做妓女所换来的, 一开始他无比愤怒, 伤心欲绝, 但后来却理所当然地享受这金钱, 最终被金钱所俘虏, 甚至为了维持这种虚弱和满足竟失去理性杀死了可能走漏风声的来访者, 最终沦落为阶下囚。在《三臂人》(*The Man Who Had Three Arms*, 1981) 中, 主人公突然有一天长出第三只手臂, 一开始他异常恐慌, 感觉末日来临, 但在经纪人的炒作下他成为了轰动一时的名人并开始全国巡回表演, 四处敛财; 然而好景不长, 这第三只手臂后来慢慢消失了, 其妻子与之离婚, 经纪人也抛弃了他, 经过一夜暴富的生活后他彻底失去了自我。同样, 在《美国梦》(*The American Dream*, 1960) 里, 剧中主人公因为结婚多年没有孩子, 经过多方周折终于领养了一个小孩, 但这夫妇却因为忍受不了孩子正常的哭叫竟然下毒手脚解了小孩。在《谁害怕弗吉尼亚·伍尔夫?》中, 乔治和玛莎结婚多年膝下无子, 于是两人默契地编造他们有自己的儿子谎言, 对来访者声称儿子在外念大学。但乔治为了报复玛莎与来访者尼克发生关系, 又编造了新的谎言, 声称有人送报来, 报纸上登载了其儿子因车祸身亡的消息, 终止了这个悖论的谎言。

纵观阿尔比戏剧创作的一生, 各种不同的伦理悖论几乎贯穿于他的所有作品之中, 这实际上体现了阿尔比对当代美国社会的忧虑: 由于伦理环境的复杂多变, 传统伦理价值观遭遇到抵抗和消解, 而新的普适性的伦理体系尚未形成, 因而各种伦理危机频频爆发, 在家庭生活领域尤其如此。为什么阿尔比要在其戏剧作品中描写这么多有关家庭生活的伦理悖论? 因为“阿尔比创作的戏剧始终关注着伦理身份, 不断从身份的立场探讨人物的伦理选择问题。”<sup>⑤</sup>这些伦理悖论的产生都与主人公的身份密切相关, 并通过主人公的伦理选择解开伦理悖论的伦理结。美国现代戏剧自尤金·奥尼尔以来都非常关注家庭生活题材, 一方面迎合了美国现代戏剧发展的需要, 另一方面美国现代社会尤其是二战以后充满着种种不可理解的悖论, 而这些千奇百怪的悖论又构成了美国生活的重要组成部分。阿尔比作为美国当代杰出的戏剧家, 他的作品诠释了自古希腊以来有关悲剧的最新含义, 他通过戏剧创作, 戳穿了美国式家庭生活的“谎言”。

### 【Notes】

①②③ See Edward Albee, *The Collected Plays of Edward Albee*, vol. 1 (New York: Overlook Press, 2005) 31, 32, 17.

④ See Edward Albee. *The Collected Plays of Edward Albee* (vol. 3, 1979-2003)(New York: Overlook Press, 2005)603.

⑤参见聂珍钊：“序言”，《身份困惑与伦理选择——爱德华·阿尔比戏剧研究》，张连桥著（北京：科学出版社，2016年）4。

### 【Works Cited】

- Bottoms, Stephen ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Edward Albee*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2005.
- Dircks, Phyllis T.. *Edward Albee: A Literary Companion*. Jefferson, N.C.: McFarland & Co., 2010.
- Gussow, Mel. *Edward Albee: A Singular Journey: A Biography*. N.Y.: Simon & Schuster, 1999.
- King, Kimball. *Ten Modern American Playwrights: An Annotated Bibliography*. New York: Garland Pub., 1982.
- 聂珍钊：“经典与阐释：二十世纪欧美戏剧的文学伦理学批评”，《浙江工商大学学报》4(2016): 5-7。
- [Nie Zhenzhao. “Classics and Interpretation: Ethical Literary Criticism of American and European Drama in the Twentieth Century.” *Journal of Zhejiang Gongshang University* 4 (2016): 5-7.]
- ：“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 Studies* 6(2015): 10-19. ]
- ：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”，《外国文学研究》1(2010): 12-22。
- [---. “Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2010): 12-22.]
- ：“文学伦理学批评：新的文学批评选择”，《哲学与文化》（台湾）4(2015):5-19。
- [---. “Ethical Literary Criticism: A New Choice of Literary Criticism.” *Philosophy and Culture* 4(2015): 5-19. ]
- ：《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, 2014.]
- Solomon, Rakesh H. *Albee in Performance*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2010.

责任编辑：章 柳

# 伦理、情感和历史的关系：论《天使在美国》中的非自然叙事

## The Interplay of Ethics, Emotion and History: Unnatural Narrative in *Angels in America*

郑 杰 (Zheng Jie)

**内容摘要：**无论是历史背景设置、人物设定还是戏剧主题，美国当代剧作家托尼·库什纳的戏剧《天使在美国》似乎延续了文学现实主义传统，直面美国 20 世纪 80 年代艾滋病疫情的爆发这一社会问题以及在同性恋团体内部乃至整个社会所引发的相关伦理、政治、宗教问题。然而，戏剧的现实主义题材和形式上“非自然叙事”的交织无疑向读者/观众提出了极大的挑战。反模拟 (antimimetic) 的戏剧叙事结构促使我们思考如下问题：在后现代语境中，作家如何探索超乎当前认知限度的“伦理身份”和“伦理情感”？而在这一过程中，如何在重新定义的伦理关系中确立道德价值体系和情感关系？笔者认为，通过戏剧中不可能场景的设置，库什纳在探讨伦理身份和情感问题时，最终指向的是伦理和历史的关系，即从伦理的角度来解释历史。普莱尔和鬼魂艾塞尔在非自然叙事中伦理身份的转换和伦理情感的认知，使他们从被历史控制和压抑的客体变成了主动改变历史轨迹的主体。

**关键词：**非自然叙事；伦理身份；伦理情感；认知；《天使在美国》

**作者简介：**郑杰，广东外语外贸大学副教授，主要研究领域为现当代戏剧和文学理论。

**Title:** The Interplay of Ethics, Emotion and History: Unnatural Narrative in *Angels in America*

**Abstract:** Set in 1986 at the height of the AIDS epidemic, the disintegration of communism, and the unraveling of Reaganism, *Angels in America* by Tony Kushner is a play that raises moral questions. It is a play that asks questions about the nature and extent of our responsibility to others, about the meaning of human progress and about the links between ethics and history. The article aims to demonstrate how the notions of ethical identity and ethical emotion are reconfigured in the “unnatural narrative,” and furthermore, to explore how this reinterpretation shape our cognitive understanding of reality and history.

**Key words:** unnatural narrative; ethical identity; ethical emotion; cognition

**Author: Zheng Jie** is Associate Professor at the School of English Language and Literature, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (Guangzhou 510420, China). Her research interests include modern and contemporary theatre and literary theory. Email: zhengjie1997@hotmail.com

托尼·库什纳 (Tony Kushner) 的《天使在美国：关于国家主题的同性恋幻想曲》(1993) 是一部长达七小时，分为上下两部的戏剧史诗，自上演以来就成为 20 世纪晚期最受关注的美国戏剧作品之一。<sup>①</sup> 戏剧设置在 1986 年的纽约，艾滋病在美国开始恣意流行，持续近半个世纪的冷战逐渐拖垮社会主义的前苏联和东欧阵营，也使里根政府岌岌可危。戏剧探讨了同性恋者之间的情感纠葛、传统宗教与现代信仰的冲突、不同种族间的误解与歧视、政治上保守主义与假民主的自由主义之斗争等庞杂而晦涩主题。作为一部公认的后现代史诗剧，无论是历史背景设置、人物设定还是戏剧主题，《天使在美国》似乎延续了文学现实主义传统，直面美国 20 世纪 80 年代艾滋病疫情的爆发这一社会问题以及在同性恋团体内部乃至整个社会引发的相关伦理、政治、宗教问题。然而，戏剧的现实主义主题和形式上“非自然叙事”(unnatural narrative)<sup>②</sup> 的交织无疑向读者/观众提出了极大的挑战。参照扬·阿尔贝 (Jan Alber) 关于“非自然叙事”(unnatural narrative) 内涵的释义，非自然叙事指的是“物理上、逻辑上和人类属性上不可能的场景”(25)。剧中人物和鬼魂的相遇、在天堂里和天使们的斗争等情节挑战了我们对于理性现实世界的理解，借用丽莎·祖希尼 (Lisa Zunshine) 对于非自然叙事的理解，“暗示性地违背了某种重要的概念性‘边界’”(19)。《天使在美国》中反模拟 (antimimetic) 戏剧叙事结构促使我们思考如下问题：在后现代语境中，作家如何探索超乎当前认知限度的“伦理身份”<sup>③</sup> 和“伦理情感”<sup>④</sup>？而在这一过程中，如何在重新定义的伦理关系中确立道德价值体系和情感关系？具体到这部戏剧中，库什纳如何理解伦理、情感和历史之间的互动联系？

《天使在美国》的故事情节围绕着两个艾滋病患者展开。曼哈顿的普莱尔对同性恋男友路易讲述了自己的艾滋病情。病痛和孤单折磨着普莱尔，路易无能为力，他们的关系也日益疏远。与此同时，臭名昭著的律师科恩也身染艾滋病，而科恩的被保护人乔意识到自己的同性恋倾向后离开了妻子。上部《千禧年降临》展示的正是在艾滋病的侵袭下，曾经亲密的人际关系被摧毁，世界走向新世纪时社会文明的日益瓦解和混乱。戏剧最后以天使从天而降告终。下部《重建》借助故事讨论了历史发展的两种可能性：终结或复兴。因为上帝已经出走，天使邀请普莱尔担任死亡先知。科恩最终死在医院的病床上，死前却得到了众人的谅解。故事的结局颇有乌托邦的意味：在纽约公园的毕士达喷泉边，<sup>⑤</sup> 剧中不同身份的人（黑人、犹太人、摩门教徒和同性恋者）



重聚于此，对生活充满希望，于是一个新的社会群体诞生了。

毫无疑问，在上世纪末关注个人和群体历史有着特别深远的意味。这是因为，正如上部剧名《千禧年降临》所影射，随着新世纪的临近，20世纪90年代初的美国戏剧文学弥漫着关于全球和美国文化的末世论情绪。另一方面，关于“审判日”的主题从古至今都被赋予悲观主义色彩和乐观主义情绪的双重矛盾性。由此来看，库什纳以宗教历史观中末世论和审判日为参照来讨论20世纪末艾滋病危机下动荡的美国社会似乎再合适不过。学界对此问题尤为关注，克里斯托弗·比格斯博（Christopher Bigsby）认为库什纳深受本杰明历史概念的影响，而这部戏剧体现了库什纳对历史进步的理解，我们必须“不断回望历史的残垣断壁”（109）。詹姆士·米勒（James Miller）进一步指出，该剧无疑是历史大叙事（“国家历史”、“圣经历史”）和小叙事（类如“个人历史”、“医药历史”“种族历史”）的重合（67）。由于文本的现实主义指向，学者在关注库什纳历史观念的同时往往将其对于种族和性别身份的思考进行关联。例如，拉任·欧麦·谢尔曼（Ranen Omer-Sherman）讨论了《天使在美国》中犹太教、同性恋权益斗争和历史之间的联系。<sup>⑥</sup> 尽管有学者意识到了库什纳对圣经和历史史料的改写这一写作手法的深层次含义，<sup>⑦</sup> 遗憾的是，他们并未将此置于“非自然叙事”的学术背景下进行讨论，种种关于戏剧主题的讨论都忽略了非自然叙事对于戏剧主题的作用，而这一问题直接影响我们深入讨论库什纳对于伦理、情感和历史进步之间关系的理解。

戏剧的现实主义题材（同性恋、艾滋病、宗教和政治）和剧中的非自然叙事（天使和人的较量、鬼魂的拜访和普莱尔造访天堂等情节）错综交织，构成了复杂有趣的互动关系。超自然（supernatural）图景与人类世界的互动，显然并非当代美国历史和文学所热衷的主流话题。以往戏剧研究往往将超自然（supernatural）、魔幻（magical）或者异想（the fabulous / fantastic）等因素进行文化习俗化解读，或者同剧中人物的疯癫或精神紊乱联系在一起。显然，在后现代语境中，解释想象 / 幻觉（the fantastic）如何编织进入现实主义文本结构，以及如何和现实主义所倚靠的认知框架产生对话性似乎更为重要，而这也正是学术界公认讨论“非自然叙事”的意义所在。尽管学术界关于自然叙事和非自然叙事的界定存在分歧，<sup>⑧</sup> 但大致认为非自然叙事包括“人类逻辑和认知上的不可能场景，以及异想的、魔幻的和超自然的场景”（Fludernik 362）。笔者认为，讨论《天使在美国》中非自然叙事已经超越了对戏剧主题的讨论，而是借由认知模式来探索人物伦理身份的转变以及在这一过程产生的情感认知，通过对伦理情感的讨论，旨在解释库什纳对于伦理和历史进步的理解。

“非自然叙事”直指文本的虚构本质，因此和布莱希特提出的“间离效果”和后现代戏剧中“元戏剧”的自我指射（self-reflexive）具有相通之处。然而从功能上来看，《天使在美国》中的非自然叙事无意间离观众的情感从而唤

醒观众的理性，也无意解构文学虚构性的本质，而是在自然叙事和非自然叙事的结合中，从认知的角度拓展伦理情感的可能性。剧中，深受艾滋病综合症折磨且被爱人抛弃的普莱尔不断被家族鬼魂拜访，死亡步步逼近，在这一过程中他看见了燃烧的圣经和破壁而降的巨大天使，最后来到了类似于卡夫卡笔下充满官僚主义的天堂。塞密·卢德威克（Sämi Ludwig）认为，对“不可能”的再现，为我们提供了特别的信息，即“经过处理的信息（‘意义’）而不是对于外部的模仿（模拟）（190）。与家族两代先灵的相遇，是一种物理上不可能出现的场景，可以说是面对未知情况失措无助时，摇摆在自我沉浸式情感和试图理解困境的尝试间的一种认知状态。从普莱尔所患疾病来看，艾滋病作为一种致命的毁灭性传染疾病，对于当时的大众而言无疑是极其可怖且不体面的（因为艾滋病患者常常是同性恋，因此对艾滋病早期的认识往往和不正常的性行为联系在一起）；从普莱尔的感情生活来看，同性者间的公开恋爱关系在当时并未得到美国社会的普遍理解和接受。因此，面对当时新的疾病和伦理关系（比如公开的同性恋关系）时，库什纳需要通过非自然叙事来拓展人类认知的限度，从而唤起人们的伦理情感。普莱尔对疾病的认识，正是建立在与鬼魂的沟通上。两个鬼魂分别来自十三世纪和十七世纪，死于英国历史上两次可怕的瘟疫；他们前来预警普莱尔死亡的恐惧和神秘信使的到来。普莱尔要鬼魂1解释他们的存在，他的回答模棱两可：“你活着，而我们已死。我们有同样的名字。你还希望我解释什么呢？”（*Millennium Approaches* 1682）。鬼魂2则告知普莱尔，他将被天使选中成为信使：“我怀疑，他们选择我们是因为血缘关系。在一个历史悠久的沃尔特家族中，总有一些深受瘟疫困扰”（*Millennium Approaches* 1683）。死亡的威胁把过去和现在、瘟疫和艾滋病、鬼魂对于痛苦和死亡的欣然接受以及普莱尔的苦苦挣扎等紧密联系在一起。普莱尔与鬼魂的相遇，一方面让普莱尔重新认识了他所经受的生理疾病煎熬和（由于被爱人抛弃所遭受的）精神折磨，如同不断重复的历史，这不过是人类时刻面临疾病和死亡威胁的常态；另一方面，作为缺乏社会关怀且被忽略群体中的一员，选择普莱恩成为信使虽然并未解决普莱尔的伦理焦虑，但却暗示改变伦理身份进而重新理解历史和社会的可能性。库什纳曾说过，“我们为了自己重新建构世界，或者至少重新组织对它的理解”（*Thinking about* 39）。他指出重新解释甚至重写历史的重要性：因为通过对世界的思考，我们可期望发现生活的信仰和希望。

普莱尔正是在成为天使的使者后，实现了真正意义上的伦理选择。当他选择放弃永生、从天堂回到尘世时，他在改变历史的同时也从麻木和自怜自艾的情绪中走向了与现状和解、接受自我并对未来充满希望的情感状态。这种伦理情感的转换最终通过伦理身份的转变实现。换句话说，渴望被救赎的个体成为了救赎他者的主体。聂珍钊教授认为，“文学概念实际上是一个伦理概念”（25）。事实上，文学叙事便是关于如何理解人类生活以及人类生

活的指导。如果说普莱尔和鬼魂的相遇让普莱尔更加清醒地认识自我和疾病，普莱尔在天堂和天使的斗争则是出于主动伦理选择的伦理身份转换过程。戏剧重写了圣经中关于天使和预言的记载，这是库什纳做出的大胆尝试。阿尔伯在定义非自然叙事时，强调后现代文学可以理解为一种写作方式，“这种写作风格和非自然性叙事存在高度重合，不仅如此，它和传统文体中已经被世俗接受的不可能性再次产生联系”（13）。显然，对圣经的改写属于对于已经接受的“非自然叙事”的再次“非自然叙事”。对圣经大叙事的改写虽然属于逻辑上的不可能，即与真实世界的逻辑原则相违背，然而却是对于真实、身份和伦理的重新认知。根据天使的描述，1906年旧金山地震爆发后，上帝抛弃了人类离开了天堂，而“无能为力”的见证者天使们（*Perestroika* 130）希望通过禁止人类的一切活动，例如“人类的旅行、思想和想象力”，来“迫使上帝现身”（*Perestroika* 86）。天使选择普莱尔作为使者，承诺只要他放弃生命和进步去取《反移民书》，就能在天堂获得永生。只要普莱尔拿到《反移民书》，时钟就会倒转到静止的状态，历史不再进步，而人类的一切活动也将终结。尽管饱受疾病煎熬，可是普莱尔却拒绝了天使的请求，选择放弃永生、回到人类社会。

从认知角度来看，普莱尔“非自然”的伦理选择不仅实现了身份上的转换，而且实现了情感上的转换。普莱尔在这种逻辑上和物理上都不可能存在的情景中确立了对他者的完全责任感。他向天使们祈求，“我仍然想……获得祝福。尽管我病了，我还是想活下去”（*Perestroika* 131）。选择放弃在天堂的永生而回到人间活下去是一个艰难的选择。活下去（more life）对于艾滋病患者普莱尔而言意味着生命，也意味着更多感染和患病的机会，以及无尽的痛苦。然而普莱尔明白：“我们不能停下来。我们不是石头——进步、移民、流动是……现代性。而现代性是生机勃勃的，这是生命的作为。[……]我们不能等待。我们又能等待谁呢？上帝……”（*Perestroika* 130）。选择普莱尔为使者并非偶然，这和他的身份和处境密切相关。如同比格斯柏所说，“垂死、被抛弃的普莱尔象征被否认的真理和被忽略的对爱和关怀的需求”（109）。莫里卡·弗卢德里克（Monika Fluderik）认为，当读者阅读非自然叙事时，他们的解读方式不同于对摹拟叙事的解读方法，“他们更侧重于另一种世界的投射”（361）。正是在物理上不可能存在的天堂场景中，普莱尔完成了在现实世界里无法实现的身份和情感转变。通过非自然叙事，库什纳向我们展示了三种可能性。当普莱尔选择人类的进步而放弃在天堂的永生，从个体来看，他完成了从饱受疾病折磨的病患者到承担人类生命进步的救世者这一伦理身份的转变——在犹太文化中，先知和预言者承担着社会进步的使命。面对情感背叛和世人冷漠，普莱尔重新具备了爱和救赎他者的能力。而从更深层意义上来看，普莱尔的伦理选择不再局限于个人，确立对他者的责任，这也正是人类主体性（human agency）和人类身份的含义。面对苦难和历史，人不

再是历史的客体，而是历史的主体。普莱尔的痛苦根源——艾滋病——也成为了促使普莱尔完成伦理身份和伦理情感转变的必然条件，换句话说，艾滋病超越了社会耻辱的印记，成为了社会进步和变革的力量。

按照阿尔贝对非自然叙事的分类，对罗伊·科恩和艾塞尔·卢森堡这些历史人物和事件的改写属于物理上不可能出现的场景。对非自然叙事“自然化”解读的本质是，通过借助真实世界知识的认知框架来消除非自然叙事的非自然性（尚必武 13）。如果说普莱尔在关于天堂的非自然叙事中完成了从历史的客体到主体的身份转换，科恩则在物理上不可能存在的场景中和他者——“被迫害者艾塞尔”的鬼魂——建立责任和道德关系，实现了伦理关系的转化，从自我转化成为他者的“我”。换句话说，科恩从政治迫害者转换为被宽恕者，而鬼魂艾塞尔则在这一过程从被迫害者转变为宽恕者。历史上的科恩是纽约的一名律师，二战后的政治掮客。他的身份充满矛盾和虚伪。他是犹太人和同性恋，却是一个不择不扣的同性恋恐惧患者和反同性恋者。他是民主党人却为共和党谋事。他在 1986 年死于艾滋病，尽管至死都对外宣称肺病。上世纪五十年代美国“麦卡锡主义”横行，政府指控美国共产党员卢森堡夫妇为前苏联窃取核武器机密，将二人送上电椅，当时政府指派律师科恩为卢森堡夫妇罗织罪名（Fisher 61-62）。艾塞尔·卢森堡的案子非常具有争议性，五十年后事实真相依然被讨论，而科恩在案件中的作用也被重新调查。科恩在剧中被描述成一个亵渎上帝且毫无道德价值观念的人。他在和乔的谈话中滥用上帝的名字，还为自己迫害卢森堡夫妇的事实而自豪：“要不是我，艾塞尔·卢森堡到今天还活着，为一些妇女杂志写生活专栏”

（*Millennium Approaches* 1689）。然而，库什纳从人性和伦理的角度塑造了戏剧中科恩和艾塞尔的形象，把科恩置于良心的谴责下，精神上饱受艾塞尔鬼魂的困扰，最后却得到了比利兹、路易和鬼魂艾塞尔的宽恕。詹姆斯·弗希尔（James Fisher）认为库什纳塑造科恩这一人物的目的是为了“探索 20 世纪美国晚期美国未出柜的同性恋者的相关问题以及保守派政治的虚伪性”

（62）。这种解释虽言之有理，但却忽略了一个重要的问题：库什纳为何要设置科恩临死前和鬼魂相遇这种历史上并不存在而且也不可能发生的情景？笔者认为，这种非自然叙事有两层深意：从文本表层来看，正如艾塞尔的鬼魂来到科恩的病床边说到，“我来是看能否原谅你”（*Perestroika* 114），显然鬼魂的宽恕这种非自然情感的完成只能在非自然叙事中得以实现；而从文本和作者间的关系来看，这也是同性恋作家库什纳和历史人物科恩的和解方式。

科恩临死时的场景不仅完全背离历史事实，也脱离了逻辑上和认知上的可能。护士比利兹和路易本打算为普莱尔偷取 AZT——一种昂贵且稀有的治疗艾滋病的药。当他们看到垂死的科恩时，比利兹请求路易给科恩念犹太祷告珈底什（Kaddish）。尽管起先路易生气地拒绝了，但他最终被说服，

开始祷告。鬼魂艾塞尔本来是来期待看到科恩死时的惨状，此时也加入了他们。比利兹，路易和艾塞尔为科恩所念的珈底什具有深刻的象征意义。珈底什是犹太教中唱给特定人具有救赎意义的赞美诗，也是一种通过赞美耶和華来荣耀死者的仪式。当这三人聚集在一起，用弗拉米基·明瓦拉（Framiji Minwalla）的话来说，“被处以死刑的共产党员（艾塞尔）、黑人同性恋者（比利兹）和有罪的犹太人（路易）哀悼科恩，宽恕科恩，自己也由此得到出路，从道德负担中解放出来”（110）。

这一幕不仅超越了我们对于历史真相的认识，也超越了我们关于真实世界的知识。当我们在虚构叙事作品中遇到上述“非自然情感”时，<sup>⑨</sup>我们需要改变已有的心理预设，整合新的认知框架。显然，为临死的科恩念祷告的场景，探索的是一种秩序和意义的缺失以及和这种缺失和解过程中的种种困境。面对无法逃脱的未知情况，探讨非自然叙事的意义，在于能帮助我们理解自然情感和伦理情感之间的对立和转换以及伦理情感的多维度，从认知的角度重新定义传统价值体系中诸如爱、责任和宽恕等道德价值。而在这一过程，需要重新定义的也包括人物的既定身份。正如比利兹的解释，“科恩是个可恶的家伙。但是他的死亡也很痛苦。所以也许……既然一个女王可以宽恕被她征服的敌人。这并不容易。如果容易也就不算什么了。宽恕是最难的。但它是爱和公正的联结点。至少通过宽恕我们能得到安宁”（*Perestroika* 124）。通过宽恕科恩，鬼魂艾塞尔完成了对于“我是谁？”这一问题的追寻，因为在科恩的病床边，她完成了伦理身份的转变——她不再是受迫害致死的受害者，而是具备拯救他者能力的宽恕者。鬼魂艾塞尔这样来解释她的存在：“我来看我是否能原谅你。”正是在非自然叙事中，她完成了对自我的认识，这种自我认识并不是内部参照的“自我”（ego），而是通过在不可能的场景中完成了和他者科恩的对话性依存关系的自我重新认知。从文学伦理学批评和叙事学的角度来看，正是在非自然叙事中，鬼魂艾塞尔（无论是历史人物还是戏剧人物）成为了一个对他者（Other）负有责任感的自我（Self）。

正如前文所述，这种非自然叙事也是作家库什纳和科恩的和解方式，折射了他对于历史进步和伦理之间关系的理解。对于这样一个臭名昭著的历史人物，库什纳有着复杂的情感。在一次采访中，他直言道，尽管他一直憎恨科恩，但当他读到新闻媒介对他的报道时依然心生悲伤，这是因为“尽管我们不愿意，然而他作为艾滋病的受害者这一事实让他成为同性恋群体中的一员”（Vorlicky 46）。从这种意义上讲，比利兹、路易和艾塞尔的祷告珈底什也意味库什纳对科恩的宽恕。在救赎科恩的过程中，宽恕的重要性和历史进步汇合到一起。当谈到宽恕和历史的关系时，库什纳认为，我们在现在的某个时刻能看到“一千个未来”，而关键的问题是：我们如何在一个充斥人类种种失败的社会中前进？在他看来，唯一的答案（出路）是宽恕：“你能原谅他人吗？这是我为什么要问关于宽恕的问题，因为我认为它可能还有

待于进一步理论化”（“Interview with Tony Kushner” 309）。显然，宽恕科恩的仪式可以被理解成为歌颂宽恕和爱的典礼。对历史的改写表明库什纳看到了“另一个美国，即可能从腐烂过去的血和粘液中重生的美国”（Bigsby 113）。库什纳对历史的本质和人类关系的思考深受布莱希特的影响。库什纳曾经说过，“在布莱希特关于历史主体和主体性的思考中，隐藏着一个问题，我们是历史的主体还是完全受它所控？我们创造历史还是历史改造我们？”

（“Interview with Tony Kushner” 303）。通过戏剧中不可能场景的设置，库什纳在探讨伦理身份和情感的问题时，最终指向的是伦理和历史的关系，从伦理的角度来重新解释历史。普莱尔和鬼魂艾塞尔在非自然叙事中伦理身份的转换和伦理情感的认知，使得他们从被历史控制和压抑的客体成为了主动改变历史轨迹的主体。

在《非自然叙事：小说与戏剧的不可能世界》（2016）一书中，阿尔贝说：“虚构叙事最有趣的一点就是它们不仅生产我们周围的经验世界，而且也经常包含一些在我们现实世界中不可能实现的因素”（3）。在《天使在美国》中，“不可能实现的因素”构成了非自然叙事的主要内容。库什纳在剧中直面的现实问题是，艾滋病不仅撕裂了社会生活也重新挑战了人际关系和伦理价值。与其说库什纳表达了面对这一致命疾病时社会道德的沦陷，不如说他向我们展示了当代美国社会的精神状态。在这样的一个移民国家，人们正逐渐丧失一种保留历史感的能力，过去和现在的历史断层直接引向对各种传统价值观的离弃，“适者生存”成为引导人们生活最重要原则。然而，正是“非自然叙事”使戏剧文本具有得以产生意义的话语空间，在现实和想象间建立一种对应且对比的联系。借助这种联系，库什纳探讨了历史进步的可能性和伦理关系的思考，深刻思索了伦理身份和情感的认知意义以及宽恕的救赎力量，在改革社会的强烈欲望和回归传统价值观念之间找到了平衡点。

### 【Notes】

① 1993 年，第一部《千禧年降临》荣获普利策奖和四项舞台剧托尼奖，第二部《重建》在 1994 年荣获包括最佳戏剧和最佳男主角等三项托尼奖，而由 HBO 电视台制作改编的电视短剧在第 56 届美国电视艾美奖上更是荣获包括最佳系列短剧、最佳短剧类编剧、最佳短剧男 / 女主角在内的等七项奖项。

② 21 世纪以来，非自然叙事成为叙事学研究的新热点，重要论著包括理查森的《非自然声音：现当代小说的极端化叙述》（*Unnatural Voices: Extreme Narration in Modern and Contemporary Fiction*, 2006），阿尔贝和鲁狄格·海因策（Rüdiger Heinze）的《非自然叙事，非自然叙事学》（*Unnatural Narratives, Unnatural Narratology*, 2011），阿尔贝、尼尔森和理查森等人的《非自然叙事诗学》（*A Poetics of Unnatural Narrative*, 2013），阿尔贝和佩尔·克罗格·汉森（Per Krogh Hansen）的《超越经典叙述：跨媒介与非自然的挑

战》(*Beyond Classical Narration: Transmedial and Unnatural Challenges*, 2014), 理查森的《非自然叙事: 理论、历史与实践》(*Unnatural Narrative: Theory, History, and Practice*, 2015) 以及阿尔贝的《非自然叙事: 小说与戏剧中的不可能世界》(*Unnatural Narrative: Impossible Worlds in Fiction and Drama*, 2016)。

③本文关于人物伦理身份的分析思路, 主要受到聂珍钊教授关于文学伦理学批评的观点的启发。聂教授认为, “伦理身份是评价道德行为的前提。在现实中, 伦理要求身份同道德行为相符合, 即身份与行为在道德规范上相一致。伦理身份与伦理规范相悖, 于是导致伦理冲突, 构成文学的文学性”(《文学伦理学批评导论》265)。

④聂珍钊教授在“论诗与情感”一文中, 提出了自然情感和伦理情感的区别和转化。他以诗歌为例, 说明“真正打动人心的是那些从自然情感转化而来的伦理情感”, 这种情感“已经不是一种自然发生的自然意志, 也不是任由情感泛滥的自由意志, 而是经过理性的陶冶, 自然情感转变成了理性的伦理情感”(54)。

⑤毕士达喷泉(Bethesda Fountain)位于纽约中央公园的核心。喷泉中的“水中天使”(The Angel of the Waters)雕像取自《约翰福音》第5章描述的一位天使, 这位天使赋予了耶路撒冷的毕士达水池神奇的治愈疾病的功效。在天使的雕像下站有四个小天使, 他们分别代表“节制”、“纯净”、“健康”与“和平”。

⑥ 详见“The Fate of the Other in Tony Kushner’s *Angels in America*,” *MELUS* 32.2 (2007): 7-30。

⑦例如, 米勒指出, “通过在当代人物和历史人物之间建立一连串的类型关联, 这部戏剧将艾滋病危机的恐慌和西方社会医学史上早起的毁灭性灾难联系在一起”(Miller 67)。而加纳(Garner Jr.)将对历史人物科恩的改写理解为“库什纳讲述反历史的一种方式”(Garner 180)。

⑧关于非自然叙事的多重定义及相关问题, 可参考尚必武: “西方文论关键词: 非自然叙事学”, 《外国文学》2(2015): 95—111。

⑨关于文学叙事中的“非自然情感”的基本类型与表现样式, 详见尚必武: “文学叙事中的非自然情感: 基本类型与阐释选择”。

### 【Works Cited】

- Alber, John. *Unnatural Narrative: Impossible Worlds in Fiction and Drama*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2016.
- Bigby, Christopher. *Contemporary American Playwrights*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- Garner Jr., Stanton B.. “Angels in America. The Millennium and Postmodern Memory.” *Approaching the Millennium*. Ed. Deborah R. Geis & Steven F. Kruger. Michigan: The U of Michigan P, 1997. 173-84.
- Fludernik, Monika. “How Natural is ‘Unnatural Narratology’; or, What is Unnatural about Unnatural Narratology?” *Narrative* 20. 3 (2012): 358-70.

- Fisher, James. *The Theatre of Tony Kushner*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Kushner, Tony. *Angels in America: Millennium Approaches. The Bedford Introduction of Drama*. Ed. Lee A. Jacobus. 4th ed. Boston, New York: Bedford/ St. Martin's, 2001.
- . *Angels in America: Perestroika*. New York: Theatre Communications Group, Inc, 1994.
- . *Thinking About the Longstanding Problems of Virtue and Happiness*. New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1995.
- Ludwig, Sämi. "Grotesque Landscapes: African American Fiction, Voodoo Animism, and Cognitive Models." *Mapping African America: History, Narrative Formation, and the Production of Knowledge*. Ed. Maria Diedrich, Carl Pedersen, & Justine Tally. Hamburg: lit, 1999. 189–202.
- Miller, James. "Heaven Quake: Queer Anagogies in Kushner's America." *Approaching the Millennium*. Ed. Deborah R. Geis & Steven F. Kruger. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1997. 56-57.
- Minwalla, Framiji. "When Girls Collide: Considering Race in *Angels in America*." *Approaching the Millennium*. Ed. Deborah R. Geis & Steven F. Kruger. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.
- Savran, David. Interview with Tony Kushner. *Speaking on Stage: Interviews with Contemporary America Playwrights*. Ed. Philip C. Kolin and Colby H. Kullman. Tuscaloosa: AL, 1996.
- Zunshine, Lisa. *Strange Concepts and the Stories They Make Possible*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2008.
- 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.]
- : “论诗与情感”, 《山东社会科学》8 (2014): 51-58。
- [---. "Poetry and Emotion." *Shandong Social Sciences* 8 (2014): 51-58.]
- 尚必武: “文学叙事中的非自然情感: 基本类型与阐释选择”, 《上海交通大学学报》(哲学社会科学版) 4 (2016): 5-16。
- [Shang Biwu. "Unnatural Emotions in Literary Narrative: Basic Categories and Interpretive Options." *Journal of Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 4 (2016): 5-16.]

责任编辑: 尚必武



# 菲利普·拉金爱情诗的伦理诉求

## Ethical Appeal in Philip Larkin's Love Poems

陈 晞 (Chen Xi)

**内容摘要：**菲利普·拉金是 20 世纪英国杰出的诗人，而爱情是其诗歌讴歌的重要主题之一。本文从文学伦理学批评角度，重点分析了拉金的爱情诗从自然情感到道德情感的转化过程，解构其诗歌中隐含着的理性意志与自由意志之冲突以及诗人在爱情和婚姻之间做出的伦理选择。拉金爱情诗歌在其创作三个阶段的不同特点，折射出现代人的理性意志和自由意志在性与爱、心灵与身体方面的对抗与平衡，同时，拉金在爱情、婚姻方面的伦理焦虑的诗性表达，揭示了社会转型时期及伦理重构的过程中人们对爱情及两性关系方面的伦理诉求、思考和伦理选择。

**关键词：**菲利普·拉金；爱情诗；自然情感；道德情感

**作者简介：**陈晞，博士，湖南大学外国语学院教授，主要从事英美文学研究。本文为国家社科基金重点项目“文学伦理学与文本研究”【项目批号：13AWW001】，以及作者本人主持的国家社科基金项目“菲利普·拉金研究”【项目批号：12BWW039】和 2013 年湖南省社科基金项目“英国诗歌的伦理导向研究”【项目批号：13YBA387】的阶段成果。

**Title:** Ethical Appeal in Philip Larkin's Love Poems

**Abstract:** Philip Larkin is one of the most distinguished British poets in 20th Century, and love is an important theme of his poetry. This article, from the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, analyzes the transformation of love in Larkin's poetry from natural emotion to moral emotion by deconstructing the entailed conflicts between rational will and free will as well as the consequent ethical choices in love and marriage. Larkin's love poems in the three phases of his writing career incarnate the confrontation and balance between rational will and free will when people deal with love and sex, as well as with body and soul. By depicting the ethical anxiety in a poetic way, Larkin reveals people's ethical thinking on love and gender in the process of ethical reconstruction and social transformation.

**Key words:** Philip Larkin; love; natural emotion; moral emotion

**Author:** Chen Xi is Professor at the School of Foreign Studies, Hunan University

(Changsha 410078, China). Her major research fields are English and American literary studies. Email: chenxi@hnu.edu.cn.

爱是诗歌永恒的主题，同样，爱的主题贯穿了拉金整个诗歌生涯，“拉金可以被称作爱情诗人，因为他的诗歌主题是爱”（Rajamouly 104）。虽然拉金一生未婚，但是他终其一生都在对爱苦苦追寻。拉金在接受约翰·海芬顿的采访时声称：我认为唯一能拯救我们的就是爱，无论是从单纯的生物学角度还是从对生活馈赠的角度而言，爱让生活更为美妙（Whalen 13）。爱，是拉金生命的动力，生活中的氧气，诗歌的灵感源泉。

爱可以定义为对某人或事的深挚情感。从人与人之间的伦理关系来看，爱是衍生自亲人之间由血缘而产生的关爱和血脉之情，如母爱、父爱、兄弟姐妹之亲情；亦可为衍生自性欲与情感上的吸引力，例如：情人之间的激情和爱恋；此外，还可能为衍生自惺惺相惜与相互钦佩之情，例如：朋友之间的彼此忠诚和友爱等等。母爱和亲情是以理性意志形式表现出来的情感，是一种道德情感（聂珍钊 250），而男女之激情受动物性本能的驱使，是一种自然情感，它是“不受道德约束的一种生理和心理反应”（聂珍钊 280）。这种由人的性本能驱使而产生的激情，是兽性因子的外化，而只有当这种原始的自然情感受到理性制约，使当事人的行为合乎伦理道德规范时，才能实现灵与肉的结合，并且“人的理性力量使他能通过和客体发生能动的联系，透过事物的表面抓住它的本质，人的爱的力量使他冲垮他与别人分离的围墙并去理解别人”（弗洛姆，《弗洛姆著作精选》165）。其实，不论男女之间两情相悦的激情还是生死不渝、情投意合的爱情，都是人性因子和兽性因子在伦理选择过程中形成的不同组合，只有当理性力量和自然情感相结合时，男女之间的自然情感——激情——就升华成为道德情感——无私永恒的爱情。从拉金的诗歌创作生涯来看，他的爱情诗历经了早期对自然情感的书写、中期对自然情感与理性意志的思考，以及后期对升华为道德情感的爱情的讴歌。

### 一、《北方的船》：自然情感的书写

20 世纪中期饱经两次世界大战离乱的现代人似乎渐渐疏远了浪漫，在这样的伦理环境中，早期的拉金在世风中迷离，他用心呼唤爱情，同时，又对之产生怀疑，以为爱等同于激情和性爱，于是，他把对这种爱的独特体验用柔美而内向的叶芝式修辞表达出来。在牛津读书时期，拉金沉迷于叶芝的浪漫主义诗风，把个人生活延展为象征化的“所思/所感”。他的第一本诗集《北方的船》（1945）就是“叶芝对爱情、性苦闷和死亡的执着的感伤化的翻版”（Motion, *Philip Larkin* 34），流露出一位青年人对爱情的梦幻般向往和对爱的实质的探索。

在从来没有情感经历的拉金早期诗作中，诗人将爱情等同为激情，其实，由激情主导的爱情就是一种自然情感，是由“性欲导致的对爱情的追求”（聂珍钊 280）。由性吸引或性行为激发的感情，“此类爱情本质上就是转瞬即逝的。两个人彼此愈熟悉，他们的结合就愈将丧失其神奇魅力，直至最后相互间的反感、失望和厌恶情绪把残存下来的激动兴奋一扫而光”（弗洛姆，《爱的艺术》5）。拉金早期作品中着墨描述了这类爱情，认为这种情感是“苍白无力的、无意义的、失败的”（Rajamouly 105），比如，他在“如果手能放你自由，我的心”如是感慨道：

爱是海市蜃楼，还是奇迹，  
你的嘴唇探向我：  
太阳像耍把戏的杂耍球，  
它们是伪装还是迹象？（33）<sup>①</sup>

拉金把这种自然情感的“爱”比作每天太阳的升起：每天升起的太阳看起来像是变戏法者的杂耍球，有时阳光灿烂，有时半掩在云中。通过这个比喻，诗人暗示：由自然情感主导的爱情虽然表现形式各不相同，但是它和杂耍球一样是骗人的，和海市蜃楼一样是短暂。接着，拉金写道：

照亮阴霾，我突然而至的天使，  
用你的胸和额头驱散恐惧，  
我紧抱着你，现在和永远  
因为永远永远就在当下。（33）

这一诗节继承了文学 *Carpe diem*（只争朝夕，及时行乐）的传统。诗人呼唤丢弃恐惧，拥抱爱情。诗人并没有言明何种恐惧，这种恐惧可能是对未来不确定性的恐惧，也可能是对爱将带来的伤害的恐惧，但是不管怎样，相爱的这一刻才是最珍贵的，不在乎天长地久，只在乎曾经拥有，“因为永远永远就在当下”。由于没有情感经历，拉金从他父亲那里耳濡目染了大男子主义作风，因而，他界定的爱情是肉欲的、短暂的、自私的，这种“由人的本能导致的情感在伦理选择中以一种自然意志或自由意志的形式体现出来，属于自然情感或自由情感”，由于这种自然情感“是人的兽性因子的外化，是自由意志的体现”（聂珍钊 280），所以男人只关注自己性爱的即时满足，不愿意受伦理道德的约束。这首诗所表现的大男子主义还表现在诗歌的表现手法上。诗歌的叙述人是以男性的口吻叙述的，叙述人在描写恋人的时候，着力渲染“胸”、“额头”，暗示着诗人认为情人之间除了肉体亲密以外，不可能存在精神层面的关系。

拉金的另一首诗“我梦到一片狭长的沙洲”同样描写了自然情感的爱情：

我梦见一片狭长的沙洲  
海鸥在海浪上翱翔  
扑打绵延数英里的沙丘；  
风儿爬上洞穴  
撕裂开一座黑色的花园  
园中黑色的花朵已经凋零，  
环绕着我们安歇的房舍，  
紧闭的窗帘和一张床。

熟睡中，你把我唤醒  
漫步在凄冷的海滨  
没有记忆的夜晚，  
直到你的声音放弃我的耳朵  
直到你的双手缩回  
我没有了泪水，  
沿着砖砌的街道一样的大海  
和洒满星星的寒丘。 (26)

拉金在第一诗节，制造了一个爱的海市蜃楼：“我梦到一片狭长的沙洲 / 海鸥在海浪上翱翔 / 扑打绵延数英里的沙丘”。现实的“风”打碎了诗人的幻觉，拉金早期诗作中“风”多象征一种现实的、不可抗拒的力量：风撕裂黑色的花园，吹落黑暗中的花瓣。风环绕着恋人歇息的房舍，暗示了不祥之兆笼罩着这对沉醉在温柔乡里的恋人。第二诗节，描写的是爱情的破碎，“你”把我从甜蜜的梦中唤醒，暗示自然情感是不会长久，而在两性关系中，女人比男人更清醒，是受骗较少者（“受骗较少者”）。既然这种爱是短暂的，分手并不一定就是伤痛，虽然耳边再也听不到“你”的声音，“你”的双手已缩回，但是“我”没有流泪，独自走上自己的道路。从这一首诗可以看出拉金年轻时的两性伦理观：他不相信天长地久的爱情，男女吸引、相爱是受到自然情感驱动的结果，是斯芬克斯因子中兽性因子的控制下做出的伦理选择，所以当男女相互间物理吸引的感觉已逝，就应该放手，分道扬镳，不要受到任何道德的羁绊。

《北方的船》中大多数爱情诗歌都是描写分手的情人或者是单相思的恋人。这些诗歌表明诗人在处理逝去的爱情做出的伦理选择：自然情感的爱情是转瞬即逝，应该珍惜在一起的短暂时光，当对恋人不再有怦然心动的感觉时，表明爱情已不存在了。没有了激情的情人们就应该分手，而理想的分手

就是从情人过渡到相敬如宾的朋友。为什么会有这种伦理选择呢？因为拉金认为女人一旦和男人建立亲密的关系，“她们总是希望男人向她们表示爱意和忠心，最主要的是，她们要觉得自己‘拥有’你——或者你‘拥有’她——我最恨这样”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 190）。拉金不愿意被爱的名义束缚，所以他说：“我担心我无法拥有任何人们称作‘爱’的那种感情”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 138）。正因为拉金不愿意被女人束缚，他心目中的理想女性是拥有独立人格、独立思想的现代女性，这类独立女子不把感情作为依附于别人的筹码，当爱情不再的时候，她们忠实于自己的情感，坦然面对，理性地分手。正如这样的女性只存在于诗人的幻想一样，这种从男性利益出发的功利性爱情也只是诗人的幻想。在“亲爱的，如今我们只能分离”这首诗中，拉金写道：

亲爱的，如今我们必须分离：不要让它  
变成灾难，带来苦痛。以往  
总是有太多的月光和顾影自怜：  
让我们将它结束：既然  
太阳从未在天空如此昂然阔步，  
心儿从未如此渴望自由，  
渴望踢翻世界，鞭挞森林；你和我  
不再拥他们于怀；我们只是空壳，听凭  
谷子正奔向它方。

有遗憾。总是，会有遗憾。  
但这样更好，我们的生活放松，  
象两艘高桅船，鼓满了风，被日光浸透，  
在某个港口分别，朝着既定的航向，  
挥手作别，直至从视线中消失。       (29)

当爱的感觉消褪，两人在一起不再快乐而“顾影自怜”时，就应该分手。正因为激情是不可能长久的，所以恋人之间的分手便是注定的。纵然分手有遗憾，但是做出分手的伦理选择比选择勉强在一起“更好”，分开后生活会更“放松”，所以，曾经的恋人就应该轻松地“挥手作别”，各奔自己的人生路。

《北方的船》这部诗集里的爱情诗几乎都否认天长地久的道德情感，认为男女之间只存在激情——自然情感，因为“这种男女之间突如其来、奇迹般的亲密之所以容易发生，往往是同性的吸引力和性结合密切相关或者恰恰是由此而引起的。但这种类型的爱情就其本质来说不可能持久”（弗洛姆，

《爱的艺术》6)，所以这种情感是短暂、自私、不可靠的。这部诗集里的诗歌表明了作者在对待自然情感时做出的伦理选择：既然男女之间的激情是短暂的，激情过后，就不应该以“爱”的名义来束缚对方，就应该潇洒分手，“挥一挥衣袖，不带走一片云彩”。拉金为什么会做出这样的伦理选择是由他所处的伦理环境所决定的：拉金在牛津大学求学期间，弗洛伊德的性伦理在大学中盛行，而弗洛伊德在两性和爱情伦理方面特别强调性欲在两性之间的驱动作用，认为爱情是出自男女之间的性吸引，因而，拉金在青年时期的诗歌诠释了一种颠覆性的爱情观：放弃道德主义的原则，奉行功利主义和男权主义的原则。

## 二、“受骗较少者”的伦理选择

在拉金的创作早期，没有爱情经历的诗人以虚无主义的态度质疑真爱的存在，然而，在他的创作中期，也就是“受骗较少者”的创作期间，拉金在现实生活中遭遇到爱情的困惑，而拉金又曾宣称“为自己也为别人保存我所见 / 所思 / 所感的事物（假如我可以如此表述一种混合而复杂的经验的话）既为我本人也为别人，不过我觉得我主要是对于经验本身的责任，我试图使它不致被遗忘……我的诗作大多与我自己的私生活有关”（Enright 77），所以，这部诗集的诗歌记载了拉金与女性的交往，诘问以结婚为目的所谓理性爱情，反映了诗人在爱情、责任和婚姻之间艰难的伦理选择。

作于 1950 年 5 月的“如果，亲爱的”真实再现了拉金和初恋情人露丝订婚这段时间的心里路程以及诗人在做出是否结婚这个伦理选择时的矛盾与纠结。虽然拉金爱露丝，但是拉金父母的婚姻给拉金的心里留下阴影，“我唯一最清楚的婚姻（我父母的婚姻）糟透了，我永远也不会忘记”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 151），“拉金最大的担心是如果他结婚就有可能像其父母一样让爱在婚姻中结束”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 119）。因此，“如果，亲爱的”一开始就描写和“我”交往的女孩“像爱丽丝”一样。爱丽丝是英国作家刘易斯·卡罗尔童话故事中的主人公。爱丽丝从兔子洞进入一处神奇国度，在探险的同时不断认识自我，不断成长，但是小说的最后却是爱丽丝猛然惊醒，发现原来这一切都是自己的一个梦境。拉金把恋人比作爱丽丝是别具匠心：其一，这个想和“我”结婚的女孩可能头脑里充满了对婚姻童话般的美好憧憬；其二，梦想结婚的恋人最后将如爱丽丝一样，发现原来一切都是一场梦：关于婚姻的美好都是少女自己的幻想。于是，这首诗歌的叙述者提醒这位姑娘婚姻不是她想象的梦幻般的仙境：

她不会找到仙境中的桌椅，  
没有红木爪足餐柜，  
以及泰然自若的余烬。

酒柜中没有美酒，没有舒适的炉边椅，  
 书架上没有安息日读的小字体书，  
 没有酗酒的男管家，慵懒的女仆。 （72）

“红木爪足餐柜”是维多利亚式客厅的典型装饰，通过“她不会找到仙境中的桌椅”，叙述者粉碎了姑娘这个幻想——婚后不会有体面的社交、酒和娱乐。“没有安息日读的小字体书”指代文学陶冶和宗教信仰，这些精神享受也不可能存在于婚姻中；没有“男管家”和“女仆”暗示着女人将要从事无止境的家务琐事。接着，叙述者描写了现实生活中普遍存在的婚姻生活是这样的：

错觉缩小成女人手套大小，  
 然后厌恶扩展。她还会唠叨  
 那肮脏的地板，仿佛坟墓的皮肤，从那 （72）

她们婚前想象的浪漫都是“错觉”，现实中的婚姻生活是琐碎和繁杂的，房间里需要打扫，肮脏的地板在已婚女人眼里就像坟墓的皮肤，沉闷而令人绝望。婚姻一旦成为现实，女人就有一种被欺骗的感觉：

公告的风笛拆开世界，如拆结，  
 听见过去怎么过去，未来怎样中性，  
 能把我心爱的从无价的中枢击倒。 （72）

诗人在最后这一诗节又谨慎地对少女即将做出的伦理选择提出忠告。“公告的风笛”象征着婚礼的告示；举行了婚礼，少女的伦理身份就会变化，她无忧无虑的少女生活就会成为过去，将要面对的就是上面说描述的现实。知道这些以后，姑娘还会想要选择结婚吗？其实，这首诗是拉金写给自己订婚的露丝，其目的昭然若揭：不要对婚姻有美好的期盼。订婚以后，露丝沉浸在对婚姻的美好憧憬之中，但是此时的拉金正面临着艰难的伦理选择，一方面，由于他在一个传统的家庭长大，遵照传统伦理规范，他对露丝负有道义上的责任，应该和她结婚，另一方面，拉金认为“婚姻是绝对违背自然的”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 260），因为结婚将意味着婚姻生子和婚后的家务琐事，而这些都会分散他作为诗人的时间和精力，让他无法实现成为文学家的梦想，所以他“真的确定是一点也不想结婚”（Motion, *A Writer's Life* 180）。

几年之后，拉金的另一首诗“没有路”描写了自己做出和露丝取消婚约这个伦理选择时的心绪以及对由此而变化了的伦理身份的思考。诗歌第一诗节宣告了“我们”之间关系的终结。爱情终结了，当事人的伦理身份发生了

改变，叙述人和曾经的恋人已不再是恋爱的关系，所以他们应该努力地去忘记他们在一起时的一切：“还用砖头将我们的门堵上，种上树将你我拦阻，/ 并放任一切时间的侵蚀”(56)，用时间和空间来阻断联系，像陌生人一样疏远。拉金的理性告诉他：由于和露丝解除了婚约并分手，他们的伦理身份从恋人变成毫不相干的男女，但是自由意识让拉金无法把露丝从心中抹去：

或许，凋落的树叶堆积；未刈的杂草蔓延；  
再无别的改变。  
如此清朗的坚持，如此琐细的蔓生，  
今夜走的这条路并不觉陌生，  
仍将被容许。再久一点，  
而时间将是更强， (56)

第二诗节描述一段刻骨铭心的爱情结束以后，叙述者的痛苦：虽然分手以后，两人的生活仿佛没有什么改变，但是“清朗的坚持，琐细的蔓生”却暗示了分手后当事人的寂寞和失落，最后一行，叙述者希望时间能解决一切问题，能治愈一切伤痛，生活又会回到正常的轨道。

设计一个天地，那里没有这样一条路  
从你伸向我；  
像冷冷的太阳看着世界运行，  
奖赏他人，是我的自由。  
不阻止它是我实现的渴望。  
随意吧，我的不安。 (56)

第三诗节展现了叙述者最终做出的伦理选择。恋人已成为陌路，虽然睹物思人，满目凄凉，但是时间会治疗一切伤痛，曾经的恋人们应该理性地做出符合变化了的伦理身份的举措，不纠结于过去，各自奔向属于自己的未来。虽然诗人对自己不能存在于恋人的未来心生酸楚，但是未来就像每日升起的“太阳”一样，无法阻挡又令人向往。未来象征着希望，象征着一段新的感情的开始。评论家施华布瑞克认为诗歌最后一节关于太阳和未来的描述是拉金这首诗歌中的败笔，特别是“拙涩”的“Not to prevent”和累赘的最后一行，明显地走题 (Swarbrick 45)。其实，最后一段是这首诗的精华。拉金的诗歌主体叙述倾向于采用三段式结构：1、讲述“真人真事”；2、由此而生的种种感想；3、最后谨慎而试探性地提出结论。在这首诗中，第一诗节讲述了分手的事实，第二诗节，描述分手的惆怅，第三诗节，表达了从诗集《北方的船》以来拉金处理感情问题的伦理选择：对于已逝的爱情就应该结束，可以怀念



它曾经的美好，但不可以挽留，并祝福曾经的恋人和自己在各自的生活上和感情上都有一个新的开始。

拉金在完成“没有路”几个月以后，又写了一首“最近的脸”描述一段新的情感的出现。这首诗歌的第一节满怀深情地描述了叙述者对少女的一见钟情：

最近的脸，如此轻  
你的美尽收我的眼眸，  
站在附近的人没有一个能猜得到  
你的美丽至此遮掩不住，  
这可爱的游荡人儿，觉察到  
我的眼，再也无法转过来       (71)

这首诗叙述了拉金的新恋情，而且很明显是写给拉金的同事维尼弗瑞德·阿诺德的，因为拉金在这首诗的草稿的最后一页写满了她的名字。当时，年仅21岁的维尼弗瑞德成为拉金所在图书馆的新同事，她的美丽和活泼立刻吸引了拉金——“你的美丽至此遮掩不住”，自然意志让拉金深陷于对她的迷恋：“我的眼，再也无法转过来”。维尼弗瑞德当时计划只在贝尔法斯特工作一年，而后她将和未婚夫完婚，这是一个公开的秘密，每个人都知道她在图书馆工作的时间是有限的，她是不属于那里的。不可得到的女人对拉金最具吸引力，因为维尼弗瑞德·阿诺德的不可得性，让拉金对她充满激情。

爱慕者和被爱慕者  
在无谓的层面拥抱，  
我把你现在的美丽封存，  
你是我的裁判；走进  
真实凌乱的空气中  
不带来永恒贡物——  
交易，痛苦和爱，  
这些常规琐节不在。       (71)

第二诗节一开始就表明他们俩之间的爱慕是没有什么结果的——“爱慕者和被爱慕者/在无用的层面拥抱”；之后，“交易，痛苦和爱”再次暗示了他们交往是脱离世俗的，不附带契约、束缚以及随之而生的痛苦；最后，“常规琐节”也是一个暗喻，比喻婚姻形式，暗示他们的爱情不会走向世俗的婚姻，因此他们的浪漫不会落入俗套，不会斤斤计较，给彼此带来痛苦。

围绕我们的谎言变得黑暗：  
 美如雕像般的你会走开吗？  
 我必须在后亦步亦趋吗？直到  
 发现了一一或什么也没发现一一  
 转身已经来不及了。  
 抑或，如果我不改变立场，  
 你的力量真的一一能够  
 拒绝逃离，躲避，  
 远离别人的视线，  
 跃离太阳，带着面具和烙印  
 不被理解，然安然无恙？（71）

在传统的伦理观念中，爱情是以婚姻为最后归宿的，只恋爱不结婚不会被世俗所接受，拉金在这个诗节中试探心仪的“你”是否也不能接受只恋爱不结婚的观点。诗中，“太阳”象征着被人们广泛接受的伦理道德，不以结婚为目的的恋爱是背离了伦理道德，为世人所不齿，当事人将带着“面具和烙印”艰难地生活，不被人们所理解，如果“你”接受了我这种离经背道的爱，但是又受不了这样的处境却发现“转身已经来不及了”，还不如“我”主动放弃对你的追求，不对你“亦步亦趋”。诗人在这一段表达了自己的观点：与心仪的对象保持一定的距离，不去获得她比获得她更好，因为如果“我”苦苦地追求爱或爱的对象，到头来什么却也没得到，或者发现不是自己原来所期盼的，那时改变主意就太晚了。渴望的东西，比如爱人或爱情，只有一直保持不可触及、无法得到，才能保持它的魅力。无论“如果，亲爱的”还是“没有路”，初读时仿佛给人感觉诗人对自己不那么自信，但实际上暗藏深意，隐讳地而不是直接地阐述了拉金的爱情伦理观以及所做出的伦理选择：享受爱情的过程，而不要结果，只恋爱不结婚。

### 三、中、晚期作品：道德情感的颂歌

从“较少受骗者”之后，拉金的作品从个体情感的伦理诉求上升到对爱的本质的探讨与追问。由于“人性因子和兽性因子在伦理选择中形成的不同组合导致人的情感的复杂性，即导致自然情感向理性情感的转化或理性情感向自然情感的转化”（聂珍钊 250），拉金晚期的爱情诗展示的就是从自然情感向理性情感的转化，这些诗歌对升华为道德情感的爱情进行了肯定，体现了作者伦理意识的强化。拉金创作晚期的爱情诗歌基本上从两个方面来探讨升华为道德情感的爱情的特征：无私性和永恒性。

拉金早期诗歌中爱情是一种由兽性因子支配的自然情感，而这些诗歌的叙述者无一例外都是男性。这些叙述者从男权主义出发，把女性边缘化，在

恋爱中只关注自己的欲望与利益的满足，表现出一种极度自私的男权主义倾向，比如：把爱情等同于激情，当欲望得到满足，激情消退，就忙不迭地把女性从身边推开，唯恐她成为自己的羁绊。但是，随着年龄的增长、生活经验的积累，拉金的后期爱情诗歌转向歌颂道德情感——永恒的爱情，主张爱应该是无私的。在“爱”这首诗中，诗人写道：

爱最困难的一部分  
是足够的自私，  
是盲目地执着  
为了自己而去  
烦扰另一个人。  
多么的厚颜。

然且无私的一面——  
你怎么才能满意，  
当你把别人在第一位  
而使自己的处境更糟？  
只为自己而活。  
就像脱离地引力

不管是道德还是不道德，  
爱适合我们大多数人。  
只有流血之人发现  
自私是错误的  
只有完全回绝自私  
他才能得到满足。 (180)

这首诗一开始就强调爱是两厢情愿的事，不能为了自己私欲而把感情强加于人，男女相处应给对方留一个适度的自由空间，不应强迫对方服从自己的意愿，而应该互相尊敬、公平相待。拉金这个时期的两性观与他早期作品所表现的大相径庭，比如：“一个被拽着手腕的姑娘”中“被拽着”这个动词明显地带有兽性因子的暴力色彩，表明了姑娘是不情愿地屈服；《欺骗》中的男人为了自己的肉欲不惜使用暴力，强奸女孩。但是在“爱”这首诗里，人性因子战胜了兽性因子，强调恋爱双方平等的权力，并提出为了满足自己单方面的私欲而骚扰另一个人的生活，是“厚颜”无耻的行为，是与“欺骗”这首诗的互文，“欺骗”中的强奸者受自兽性因子控制不顾女方的意愿，千方百计甚至不惜以暴力征服女性，他才是“多么的厚颜”。在第二节，诗人

提出真正爱着对方就应该把她（他）的利益放在首位，甚至不惜牺牲自己。而最后一节更是提出：“自私是错误的”，只有拒绝自私，抵御自由意志的泛滥和兽性因子的控制，恋爱中的男女才能得到“满足”，这种满足不是兽性的满足，而是身心的满足，灵与肉的结合之爱的满足。

升华为道德情感的爱情另一个特征就是永恒性，“1952-1977”就是其中的代表作。标题“1952-1977”是个文字游戏：从1952年到1977年总共25年：

在没有什么永恒的时代  
只有变得更糟，或者变得陌生  
唯一不变的好事：  
她从未改变。 (192)

世界上没有任何东西是持久不变的，25年的时光穿梭，世间万物可能会衰老、败落，或者面目全非，但是有一样东西是始终没变，那就是爱人——“她”。对于女人来说，25年，是她生命中最美的一段；25年，对于成年女人来说只会意味着青春流逝殆尽，为什么叙述者说“她”一点没变呢？因为叙述者认为女人最重要的是内心，而不是容颜。容颜会随着岁月的流逝而枯槁，但是心灵可以一如既往地保持童贞般真挚、单纯。这与拉金年轻时不相信精神层面的爱情大相径庭，到了晚年，拉金理性睿智地看到事物的本质，摆脱了年轻时完全被兽性因子控制的自然情感以及对肉欲的沉醉，而追求一种心灵的契合、理性的、合乎伦理道德的爱。

《降灵节婚礼》的压卷之作“阿兰德尔墓”之所以受人们的喜爱，是这首诗歌咏颂的爱兼具无私性和永恒性。这首诗通过对伯爵夫妇雕像紧握着的双手的细致描写，展开了对人性以及对爱情的伦理本质、时间流逝和永恒性的思考，诗歌的最后一句：“只有爱情能使我们长存”成为脍炙人口的诗行。

肩并肩，他们面容模糊，  
伯爵和夫人共眠在墓石里，  
他们特有的习惯隐隐显现  
贴合的盔甲，挺括的裙褶，  
以及微微荒诞的暗示——  
他们脚下的小狗。

如此前巴洛克风格的平实  
不太能吸引目光，直到  
看见他左手的铁手套，空空的  
握在另一只手里；

人们发现，带着柔情和震惊，  
他抽出的左手，紧握她的手。 (116)

开首的两行诗句仿佛是伯爵和伯爵夫人雕像的速写图，他们的脸模糊不清，只有寥寥几笔勾画他们衣着：伯爵身着戎装盔甲，伯爵夫人穿着长裙礼服。虽然只有寥寥几笔，伯爵和夫人的伦理身份及他们生前的生活状况栩栩如生地展现在读者面前。从伯爵的盔甲可以推测伯爵的军人身份，“他们脚下的小狗”暗示着夫人是一位养尊处优，悠闲地养着名犬的贵妇人。如果只是这样的话并不能吸引人们，视觉意象使雕像灵动起来的关键是他们握着的双手：他本来带着盔甲手套的，此时脱下左手的手套拿在右手，用温暖的左手握着妻子的手，这个意象让读者震惊于这位铮铮汉子的铁骨柔情，动情于这对夫妻之间的关切、责任、尊重和忠诚，因为“当两性真正相爱时，最为普遍的接触都可以将欲火点燃；握手、双肩相触、含情一瞥、爱慕的微笑，都可使他们获得比情欲冲动更多的幸福”（科勒 99）。随着描写进一步展现，主旋律进一步复杂化，也进一步明晰：

他们没有想到会躺如此久。  
此种蕴藏在肖像内的逼真  
只有细致的朋友才可察觉：  
被雇雕塑家雕刻的优雅  
抛弃，而促使雕像底座的  
拉丁姓氏得以流传久远。

他们怎么也猜想不到这么早  
在他们仰卧静止的旅程中  
空气化成无声的损害，  
把老房客赶走；  
这么快，后代的眼睛就开始  
浏览，而不是细看。…… (116)

第三诗节暗示雕刻这座雕像的时候，雕刻家只是抓住了他们生活的一个细节，两人手挽手的甜蜜形象只不过是“受雇的雕塑家雕刻的优雅”，伯爵和伯爵夫人握着的双手并没有什么特殊的含义，只不过是艺术造型而与爱情无关，当时雕刻这座雕像的真实意图是纪念这个家族中曾出过这么个显赫的人物。第四诗节话锋一转，死神剥夺了生命，时间终将毁灭一切，“在他们仰卧静止的旅程中 / 空气化成无声的损害”喻指他们死后，随着时间的流逝，空气蚀啮了雕像。原文中的“tenantry”（仰卧静止）寓指人的肉体，几百年过去

了伯爵夫妇的尸骨已腐蚀无存，更重要的是：伦理环境改变了，伯爵夫妇所处的封建时代成为历史，现代人对于刻在墓碑上的显赫家族姓氏不屑一顾。

坚持着，相依着，穿越过时间的  
长度和宽度。雪花飘落，无止尽。阳光  
在每个夏季透射玻璃。明丽的  
鸟语零乱地撒落于同一  
枯骨遍地。而沿着小路  
无穷尽的变换的人们来到，

冲洗去他们的身份。  
而今，无助地置身没有  
纹章的时代，一缕  
青烟冉冉升起  
漂浮在历史断片之上  
只残余一种姿态： (116)

不管时间怎么变迁，雕像中的伯爵夫妇都保持不变的姿势，但是伦理环境在变化，来参观的人在变化，这些人代表的伦理观念也在变化。原文中的“washing”（冲洗）这个字有两层喻意：一方面是“侵蚀”——时间不仅侵蚀了雕像，从历史的角度来看，伯爵夫妇的伦理“身份”在现代人眼里不再具有以前的伦理价值，伯爵这个头衔在封建社会代表着显赫的身份，在现代人眼里没有任何意义；另一方面是“净化”——当伯爵夫妇除去了虚华光环，最真实、最本质的东西便显现出来：伯爵伉俪的莺凤和鸣让旁观者感受到他们耐人寻味的亲密感和信任感，以及夫妻间无需言表的依恋和关怀。没人再关心伯爵夫妇生前的辉煌，现在他们给人们留下的印象只是一种“姿态”——相互紧握的手，两双紧握的手展现了夫妻之间亲密和相互扶持，共同走过的岁月成为夫妻双方生命的一部分，无法割舍，他们的爱是自然情感和道德情感的融合，他们的婚姻是灵与肉的和谐统一。

时间已将他们变形成为  
虚幻。他们从没想到  
墓石的坚贞已变成  
他们最后的纹章，并且证实  
我们的准直觉几乎真确：  
只有爱能使我们长存。 (116)

时间让雕像中的伯爵夫妇变得“虚幻”，不再反映他们真实的生活。他们握着的双手对于逝去的伯爵夫妇来说可能不代表任何意义，现在却变成了“他们最后的纹章”。人们为什么如此关注这座雕像，因为它证明了“我们的准直觉”（116）：“只有爱能使我们长存”。尽管不是塑造雕像的最初意图，但浮雕最终似乎传达了一种永恒的爱：灵与肉的结合，自然情感和道德情感的升华，以及男女之间性关系的道德标准：性与爱情、婚姻的统一。因而，拉金在这首诗里表达了诗人的伦理诉求：人们希望有一种超越时间的永恒的爱情、和谐完美的婚姻。

“阿兰德公墓”这首诗之所以成为拉金影响最广、最受欢迎的一首诗，正是因为拉金在诗中歌颂了道德情感的爱情，歌颂了“一种理想的、超时空的爱”（Hassan 38）。拉金在早期诗歌中否定永恒的爱情，在“较少受骗者”中只要爱情不要婚姻，而从“降灵节婚礼”开始，拉金歌颂了自然情感和道德情感相结合的爱情，在伦理选择中实现了道德升华：性、爱情、婚姻一体化，而这种爱情符合广大读者在伦理道德方面的期待视野——爱能超越时间、超越生死而永恒存在。

### 结语

拉金生活在英国社会和人们的思想历经巨变的时代，在这样的伦理环境中，人们的心理、伦理道德和个人行为都发生了巨变，传统价值观、伦理规范受到了现代潮流的冲击。诗人的爱情观也不例外，拉金的早期爱情诗反映了在传统伦理价值受到新思潮的挑战时，青春萌动的诗人的矛盾与困惑，此时期诗歌描写的爱情都是由激情支配的自然情感；拉金成熟期的作品体现了诗人对两性伦理的诉求，对爱情婚姻的伦理焦虑；拉金巅峰期和晚年的诗歌对升华为道德情感的爱情进行了肯定，拉金创作三阶段反映了诗人思想和艺术的成长和成熟的过程，而其爱情诗在这三个阶段所表现出的不同伦理诉求反映了诗人的伦理意识在两性、爱情、婚姻方面逐渐成熟和强化的过程，展现了在 20 世纪四十年代到七八十年代西方社会转型时期，伦理重构的过程中人们对爱情及两性关系的伦理焦虑、伦理诉求及其伦理选择。

### 【Note】

①本文相关引文均出自 Anthony Thwaite, ed. *Philip Larkin: Collected Poems* (London: Faber and Faber, 2003)。下文只标注页码，不再一一说明。文中引用的诗歌均为本人翻译。

### 【Works Cited】

Booth, James. *Philip Larkin: Writer*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

- Enright, D. Joseph. ed. *Poets of the 1950's*. Tokyo: The Kenyusha Press, 1955.
- 埃里希·弗洛姆：《爱的艺术》。陈维纲等译。成都：四川人民出版社，1986年。
- [Fromm, Erich. *The Art of Loving*. Trans. Chen Weigang et al. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Publishing House, 1986.]
- ：《弗洛姆著作精选》。黄颂杰译。上海：上海人民出版社，1989年。
- [---. *The Collected Works of Fromm*. Trans. Huang Songjie. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 1989.]
- Hassan, Salem. *Philip Larkin and His Contemporaries: An Air of Authenticity*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- 奥·科勒：《女论》。朱福铮译。哈尔滨：黑龙江人民出版社，1988年。
- [Kolle, Oswalt. *Te Femme Cette Innonue*. Trans. Zhu Fuzheng. Haerbin: Heilongjinag People's Publishing House, 1988.]
- Larkin, Philip. *Required Writing: Miscellaneous Pieces 1995-82*. London: Faber and Faber, 1983.
- Motion, Andrew. *Philip Larkin*. London. New York: Methuen, 1982.
- . *Philip Larkin: A Writer's Life*. London: Faber and Faber, 1993.
- 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.]
- Rajamouly, Katta. *The Poetry of Philip Larkin: A Critical Study*. New Delhi: Prestige Books, 2007.
- Swarbrick, Andrew. *Out of Reach — The Poetry of Philip Larkin*. London: Macmillan Press, 1995.
- Whalen, Terry. *Philip Larkin and English Poetry*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996.

责任编辑：郑杰



# 走出自由伦理之后——论史铁生后期作品中的宗教伦理思想

## After Ethics of Freedom: Shi Tiesheng's Religious Ethics in His Late Works

叶立文 杜娟 (Ye Liwen and Du Juan)

**内容摘要：**在中国当代作家中，也许没有一位像史铁生那样受到宗教伦理思想的深刻影响。他后期创作的小说和随笔《我的丁一之旅》、《昼信基督夜信佛》等作，皆以消泯自我主体意识、奉献个体生命迷途的方式，传递出了一种将自由伦理消融于神性价值的思想倾向。但由于史铁生是一个骨子里充满了启蒙情怀的知识分子，故而他所倡导的“救世”与“爱愿”，就并非一种宗教学意义上的伦理观念，而是一种自我实现的伦理观。就此而言，虽然说史铁生在《务虚笔记》之后告别了启蒙主义，但他仍无法摆脱对人的主体性力量的迷恋，由此所形成的功利主义的宗教伦理思想，充分体现了他与基督徒和佛教徒之间的思想分野。

**关键词：**史铁生；《我的丁一之旅》；《昼信基督夜信佛》；宗教伦理；自由伦理

**作者简介：**叶立文，武汉大学文学院教授，主要从事中国现当代文学和比较文学研究。杜娟，华中师范大学文学院副教授，主要从事英国文学和比较文学研究。本文为国家社科基金青年项目“史铁生评传”【项目批号：11CZW066】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** After Ethics of Freedom: Shi Tiesheng's Religious Ethics in His Late Works

**Abstract:** No contemporary Chinese writers reflected so seriously and intelligently on religious ethics as Shi Tiesheng did. His late novels and essays, such as *My "Ding Yi" Journey* (2006), *Faith in Christianity in the Day, Faith in Buddhism in the Night* (2012), all depict characters' ethical confusion, and show the author's explicit interest in divine value rather than ethics of freedom. Yet Shi Tiesheng is an intellectual with a full embrace of the philosophies of Enlightenment. His faith in Christianity in the name of "salvation of world" and "willingness to love" was essentially self-fulfilling ethics. Although Shi Tiesheng gave up the enlightenment after *Retreat Notes* (1996, 2009), his pursuit of subjectivity in enlightenment

philosophy was still entangled with his religious thought, thus formed an utilitarian religious ethics which showed ideological division from Christians or Buddhists.

**Key words:** Shi Tiesheng; *My "Ding Yi" Journey*; *Faith in Christianity in the Day*, *Faith in Buddhism in the Night*; religious ethics; ethics of freedom

**Authors:** Ye Liwen is Professor at the College of Literature, Wuhan University (Wuhan 430072, China). His research area is modern and contemporary Chinese literature, and comparative literature. Email: yeliwen1973@163.com Du Juan is Associate Professor at the School of Chinese Languages and Literature, Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China). Her research interests are British literature and comparative literature. Email: janeto131@163.com

在上世纪八十年代的启蒙文学中，中国作家不仅致力于提升人的主体性价值，而且也对那些影响了人物命运的伦理问题格外关注：无论是八十年代前期的人道主义文学，抑或是嗣后的先锋小说运动，皆以表达生命个体存在的伦理困境（聂珍钊 258）、解放人物的自由伦理为己任。隐含其间的价值诉求，无不与传统的人民伦理思想针锋相对。但在此过程中，中国作家对自由伦理的过度申张，却也因了对启蒙神话的鼎力构筑，从而逐步落入了一个以自我中心主义为表征的现代性陷阱——八十年代中期至九十年代前期泛滥成灾的欲望与暴力叙事，只不过是当代作家自由伦理意识极度膨胀的一个现实缩影。

进入九十年代以后，随着启蒙运动的落潮，一些中国作家也开始对自由伦理产生了质疑：他们对“我”之价值的疏离，对此世苦难的承领，以及对彼岸世界的倾心，莫不显现出了宗教伦理思想的深刻影响。从某种程度上说，告别启蒙、投身宗教，似乎成为了一部分中国作家在九十年代的人生选择。这其中又尤以史铁生为甚——他的小说与随笔，皆以消泯自我主体意识、奉献个体生命迷途的方式，传递出了一种将自由伦理消融于神性价值的思想倾向。这当然是一种宗教伦理学意义上的“无我”诉求——因为只有通过消泯自我欲望、在“无我”之境中承领此世的存在苦难，人才能真正倾心于彼岸世界的无上神恩。而人借此与神或他人所构建起来的伦理关系，就不再是一个执迷于自我伦理处境的单向度结构，而是一种以悬置自我意志、承领神性价值为标志的伦理诉求。那么，史铁生的这一宗教伦理思想究竟如何体现于他在新世纪的文学创作中？而自由伦理和宗教伦理之间的权力博弈，又让史铁生作品呈现出了怎样的思想面貌？

—

作为史铁生的最后一部长篇小说，《我的丁一之旅》似乎只是一部形式奇特的爱情小说，但透过那些动人心魄的诗意抒情和理性思辨，却分明可见

史铁生独具个人色彩的宗教意识。在这部作品中，史铁生不仅延续了另一部长篇小说《务虚笔记》对人物生命迷途的呈现，而且还将主人公丁一的爱情故事，演绎成了一则思想驳杂的宗教寓言：其中不仅有基督教和佛家思想的深刻影响，而且也掺杂了史铁生无时或忘的启蒙情结。尤其是当作家皈依信仰的“无我”诉求与借上帝之名寻找自我的主体意识发生碰撞时，迸发出的精神力量庶足以颠覆启蒙与宗教之间的思想鸿沟。

在“标题释义”一节中，史铁生指明“我”就是一个永恒的行魂，它辗转千回，徜徉于数不尽的人形之器中，丁一于“我”，只不过是永恒灵魂的暂驻地。在经历了无数的生命轮回后，“我”偶然栖居于丁一。这一身魂分离的故事显然受到了佛家轮回思想的影响。然而，当“我”身处史铁生之旅时，“张望时间之浩瀚，魂梦周游，常仿佛又处丁一”（《我的丁一之旅》1）。何以如此？皆因“我”的丁一之旅歧路频频，从“我”初到丁一之日起，便开始了一段上下求索的灵魂之旅。“我”试图借助丁一这位天生的情种，去寻求魂牵梦萦的夏娃芳踪。如果参照作品中的“引文与回想”一节，当可知晓史铁生的标题释义，其实具有为整部作品开宗明义的叙事功能：“我”作为一个永恒的行魂，归根结底来自于上帝创造生命的太初世界（《我的丁一之旅》2-3）。史铁生也借此在阐发《旧约·创世记》的基础上，解答了“我”从何而来的生命本原性问题。在他看来，“我”其实就是上帝的仆人亚当，在无法抵御蛇的诱惑下偷吃了禁果，从此便与夏娃天各一方，而“我”的生命意义，也因此全系于对夏娃芳踪的苦苦寻觅——惟有和夏娃这样的一个“你”的重逢，“我”才有可能实践那生命原初的伊甸盟约。因为这一盟约，是上帝对世人的殷切嘱托，也只有实践了这一盟约，人才能以承领上帝恩泽的形式圆满自我。对于深受基督教思想影响的史铁生来说，寻找夏娃就是生命个体追求自我认识、活出人生意义的终极事件。从这个角度看，史铁生在这部作品里其实是以讲述爱情故事的方式，探讨了人如何将自我托付于上帝的救赎之途。而小说中“我”与丁一之间的种种灵肉冲突，恰恰反映了这一过程的艰巨与复杂。

如果说《务虚笔记》更多的是藉由男女之间的爱情故事去讲述灵魂的相遇，那么，《我的丁一之旅》就以圣经故事为原型，将种种发生于世俗世界的情爱故事改写为人对伊甸盟约的倾力实践。在此过程中，爱情这一原本是为了满足人类情感欲望的生命事件，就升华为人践行上帝殷切嘱托的一个宗教事件。不过丁一这个世俗人物却不能独立担当起重践伊甸盟约的生命重任，他必须依靠“我”这一行魂的精神指引行事。而“我”的职责之一就是用人神性价值去消弭丁一的世俗欲念。因为唯有如此，丁一这个囚居了行魂的腌臢肉身才能彻底走出世俗生活的欲望纠葛，并在寻找夏娃的人生旅途中去实现精神腾飞。就此而言，“我”的使命其实就是破除丁一的“我执”(obsessiveness)，“我”实际上成为了丁一践行伊甸盟约的精神导师。而作品中“我”与丁一

的诸多辩论，无处不见史铁生破除“我执”之心、追寻神性之维的宗教伦理思想。

## 二

具体来说，小说中的“我”和丁一，其实分别代表了两种截然不同的伦理观念：“我”作为一个将践行伊甸盟约视为生命意义的永恒行魂，无疑对一切现实生活都具有宗教伦理的思想考量，譬如“我”对自己伦理选择的坚持，对丁一这一肉身的伦理告诫，皆能反映其消泯自我欲望、承领上帝神恩的行为准则；而在丁一身上，则具有一种以自我意志为最高法则的自由伦理思想。他对女性的追求，对世俗欲望的沉迷，同样能够折射其无时或忘的自我意识和生命本能。正是出于这两种伦理观念的差异，“我”和丁一才会在现实生活中屡屡爆发出激烈的思想冲突。由于“我”作为一个行魂，只能寄托在丁一这个肉身之所中才能实现寻找夏娃的人生理想，因此丁一的每一次任性妄为，都会令“我”陷入一个两难的伦理困境：一方面，“我”必须坚持自己的信仰，不断去提醒和告诫丁一收敛自己的言行；另一方面，“我”有时却也不得不因为灵肉共存的现实而随波逐流，因为丁一的拈花惹草虽非“我”这一行魂之愿，但在很多时候“我”都在客观上成了丁一的某种爱情工具。直至经历了和丁一之间的无数次冲突之后，“我”才意识到“我与丁一毕竟志趣不同！他沉迷于美形美器，我犹自盼念夏娃的魂踪”（《我的丁一之旅》115）。但凡事也有例外，“我”和丁一也曾等到了双方都很满意的娥，此时身与魂之间的短暂妥协就具体表现为性爱的和谐，因为这种和谐“象征着作为主体的人，在灵与肉、现实与梦想、物质和精神、欲望和情感之间的和谐一致。……只有这样的人，才是自然的、没有被分裂和异化的人，只有这样的人生，才是完整和有意义的人生”（张宏 A01）。本以为丁一的爱情终于得以圆满，然而好景不长，在一场以戏剧为名的排演中，萨的介入却导致了丁一和秦娥的劳燕分飞。这是丁一坚持自我意志、追求自由伦理的一个爱情悲剧，当娥令他感到厌倦时，他便会秉承内心的情感本能，义无反顾地放弃自己的爱情承诺。正如聂珍钊教授指出的那样，“自由意志指人的不受约束的意志（*natural will*）。……自由意志的动力主要来自人的不同欲望，如性欲、食欲、求知欲等”（282）。从这个角度说，丁一因自我意志而生的权力欲望，才是令爱情理想趋于毁灭的罪魁祸首。

对于史铁生而言，爱情关系中的权力欲望问题，实际上与人们的自由伦理意志密切相关。譬如像丁一这样的小人物，本身既无纯洁的爱情理想，同时也更缺乏践行伊甸盟约的宗教情怀。他所具有的只是对自由的一种本能向往。因此当丁一在身处一段爱情关系时，他都会为了满足对自由的渴求而无视爱人的权利。就像丁一用一己私欲伤害秦娥那样。作品中丁一对自我意志的坚持，以及在处理爱情关系时所做出的伦理选择，都证明了人若是一味追

求本能的自由理想，那么就会导致某种毁灭性的悲剧结局。也正因为如此，史铁生才会说“丁一之旅也主要是我内心的故事，我只是以‘丁一’之名去看那理想的危险”（转引自胡山林 295）。由此可见，从《我的丁一之旅》开始，史铁生已然告别了标榜人性自由的启蒙主义，继而转向了以奉献与牺牲为价值核心的宗教精神。

但正如前文所说，由于史铁生是一个骨子里充满了启蒙情怀的知识分子，故他对宗教伦理的渴慕，也始终摆脱不了自由伦理的羁绊。譬如作品中有关丁一“我执”问题的书写，就在破除丁一“我执”的同时令“我”这一行魂陷入了一个更深的“我执”之境：“我”对丁一好色之心此等世俗欲念的劝诫和扼杀，岂不等同于对“我”这一行魂寻觅夏娃芳踪、重践伊甸盟约的欲念的伸张？实际上，当“我”嘲笑、挖苦丁一在世俗爱情面前的诸多失败时，无疑也造就了一种新的精神霸权。在此意义上，史铁生借助“我”这一行魂所实施的“无我”诉求，只不过是破除丁一一己私欲、解构肉身神话的同时，重新陷入了启蒙主义的自圣牢笼。不过较之早年启蒙文学中那种盲目的自我崇拜，史铁生的精神自圣只针对丁一的肉身迷途，他希望以“我”这一行魂之名，在重践伊甸盟约的价值引领下，重新反观自我的生存境地——此即为卡尔巴特所说的“以寻找上帝之名寻找自己”（转引自刘小枫 55）。

事实上在讲述丁一的人生故事时，史铁生也充分考量了自由伦理与宗教伦理之间的复杂关系。尽管小说中的“我”作为一个思想者，可以不断地对丁一提出诸般告诫，但“我”对夏娃的寻找，甚至包括在此迷途中对于上帝恩泽的领悟，却都要寄希望于丁一的爱情实践：倘若不是丁一凭着一股子胡搅蛮缠的劲头去拈花惹草，“我”又怎能辨别出“她”不是夏娃？“我”又怎能借助丁一去张望夏娃的可能居所？因此可以说，“我”和丁一在寻找夏娃的人生迷途中，尽管有着这样或那样的身魂牴牾，但丁一于“我”，却始终是一位值得信赖的朋友，甚至在某些境遇下，丁一的任性妄为反倒试探出了人心的蒙昧。比如在寻找夏娃途中遇到的那些“别人”，他们对“我”而言意味着阻挠和遮蔽，但对于丁一呢？“别人”却是上帝有意为亚当和夏娃设下的重重考验。因为有了“别人”，上帝才能证明夏娃的存在，同时也令“我”的灵魂之旅归途可期——毕竟只要敞开自己的心魂，“我”便终究会与夏娃相遇在茫茫人海。如此一来，魂之所牵就必得托付于身之所求。在这个意义上说，“我”与丁一的这种复杂关系，其实深刻揭示了史铁生对灵与肉，以及世俗生活和宗教关系等问题的深入思考。在他看来，尽管世俗生活混浊不堪，但因其对人类灵魂的层层压制与不断锤炼，反而促使其成为了世人承领上帝之恩泽的生命动力。这就意味着人必得通过世俗生活的磨难，方有可能在生命的迷途中敞开自身，从而在实践伊甸盟约的过程中去重获存在的明朗与欢乐。而这种藉由圣经故事所表达的自我认识，无疑反映了史铁生始终以个人存在困境为思想原点的精神之旅。由此所衍化出来的诸多伦理考

量，充分说明了史铁生在走出自由伦理之后，永难在宗教伦理的神性之维中，遗忘那些拯救自我困境的创作初心。

### 三

在新世纪的另一部作品《昼信基督夜信佛》中，史铁生延续了《我的丁一之旅》的问题意识。那种从质疑自由伦理的宗教精神入手，继而在强调奉献与牺牲精神的宗教伦理中去反观人物伦理困境的思想路径，同样构成了这部随笔内在的叙述逻辑。其实对于史铁生来说，创作小说和随笔目的只有一个，即如何去解决人的生死问题。由于“人的迷茫，根本在两件事上：一曰生，或生的意义；二曰死，或死的后果”（《昼信基督夜信佛》4）。因此宗教的功用，便是教人去如何应对生死，譬如“基督教诲的初衷是如何面对生，而佛家智慧的侧重是怎样看待死”（《昼信基督夜信佛》4）。以这样的一种实用理性精神去面对宗教，无疑能够折射出史铁生思想中的某些功利主义色彩。

与《我的丁一之旅》相比，《昼信基督夜信佛》首先设定了一个人唯有依靠信仰方能得救的叙述前提。较之他在八十年代的小说创作，史铁生显然已放弃了人依靠主体性力量去获得精神救赎的启蒙主义。他以白天和黑夜为喻，阐明了人无论在生命的何时何地，都离不开和苦难之间的精神搏斗。而此时信仰的力量便显得至关重要。史铁生说，

……基督与佛法的根本不同，集中在一个“苦”字上，即对于苦难所持态度的大相径庭。前者相信苦难是生命的永恒处境，其应对所以是“救世”与“爱愿”；后者则千方百计要远离它，故而祈求着“往生”或“脱离六道轮回”。（《昼信基督夜信佛》6）

白天（以及生）充满了及他之事，故而强调爱。黑夜（以及死）则完全属于个人，所以更要强调智慧。白天把万事万物区分得清晰，黑夜却使一颗孤弱的心连接起浩瀚的寂静与神秘，连接起存在的无限与永恒。所谓“得大自在”，总不会是说得一份大号的利己之乐吧？而是说要在一个大于白天、乃无穷大的背景下，来评价自我，于是也便有了一份更为大气的自知与自信。（《昼信基督夜信佛》8）

既然基督承认苦难是人的生存常态，那么信仰基督之人便应具有一种利他的伦理观念，即唯有以“救世”与“爱愿”之心，人才能从奉献与牺牲自我的伦理选择中去圆满自我。

但问题在于，史铁生所倡导的“救世”与“爱愿”，却并非一种宗教学意义上的伦理观念，他对圆满自我这一伦理选择之终极目标的执着，实际上仍是一种具有功利色彩的利他主义。因为在宗教伦理学看来，如果宗教性的自我完善被认为是伦理生活的终极目标，那么这种自我完善的伦理观就是以

人为中心的，“如果在宗教的氛围中对其加以提倡，它会导致一种以人为中心定位的宗教”（白舍客 1:79）。其不足之处在于，“它以带有局限性的价值为中心，忽视了那些更为高级的价值，而这些高级的价值才应是人们爱和注意力的中心”（白舍客 1:80）。换言之，以人的自我完善替代对神恩的承领，只能是一种人本主义追求自我完善的伦理观念，一旦“自我实现的利益与邻人的需要发生冲突时，这种伦理很容易导致人忽视邻人的权利”（白舍客 1:80）。从这个角度说，史铁生以“救世”和“爱愿”为名的基督信仰，本质上是一种自我实现的伦理观。这当然和史铁生之前的启蒙主义有着复杂关联。甚至可以这样说，虽然史铁生自写作《务虚笔记》以来就放弃了启蒙主义中的自圣情结，但启蒙主义对人之主体性价值的追求却仍然潜存于他的宗教伦理思想中，只不过启蒙主义那种唯我独尊的价值自圣，已被史铁生转换为一种自我实现的伦理观。就此而言，可以说史铁生在走出自由伦理之后，仍然无法完全遗忘自我的伦理处境，由此所形成的功利主义的宗教伦理思想，充分体现了他与基督徒之间的思想分野。

同样，史铁生对于佛教的态度也十分复杂。一方面，他欣赏佛教对死亡的认识，但另一方面，他却对“往生”或“脱离六道轮回”的宗教思想半信半疑。按他的理解，如果只依靠人的行动便能活出“明天的意义”（《昼信基督夜信佛》22）。那么佛教对来世的描绘似乎就失去了意义。从这一点来看，史铁生欣赏的无非是佛教对人内心的静观反省，他最为看重的仍然是人在实现自我认识之后的“完美行动”——史铁生似乎依旧无法破除信奉人之主体性力量的某种“我执”。至于

“……脱离‘六道轮回’呢？说真的，我半信半疑。所信者，你下辈子可以不是人、畜牲、饿鬼等等；所疑的是，莫非你可以是‘无’吗？你只要是‘有’那就麻烦。‘有’就是‘有限’，正如‘无限’其实就是‘无’。你看吧，哪一种‘有’不是有限的？你想吧，惟观察所不及者谓之‘无’，而那正是因为它的无限。这样我们就有救了，就算我们有一天不再是人，也不是畜牲、饿鬼和什么什么，我们总还得是‘有’（因为‘无’是无的呀），进而就还得是‘我’。‘我’位于有限而行一条无限的路，那才是佛或上帝的恩宠！”（《昼信基督夜信佛》22）。

史铁生的这段话可谓是再明白不过，对他而言，宗教最重要的功能便是教会人认识到自我的有限性——人只有认识到了自己的软弱与无助，并将这种有限性视为生之本源，那么才有可能破除“我执”，在有限中活出无限。由此可见，史铁生亲近宗教的本意是想破除启蒙主义的主体性神话，但他对人在承认有限性之后得救之途的认识，却仍旧是一种人本主义的伦理选择。就此而言，《昼信基督夜信佛》深刻反映了史铁生借助宗教认识自我，进而

活出人生意义的伦理思想。

#### 四

综上所述，较之虔诚的基督徒或佛教徒，史铁生这种以自我存在困境为中心、以追求绝对价值为方向的宗教意识，其实很难称得上是一种哲学意义上的宗教观。因为对于信徒而言，如何接纳神旨，为信仰去牺牲和奉献，远比解决自身的现实困境更为重要。在此过程中，人的自我认识是手段。因为唯有认清人自身的有限性，人才能义无反顾地投身于彼岸世界。而倾心于彼岸世界的绝对价值，并为此奉献与牺牲自我，则是宗教信仰的终极目标。与之相比，史铁生当然也讲求自我认识，但这种自我认识却因为作家无时或忘的主体性意识，从而使其由手段上升为目的本身。这表明在史铁生的宗教意识中，寻找上帝所代表的绝对价值仅仅是人认识自我的一个必经之途。说到底，借助宗教的精神力量反观自我，并希冀实现人的自我得救，乃是一种具有实用理性精神的自由伦理思想。较之强调奉献与牺牲精神的宗教哲学，史铁生的这种宗教意识显然更符合卡尔·巴特对宗教的理解，即“人的本性并不是追寻上帝，而是寻找自己，以寻找上帝之名寻找自己”（转引自刘小枫55）。在这个意义上说，以强调自我价值为核心的自由伦理，就势必不愿受制于宗教伦理的“无我”之境。由是观之，强调人自我价值的自由伦理，与消泯自我意识、追求神性价值的宗教伦理，就必然会在史铁生的文学创作中构成一种思想的悖论与冲突。

事实上，史铁生在其创作实践中也确实遭遇了这样一个问题：一方面，为步入宗教的思想殿堂，史铁生就必须以消融自我欲望的方式去实现宗教意识的升华，此即为他对于自由伦理思想的克服；但另一方面，这种“无我”之境又仅仅是史铁生破除“我执”、领悟神恩的一种思想手段。他倾心关注的对象，仍然是宗教对人自身的救赎之道。换言之，“我”如何在宗教神性光辉的照耀下去摆脱此世的生存苦难，依然是史铁生最为根本的创作目标。正是因为这一点，史铁生藉由亲近宗教去认识自我的人生苦旅，就具体表现为宗教伦理和自由伦理之间的思想博弈。前者是宗教哲学对人消融自我意识、倾心绝对价值的应然要求，而后者则是启蒙文学凸显人性创伤、期待价值拯救的实然本能。两者之间的复杂关系，最终造就了《我的丁一之旅》和《昼信基督夜信佛》这两部作品独具特色的思想风貌。

更为重要的是，倘若以文学史视角观之，则可发现史铁生这样一种以自由伦理为底色的宗教伦理思想，不仅可为中国当代文学中极度匮乏的神性写作增光添彩，而且亦能在深具思辨魅力的精神探寻中，澄明乃至指引中国作家的伦理革命。如果说上世纪八十年代启蒙文学的感时忧国和九十年代世俗化书写的欲望狂欢，只不过反映了国人“曾经怎样”的伦理认知，那么以史铁生为代表的神性写作，就以人生“应当怎样”的思想追求，重新提升了中



国文学的伦理价值。

### 【Works Cited】

- 胡山林：《极地之思——史铁生作品解读》。北京：中国对外翻译出版有限公司，2014 年。  
[Hu Shanlin. *Thinking of Polar Region: On Shi Tiesheng's Works*. Beijing: China Translation & Publishing Corporation, 2014.]
- 刘小枫：《走向十字架上的真》。上海：华东师范大学出版社，2011 年。  
[Liu Xiaofeng. *Towards the Truth on the Cross*. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 2011.]
- 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. *Introduciton to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- 白舍客：《基督宗教伦理学》（第一卷），静也 常宏译。上海：华东师范大学出版社，2010 年。  
[Peschke, Karl-Heinz. *Christliche Ethik*. Trans. Jing Ye and Chang Hong. Shanghai: East China Normal UP, 2010.]
- 史铁生：《昼信基督夜信佛》。北京：北京十月文艺出版社，2012 年。  
[Shi Tiesheng. *Faith in Christianity in the Day, Faith in Buddhism in the Night*. Beijing: Beijing October Literature and Art Publishing House, 2012.]
- ：《我的丁一之旅》。北京：人民文学出版社，2006 年。  
[---. *My "Ding Yi" Journey*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2006.]
- 张宏：《史铁生——一个理想主义者的爱情哲学》，《中国图书商报》2006 年 1 月 20 日：A01。  
[Zhang Hong. "Shi Tiesheng and His Love Philosophy of an idealist." *The Commercial Newspaper of Books in China*, January 20, 2006: A01. ]

责任编辑：柏 灵

# 理性意志与自由意志之争

——《国王之歌》的文学伦理学解读

## The Conflict Between Rational Will and Free Will: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of *Idylls of the King*

张成军 (Zhang Chengjun)

**内容摘要：**长诗《国王之歌》作为丁尼生最富雄心的作品，内蕴丰富，学者们有各种阐释。本文作者认为，在长诗中，亚瑟王是人的理性意志与人性因子的化身，圆桌骑士是自由意志与兽性因子的象征，“亚瑟誓言”则代表着伦理意识或理性。亚瑟王与圆桌骑士之间的冲突形象地展示了人的理性意志与自由意志的矛盾、斗争。圆桌骑士团悲剧性的结局既揭示了自由意志力量的强大与难以控制，又昭示了自由意志完全脱离理性意志的可悲后果。这令人警醒、深思。

**关键词：**《国王之歌》；理性意志；自由意志；伦理意识

**作者简介：**张成军，文学博士，江苏师范大学文学院讲师，主要从事英语诗歌及骑士文学研究。本文为江苏高校哲学社会科学研究项目“论《国王之歌》的伦理叙事”【项目批号：2016SJB750023】及江苏师范大学人文社会科学研究基金项目“《国王之歌》的伦理叙事研究”【项目批号：15XWR014】的阶段性成果。

**Title:** The Conflict Between Rational Will and Free Will: An Ethical Literary Interpretation of *Idylls of the King*

**Abstract:** *Idylls of the King*, the most ambitious work of Alfred Tennyson, describes the process of the Arthur Kingdom from foundation to decline and fall. Scholars have given various interpretations of it. This paper holds that in the long poem, King Arthur is actually the embodiment of rational will, Knights of the Round Table symbolize free will and Arthur's vows represent ethical consciousness. The conflict between King Arthur and Knights of the Round Table figuratively demonstrates the struggle between rational will and free will. The tragic end of the Round Table Knights reveals that free will is powerful and uncontrollable and that rational will is circumscribed. It is a sobering reminder.

**Key words:** *Idylls of the King*; rational will; free will; ethical consciousness

**Author: Zhang Chengjun**, Ph.D., is Lecturer at Jiangsu Normal University (Xuzhou 221116, China). His major research area is English poetry and chivalric literature. Email: zhchjun126@126.com

作为英国维多利亚时代桂冠诗人丁尼生“最长和最为雄心勃勃的作品”（Gray 2），《国王之歌》的创作断断续续持续了半个来世纪，直至诗人逝世前一年仍在修改。全诗具有史诗的规格，共12卷，一万余行。如同歌德之于《浮士德》，我们或许也可称《国王之歌》为丁尼生“一生的事业”。关于这部长诗的主题，学者们曾各抒己见，众说纷纭。如有的学者认为《国王之歌》是一首“关于理想失败的诗歌”（桑德斯 630），甚至是“我们文学中对理想失败的最敏锐的剖析”（Rosenberg 11）；有的学者则认为其“首先和最重要的是一首挽歌，致力于对无可挽回的消逝者的哀悼”（Hill 447）；另有学者认为《国王之歌》的一个明确主题是“流言的破坏性”（Hair 147）。杰作的意蕴理应是丰富的。仁者见仁智者见智。

从“字面”看来，《国王之歌》描述了亚瑟王国从建立到兴盛，然后衰落，最后倾圮的历程。如同它所主要取材的马罗礼爵士的《亚瑟王之死》。但与马罗礼之作存在重大不同的是，《国王之歌》有着深刻的“寓言的”主旨。对此，丁尼生本人曾明确指出：“《国王之歌》有一个寓意或寓言的主旨”（Birch 515）。1868年丁尼生在给友人诺尔斯（Knowles）的信中这样写道：“《国王之歌》意味着比单纯的亚瑟王传奇更多的东西：否则我为何不把此书命名为《亚瑟王之歌》呢？对我的读者而言，它本应该更清楚：在这个题目里暗指了我们内在的国王”（Ricks 673）<sup>①</sup>。这里“我们内在的国王”何指？在长诗的结语《致女王》中，诗人又写道：这个古老的故事，“暗示着感官（Sense）与心灵（Soul）之战”（974）。这里“感官”、“心灵”又是何指？下面笔者就运用文学伦理学批评，试图对上述问题进行阐释，同时力图给予《国王之歌》一个新的主题诠释。

### 亚瑟王：理性意志

《国王之歌》的中心人物是亚瑟王。在传统亚瑟王传奇里，亚瑟王虽表现得比较英明，但总不乏这样那样的缺点、过失，甚至重大的罪过。例如在《亚瑟王之死》里，亚瑟王虽然是一个明君形象，但远非完美：在两性关系上他不够贞洁，尤其是当他在不知情的情况下与他同母异父的姐姐发生关系并生下莫俊德后，为了防止其日后成为孽子，竟下令杀死所有与其同月出生的孩子。<sup>②</sup>此举令人发指。与其不同，《国王之歌》里的亚瑟王则是一个“完美无疵”的形象。对之，丁尼生曾引用前人的话说：“上帝自亚当以来创造的最完美的人”（H. Tennyson 129），“旧世界不知道可与他相匹敌的，未来也不会向我们展示能与他相媲美的；他高出所有其他的国王，比消逝的都好，比将

来的都伟大”（H. Tennyson 128）。故此，诗中人物反复称誉其“完美无疵”，例如，他坚强的支持者、智者莫林曾满怀感情地称颂他道：“哦，纯正的君主，温柔亲切的国王！哦，无私的男人，无瑕的（stainless）绅士！”（829）而他那貌合神离的助手朗斯洛亦对桂尼维尔这样说：“你的完美无疵的（faultless）丈夫”（838），甚至他的反对者、敌人，如薇薇安也如此称呼他：“无可指责的（blameless）亚瑟，纯洁如处子”（800），等等，以致他的红杏出墙的妻子只得这样指责他道：“他的缺点恰恰是他根本没有缺点”（838）。

在现实生活中，完美无缺的人是不存在的。故长诗中“完美无疵的”亚瑟王与其说是现实的、物质的存在，不如说是一种精神的、灵性的存在。用文学伦理学批评的术语来说：“完美无疵的”亚瑟王实是人性因子的化身、理性意志的象征。长诗中，皇后桂尼维尔曾这样评价亚瑟王：“冷淡，崇高，自我克制，缺乏热情”（952）。殊不知，这正是理性意志的特征。

《国王之歌》里的亚瑟王确实臻于完美。他满怀仁爱，甚至对敌人也不乏仁慈。桂尼维尔曾这样说道：“国王无论是在战场上还是比武场上，/ 均克制自己的优势”（950）；在战场上，敌人一旦投降他便马上命令骑士们停止刀剑。例如，长诗第一卷中写道：“他们（按：敌人）突然转向，开始 / 逃离，亚瑟王疾呼：‘噤，他们投降了！’ / 以制止在逃跑者中间劈砍的刀剑”（682）。在比武场上，亚瑟王从不在意自己的“战果”。首席骑士朗斯洛曾说：“他不关心 / 在比武场上的胜利——/ 假如他自己的骑士打倒了他，他会笑着 / 说，他的骑士比他更好”（843）。他励精图治，勤政爱民：坐在卡米洛宫的大殿上，主持正义，为民伸冤，并如此对众人说道：“国王坐在殿堂之上，就是为了 / 为所有国民伸冤”（703）。他还不时到国内各地巡视，甚至多次亲自带领骑士去清剿土匪或平定内乱。<sup>③</sup>在情感生活上，亚瑟王纯洁忠贞，一生只爱桂尼维尔一人；并极富克制，即使在异常艰危的困境里仍努力保持自己的风度。例如，在得知心爱的妻子皇后桂尼维尔竟长期与朗斯洛私通，并由此造成圆桌骑士团的分裂及王位被篡夺时，亚瑟王虽极其悲痛、愤怒，但并没有变得穷凶极恶，对祸首桂尼维尔并没有施以刑罚，而只是严厉责备；甚至对她依然怀着爱，并希望以此来激励她改过自新（Ricks 956）。亚瑟王不仅秉性高洁、洁身自好，而且志存高远、怀抱崇高理想：他既对他的骑士爱护有加，同时亦要求他们“……慷慨，仁慈，/ 说真话，勇敢，道德高尚”（705），以成为“完美的人”，“像他一样”（838），进而将他的王国，他的圆桌骑士团建成“世界之花”（819）、“浩大世界的榜样”（954）。这是亚瑟王的理想，是他终生为之不息奋斗的目标。总之，亚瑟王的精神境界是崇高的，行为是理性的：他总是表现得高贵而理性，崇高而节制，确是理性意志的化身、人性因子的象征。

聂珍钊先生在《文学伦理学批评导论》中指出：“人性因子即伦理意识，主要由人头体现”（38）。在《国王之歌》里，亚瑟王即不时被称为骑士们

的“头”(head)。例如,在第一卷“亚瑟到来”中,开端部分亚瑟王即被称为“他们的国王和头”(679);在“桂尼维尔”卷中,亚瑟王则自称:“我,他们的头”(953),等等。在长诗中,正是亚瑟王赋予了圆桌骑士团及整个王国以伦理意识与道德责任,赋予其灵的崇高,促使其摒弃物欲的低贱。同时,“头”作为人性因子及伦理意识的象征,人无“头”则意味着无人性因子与伦理意识,实即野兽。在长诗中,在亚瑟王到来之前的卡米利亚德王国正是一片“野兽之地”(land of beasts)(681):土地荒蛮,野兽肆虐,人伦败坏。亚瑟王到来后,“驱逐/异教徒,屠杀野兽,砍伐/林木,让阳光照进来”(680-681),方使之真正成为“人的王国”。正因此,在亚瑟王的加冕典礼上,骑士们在亚瑟王面前唱道:“吹响吧,号角,世界与五月一同洁白!/吹响吧,号角,漫长的黑夜已远远逃遁!”(692)这里正如同昔人之所赞誉孔子:天不生仲尼,万古如长夜。亚瑟出世前,世界黑夜漫漫;亚瑟出世后,则世界被照亮,人们方真正告别兽的时代,而步入人的时代。

学界对《国王之歌》曾有一个普遍的批评,即中心人物亚瑟王形象塑造的不真实(Buckley 177),“难以相信他是一个人”(Milch 46)。其实,若我们从文学伦理学批评的角度来审视之,会有豁然开朗之感:这可以说是丁尼生有意为之,因为亚瑟王本不是一个有血有肉的现实形象,而是超尘拔俗的人性因子的化身、理性意志的象征。

综上,丁尼生在给诺尔斯的信中所言:将长诗命名为《国王之歌》,而非《亚瑟王之歌》,是因为在这个题目里暗指了我们内在的国王——这里“我们内在的国王”,即指人之人性因子与理性意志。

### 圆桌骑士:自由意志

1867年,丁尼生在与友人阿林汉姆(Allingham)谈及《国王之歌》时曾说道“国王是完人,骑士们是激情”(Ricks 671);在八十岁生日上,丁尼生又这样说道:“我意欲让亚瑟王代表人的理想心灵,与斗争的肉体元素接触”(H.Tennyson 130);而在长诗中,忏悔后的桂尼维尔亦曾如此自语:“啊,伟大仁慈的国王,/您之于您的骑士,犹如圣人的良心/之于感官”(958)。这里“完人”、“理想心灵”实即指人之人性因子与理性意志,如同卡尔维诺笔下子爵善良的一半(或曰“善良的子爵”);那么,这里“激情”、“肉体”、“感官”等又有何寓意?聂珍钊先生在“伦理选择与斯芬克斯因子”一文中指出:“心灵即理性意志,肉体即自由意志。体现兽性因子的人体感官能够产生强大的欲望和情感,即自由意志”(8)。在《国王之歌》里,与亚瑟王相对,圆桌骑士实是人之自由意志与兽性因子的代表、象征。

这是一群骚动的情感和精力,如同一匹匹跃跃欲驰的野马,或一锅沸腾的激情,不甘沉静,亦不甘受约束,而渴望着自由放任。这是圆桌骑士的本质特征。圆桌骑士的这一本质特征在其著名代表特里斯坦的话中得到鲜明揭

示。在“最后的比武大会”卷中，特里斯坦曾对他的情人、马克的王后伊瑟这样说道：“……国王 / 用神圣的誓言绑住他们（按：圆桌骑士）， / 血肉之躯定会违背。 / 因为触摸我的这只手臂，流着 / 追逐自由的鲜血，散发着欧石楠的气息， / 搏动着十足的男人（pulsing full man）……”（939-940）这里特里斯坦所言“十足的男人”，并非顶天立地的男子汉，不过是本能的男人，实即人之兽性因子；这里的“自由”亦非真正的自由，而不过是情欲放纵的自由。因此特里斯坦接下来恬不知耻地说道：“我们能爱就要爱”（940），终于不顾社会的伦理道德，“公开”和马克的王后金发伊瑟私通，后又“轻易娶了”玉手伊瑟。作为亚瑟王的两大圆桌骑士之一，在《国王之歌》里，特里斯坦是自由意志、兽性因子的典型代表。朗斯洛是首席圆桌骑士，“骑士之花”，本应是圆桌骑士们的表率。但是在《国王之歌》里，朗斯洛却置自己的伦理身份于不顾，在情欲的驱使下，和自己的主公及朋友亚瑟王的妻子桂尼维尔发生了私情。<sup>④</sup>此举既严重背叛了君臣之伦、朋友之伦，又公然践踏了《国王之歌》里的骑士爱情伦理<sup>⑤</sup>。朗桂私情鲜明昭示了自由意志无视伦理规范、追求欲望满足的非道德倾向。高文曾立誓帮助青年骑士佩里斯去赢得艾塔蕾的爱，但是当他来到漂亮的艾塔蕾面前时，却转眼间“爱”上了她。三天之后，当佩里斯再次见到他们时，“他们正躺在一起酣眠”（916）。其无信无义一至于斯！然而，另一方面，这恰恰正是自由意志的行为表现。

自由意志主要产生于人的动物性本能，其主要表现形式为人的不同欲望。在《国王之歌》里，步踵朗斯洛、特里斯坦之后，其他骑士即纷纷将曾发下的高贵的“亚瑟誓言”抛诸脑后，纵身跳入欲望的泥沼。

### 亚瑟誓言：伦理意识

文学伦理学批评认为，人是一种斯芬克斯因子的存在，由人性因子和兽性因子组成。无视社会的伦理道德，追求欲望的满足，现世的快乐，趋乐避苦。这本是兽性因子的特征。若无人性因子的约束、指引，必然导致原欲泛滥，人欲横流。人性因子的职责和使命就是控制、约束兽性因子。

在《国王之歌》里，作为人性因子与理性意志化身的亚瑟王是如何约束、控制骑士们，以朝着他所指引的向上、向善的方向前进的？纵观《国王之歌》，这主要是靠“亚瑟誓言”。在圆桌骑士团创建之初，亚瑟王即为骑士们设立了需谨遵的誓言。长诗中，亚瑟王曾这样谈道：“我让他们把双手放在我的手里，发誓： / 崇敬国王如他们的良心， / 崇敬良心如他们的国王； / 打击异教徒，维护基督教； / 骑行世界，铲除邪恶； / 不说诽谤之辞，亦不听之； / 信守承诺，如同它来自上帝； / 在最纯洁的节操中过甜美的生活， / 只爱一位未婚女子，坚守对她的爱， / 以经年的高贵行为来崇拜她，直至 / 赢得她的芳心”。这就是“亚瑟誓言”。亚瑟王希望骑士们以此为行为准则，“去除人心中的卑贱”或者说兽性，“成为一个真正的人”（954）。

聂珍钊先生在“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”中指出：“把人同兽区别开来的本质特征，就是人具有理性，而理性的核心是伦理意识”（17—18）。这里的“亚瑟誓言”，即具有鲜明的伦理属性，实可视为圆桌骑士团的伦理规范。骑士们若能信守之，则成为一个真正的人；若践踏之，则堕落为野兽。“亚瑟誓言”这种区别人、兽的伦理性质，在智者莫林的话语中得到清晰的揭示。在“盖瑞斯与丽奈特”卷中，莫林向即将踏入卡米洛城、渴望成为亚瑟骑士的盖瑞斯说道：“……国王 / 将以如此誓言约束你，即一个人 / 不为之约束就是耻辱；然而 / 无人能坚守这些誓言；因此，你害怕 / 发誓就不要跨越这道门，而 / 呆在外面，在旷野的牲畜中间”（701）。这里“呆在外面，在旷野的牲畜中间”，诗人本人曾亲自注释道：“做一只纯粹的野兽”（Gray 431）。莫林的话清晰表明，一个人若不愿接受亚瑟誓言的规约，拒绝它的引导，我行我素，其实是“一只纯粹的野兽”；若想成为一个真正的人，则必须接受亚瑟誓言的规约。

由上述可见，在《国王之歌》里，“亚瑟誓言”实即人之伦理意识、或者说理性的象征，它将人与兽区别开来。在长诗中，亚瑟王曾反复强调人之承诺（word）的重要性：“人之承诺是神圣的”（682、788）、“信守承诺，如同它来自上帝”（954）。究其实，亚瑟王的主要目的，即希望骑士们将自己曾庄重发下的誓言视作至上的规约，信守之，践行之，从而祛除身上的兽性，摆脱原欲的驱使，向上，向善，以成为“世界之花”（819）。

在圆桌骑士团建立之初，骑士们甘愿接受亚瑟王的领导，谨遵亚瑟誓言；大家互相鼓励，“践行高贵行为”（819）。长诗中写道，正是“凭借着与高贵的誓言相一致的高贵行为，/ 从绝对的混乱和无理性的暴力中”（924），建立起了亚瑟王国。这是人性因子与兽性因子，或者说理性意志与自由意志，在誓言的联结下，紧密团结、“一心一意”的结晶（693）。可惜的是，这种“一心一意”只是暂时的。

### 亚瑟王国的陷落：理性意志与自由意志之争

自由意志和理性意志是相互对立的两种力量，二者并非同一，而是存在着交锋和斗争。在《国王之歌》里，作为自由意志的代表，圆桌骑士们并不甘于始终和完全处于亚瑟王的控制之下。当作为理性意志化身的亚瑟王力量足够强大，并面临着外患时，自由意志会暂时紧密团结在理性意志的周围，信守誓言，听凭其约束、指引，一致对外。但是随着外敌的被消灭，王国的日渐稳固、繁荣，自由意志和理性意志结成的统一体，便渐渐懈怠。自由意志开始蠢蠢欲动，不再甘受誓言的束缚，不再乐于接受理性意志的引导。于是骑士们开始“反思”誓言、质疑誓言。圆桌骑士的著名代表特里斯坦在与情人金发伊瑟幽会时说道：“……誓言！ / 哦，一时的有益健康的疯狂，/ 它们有它们的用途、它们的时限”（939）。既然视其为“一时的疯狂”、有

其“时限”，甚至时限已过，那么它们就不是必须信守的、不可违背的。于是开始嘲笑之，轻贱之。在“最后的比武大会”卷中，特里斯坦说道：“誓言——我是森林里的樵夫，/我听到啄木鸟在嘲笑它们……”（940）在同一卷中，亚瑟王的小丑戴格尼特这样指责特里斯坦道：“你正沿着/魔鬼的道路走下去，走得如此之远/变得如此之聪明，以致你在/地狱火湖边，用亚瑟王的誓言打水漂”（930），终而至于“背弃了”亚瑟誓言<sup>⑥</sup>。紧随特里斯坦之后，其他骑士亦纷纷将曾发下的高贵的亚瑟誓言抛诸脑后，弃之如敝履。

自由意志一旦完全脱离了理性意志的控制，便会不可避免地“陷入自然主义的泥淖，任凭原欲泛滥，让人变得与兽无异”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》44）。背弃了亚瑟誓言、脱离了亚瑟王控制的骑士，一任欲望的驱使，没有伦理观念，不计是非善恶，无信无义。因此，在“轻易娶了”玉手伊瑟之后，特里斯坦又“轻易遗弃了她”，返回康沃尔与旧情人金发伊瑟重温旧梦……莫俊德是亚瑟王的骑士和外甥，在舅父远征时受其信托代理朝政，但他却不顾君臣之伦和舅父的信任而篡夺了王位，并与异教徒结为联盟抗击舅父；甚至还想霸占舅母桂尼维尔……而在这种情形下，众多骑士“忘记了他们的誓言和忠诚”（953），归附了莫俊德，与君主亚瑟王对抗。面对无信无义、欲望泛滥的骑士，在“亚瑟消逝”卷中，亚瑟王痛心疾首地说道：“……我的王国退回到野兽状态”（960）。抛弃了伦理意识、理性意志规约的自由意志，已然沦为野兽。结果还不止于此。聂珍钊先生在《文学伦理学批评导论》中指出：“如果兽性因子同人性因子分离开来，自由意志就如同脱缰的野马，……，不能自控也不能他控，最后只能造成毁灭”（45）。这正是圆桌骑士团的结局。在《国王之歌》里，骑士们由嘲笑誓约，到背弃誓约，再到最后竟公然反叛亚瑟王，与之对垒。面对着自由意志的放纵无度，理性意志虽用“誓言”竭力羁勒，然而，在强大的肉欲面前，人的理性意志往往也显得无能为力。为了不与之同归沉沦，亦为了维护自己的尊严，亚瑟王只得与其决裂、决战。

在最终爆发的这场理性意志与自由意志的鏖战中，圆桌骑士团可谓同室操戈，自相残杀。其时大雾弥漫，海风刺骨，长诗中写道，“在迷雾中朋友和敌人都是影子”，“朋友杀了朋友，而不知道杀了谁”（963）……一幅伦理混沌之象。“一整天，战争的喧闹声在/连绵的群山中、在寒冷的大海边回荡，/直至圆桌骑士们一个个倒下……”（965）圆桌骑士团终于分崩离析，灰飞烟灭。圆桌骑士们归于尘土，亚瑟王则远逝阿瓦隆，归返他属灵的世界。

一个曾经辉煌灿烂的王朝，一个纯洁有力的机体，因理性意志与自由意志的同心协力而屹立人间；因互相鼓励，践行高贵之举而蒸蒸日上。它怀抱着崇高的理想，以期有朝一日成为“世界之花”，建立起一个理想王国。然而，后来由于根深蒂固的兽性因子的蠢蠢欲动、自由意志对理性意志的背离而渐渐衰落；最后，因自由意志对理性意志的反叛、战争而倾圮……美好的



理想终成泡影，“王国又退回到野兽状态”（960）。如此结局令人扼腕叹息，又令人深长思之。

对人格之二重，丁尼生是有深刻体认的。诗人家族及自身的遭遇使他深切体味到人身上存在的非理性<sup>⑦</sup>；同时对当时资本主义社会的观察、对历史事件（如法国大革命）的理解，又使他认识到人无法理性地控制自己；而进化学说日益广泛地传播，则使他认识到人类与动物世界的密切联系：人或许由动物进化而来。在此情形下，丁尼生就形成了他对人格之二重的认识：人身上不仅具有“神性”，还潜伏着“兽性”；用文学伦理学批评的术语来说，即人身上同时存在着人性因子与兽性因子。在创作中，丁尼生竭力张扬前者，抑制后者。例如，诗人的著名长诗《悼念》中写道：“快起来超越 / 那醉舞的牧神、那声色之乐， / 向上运动，从‘兽’中超脱， / 而让那猿性与虎性死灭”（Ricks 465）。但同时丁尼生对人性能否始终高扬，人性因子能否始终或最终驾驭兽性因子，是深怀忧虑的，有时甚至不无悲观。在《洛克斯利厅，六十年后》中，抒情主人公如此感喟道：“我们不是从兽类而来，又复归兽类吗？”（Ricks 647）在《绝望》中，诗中人物甚至发出这样的绝叫：“我们这些可怜的魂灵——没有魂灵——本 / 来自兽类，再与兽类同死”（Alfred Tennyson 535），对人之复归动物性表示了深沉的忧虑。

在《国王之歌》里，丁尼生亦在某种程度上表达了这一观念。长诗中，诗人让亚瑟王代表人性因子与理性意志，圆桌骑士代表兽性因子与自由意志，“亚瑟誓言”则象征着理性或伦理意识。亚瑟王与圆桌骑士之间的冲突、战争，形象地展示了人的理性意志与自由意志的矛盾、斗争。圆桌骑士团最终的悲剧结局，则昭示了自由意志力量的强大与难以控制、理性意志力量的局限与无奈。然而，另一方面，悲观并不等同于绝望。在《国王之歌》里，作为人性因子象征的亚瑟王在红尘俗世虽遭受了重创，但并非气绝，而是一息尚存。诗中写道：载着他远去的小船，“越来越远，越来越小”，但是最终并非为灰暗的世界所淹没，而是溶于天边的“一片光中”。尤其是长诗最后一句写道：“新的太阳升起，带来新的一年”（973），更是赋予作品结尾以一抹亮色，一种期冀。人或许是可以重生的，正如凤凰涅槃。

### 【Notes】

① See Christopher Ricks, ed., *Tennyson, A Selected Edition* (Harlow: Longman, 1989). 克里斯托弗·瑞克斯编注的丁尼生诗歌版本是目前最具权威的丁尼生诗歌版本，它不仅是丁尼生诗歌文本的一个可靠来源，而且包含广博的文本注释、简要的评述和背景信息等，被誉为“伟大的版本”和“令人惊奇的壮举”（Mazzeno 122）。本文所引《国王之歌》里的诗句均出自其版本，译文由笔者自译，以下只标明页码，不再一一说明。

- ② 参见马罗礼:《亚瑟王之死》,陈才宇译(南京:译林出版社,2008年)42。
- ③ 参见《国王之歌》之卷“杰润特与伊尼德”(782—786)、“圣杯”(882—884)及“最后的比武大会”(932—934)等。
- ④ 在《国王之歌》里,亚瑟王对朗斯洛极其器重和信赖,不只将他看作自己的骑士,而且视其为最亲密的朋友,对之经常以“朋友”相称。例如,在“圣杯”卷中,当朗斯洛从圣杯追寻的历程中返回朝廷时,亚瑟王向他问道:“我的朋友,我们圆桌骑士中最强大者,这次追寻对你有帮助吗?”(897)在“朗斯洛与伊莲”卷中,当亚瑟王从皇后桂尼维尔那里得知朗斯洛隐名埋姓参加了比武大会时,他说道:“当然他的国王和最亲密的朋友会很好地替他保守秘密的”(851),等等。
- ⑤ 《国王之歌》里的骑士爱情伦理为——“在最纯洁的节操中过甜美的生活,/只爱一位未婚女子(maiden),坚守对她的爱,/以经年的高贵行为来崇拜她,直至/赢得她的芳心”(954)。因此,与已婚贵妇相恋甚至私通,是骑士爱情的伦理禁忌。
- ⑥ 在该卷稍后,特里斯坦直言不讳地说:“我曾对国王发下誓言,但现在背弃了”(938)。
- ⑦ 丁尼生家族似乎有着“黑暗血统”:他的父亲、祖父、曾祖父等,都程度不同地受着疯狂、抑郁、纵火癖,或是躁郁症等的侵袭。这种忧郁疯狂的症状也不同程度地体现在其兄弟身上;丁尼生本人也曾为自己可能会遗传上这些病症而极其忧虑(参见凯·雷德菲尔德·杰米森:《天才向左,疯子向右(上):躁郁症与伟大的艺术巨匠》,聂晶译[杭州:浙江人民出版社,2013年]174—179)。事实上,丁尼生也确实有些许病症,有时乖戾、激烈,神经过敏……奥登曾说:“对忧郁症,他几乎无所不知”(Mazzeno 80)。这虽有些夸张与贬抑,但亦道出了些许事实。因此,丁尼生对人能否完全理性地控制自己的行为、按理性的规划行进,是深有疑虑的。丁尼生有很多作品涉及疯狂题材,如《莫德》、《圣西蒙·斯泰利茨》、《卢克莱修》等,也包括《国王之歌》。

### 【Works Cited】

- Birch, Dinah, ed. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford; New York: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Buckley, Jerome. *Tennyson: The Growth of a Poet*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1960.
- Gray, J. M., ed. *Idylls of the King*. London: Penguin Books, 2004.
- Hair, Donald S. *Tennyson's Language*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1991.
- Hill, Marylu. “‘Shadowing Sense at War with Soul’: Julia Margaret Cameron’s Photographic Illustrations of Tennyson’s *Idylls of the King*.” *Victorian Poetry* 4(2002):445-56.
- Mazzeno, Laurence. W. *Alfred Tennyson, The Critical Legacy*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 2004.
- Milh, Robert J. *Cliffs Notes on Tennyson’s “Idylls of the King.”* Lincoln: Chifls Notes, 1964.
- 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 Literature Criticism: Ethical Choice and Sphinx Factor." *Foreign Literature Studies* 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 Literature Criticism: Its Fundamentals and Terms." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1(2010):12-22.]

——: 《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2014 年。

[---. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]

Ricks, Christopher, ed. *Tennyson: A Selected Edition*. Harlow: Longman, 1989.

Rosenberg, J. D. *The Fall of Camelot: A Study of Tennyson's "Idylls of the King"*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1973.

安德鲁·桑德斯: 《牛津简明英国文学史》, 谷启楠等译。北京: 人民文学出版社, 2000 年。

[Sanders, Andrew. *The Short Oxford History of English Literature*. Trans. Gu Qinan et al. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2000.]

Tennyson, Alfred. *Tennyson's Poetry*. Ed. Robert W. Hill, Jr. New York; London: W. W. Norton & Co., 1999.

Tennyson, Hallam. *Alfred Lord Tennyson: A Memoir II*. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1897.

责任编辑: 章 柳

# Dark Forces, Identity Crisis and Ethical Choice in Growing up: An Ethical Literary Study of *I was a Rat!* and *The Amber Spyglass*

Bai Ling

**Abstract:** Philip Pullman's works present sharp observation and profound exploration of the problems children face in our time. Adopting a perspective of ethical literary criticism, of its theory on ethical identity and ethical choice in particular, this paper takes a close reading of *I was a Rat!* (1999) and *His Dark Materials III: The Amber Spyglass* (2000), with a focus on their children protagonists' identity crisis. It aims to navigate the dark forces behind—the media and the fundamentalist religion—and their operation of power. Based on this analysis, this paper elucidates the ethical orientation of Pullman's works to our own world penetrated with forces alike and to the new ethical problems children face in the new century. It argues that the two books have their ethical value in presenting to children the world with no simplification of its ethically complicated and questionable state, and thereby putting those unopposed “truth” under scrutiny and inviting serious reconsideration of humanity. Growing-up, as Pullman presents in his novels, entails constant choices through which children acquire ethical consciousness and realize their ethical existence.

**Key words:** Ethical Literary Criticism; Philip Pullman; Dark Forces; Identity Crisis; Ethical Choice

**Author:** **Bai Ling** is Associate Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Huazhong Agricultural University (Wuhan 430070, China), Ph.D in World Literature at Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China), post-doctoral scholar at H. C. Andersen Center at the University of Southern Denmark. Her research interests include H.C. Andersen study, ethical literary criticism and children's literature. Email: bolingiswode@126.com.

**标题:** 黑暗势力、身份危机与成长中的伦理选择: 文学伦理学批评视域中的《我过去是只老鼠》与《琥珀望远镜》

**内容摘要:** 作家菲利普·普尔曼的作品对当代儿童面临的各種伦理问题有着深刻的反映和深入的剖析。本文在文学伦理学批评的理论视域下, 重点以伦

理身份和伦理选择的理论视角解读普尔曼的小说《我过去是只老鼠》（1999）与《黑暗物质之三：琥珀望远镜》（2000）。本文聚焦小说中主人公的身份危机，剖析导致危机的两大势力——媒体及原教旨主义宗教势力——及其权力运作，指出普尔曼意在引导读者反思被相同势力浸淫的现代社会中儿童面临的新的伦理问题。本文认为，普尔曼小说的伦理价值在其向儿童呈现了真实世界中复杂、混乱的伦理现状，从而引导读者重新审视绝对的“真理”并思考人的本质。普尔曼将成长表现为不断进行伦理选择，从而形成伦理意识，实现人的伦理本质的过程。

**关键词：**文学伦理学批评；菲利普·普尔曼；黑暗势力；身份危机；伦理选择

**作者简介：**柏灵，华中农业大学外国语学院副教授，华中师范大学文学博士，南丹麦大学安徒生研究中心博士后，主要从事安徒生研究、儿童文学研究与文学伦理学批评研究。本文受到国家留学基金委 2016 国家公派留学博士后项目资助；中央高校自主创新科技基金项目资助【项目编号：2013BQ039】。

In his elucidation on the moral value of children's literature, Jack Zipes exalts Phillip Pullman for his works present the dark forces of our time, their threat to our world, and the deceit they tell our children.<sup>①</sup> Pullman's works foreground a lot of ethical issues confronting children today, the moral power of which, however, has not been profoundly explored and appreciated in China today. Within the theoretical paradigm of ethical literary criticism, this paper takes a close reading of *I was a Rat!* (1999) and *The Amber Spyglass* (2000), the last book of the trilogy *His Dark Materials*, with an objective to navigate the dark forces and the identity crisis they pose to children. It is also the aim of this paper to illuminate how the fictional catastrophe tactfully alludes to the moral disaster children experience in the new century. It argues that the two books present children a reality with no simplification of its ethically complicated and questionable state, and thereby invite serious reconsideration of what is true and what it takes to be human. Growing up, as Pullman presents in his novels, entails constant choices through which children acquire ethical consciousness and realize their ethical existence.

## I

When the narrative begins in *I was a Rat!*, the paradoxical scenario in which a little boy claims that he was a rat brings the identity problem to the fore. Though the appearance presents him as human, his claim and scruffy behavior like that of a rat's strongly suggest the different. Who is he? Is he a boy or a rat, or a boy/rat hybridity? The identity problem thereby forms the ethical knot around which the

whole narration revolves.

The boy coming from nowhere starts his civilization process the moment he steps into Bob and Joan's house. Bob and Joan name the little boy "Roger"—a name Bob wants to give his own son if he has one. This naming process implies the ethical relationship built between Bob, Joan and Roger, as that between parents and children, and thus gives Roger an identity as a human boy and as Bob and Joan's foster son. With his new name, Roger starts to claim "I'm a boy" and that he is going to stay a boy (*I was a Rat!* 27). To adapt to his human identity, Roger endeavors to learn social rites and codes: he learns to eat like human, to walk with clothes on, to say thank you and sorry when necessary, and to refrain from his rat behavior. Meanwhile, however, there are forces overwhelmingly push him to the opposite side, and the newspaper *Daily Scourge* is one of the most powerful among them. It pins down the identity of human-rat hybrid on Roger for sensational story sells. And that causes Roger's identity crisis by having him confused of who he really is and by cornering him to chaos where he is made to resume the animal nature.

With *Daily Scourge*, Pullman has his target levelled against press in our time. He has the discourse of *Daily Scourge*'s coverage "strongly reminiscent of British tabloids such as *The Sun* or *The Daily Mirror*" (Joosen 199). Its announcement of the Prince's engagement, for instance, with the diction "The Playboy Prince," is an epithet that the "popular press associates with Prince Edward of Britain or Prince Albert of Monaco" (Joosen 199); thereby Pullman strings an easy association between the *Daily Scourge* with the newspaper in the real world, for which, to use McLuhan's words, "news was not only to be reported but also gathered, and, indeed, to be made" (McLuhan 211), and making the news implies "a world of action and fictions alike" (212). In *I was a Rat!* the report of Roger as a hybrid monster is an action of making news, making seamy news in particular. In a fiction-like way, with words like "subhuman creatures" and "evil and bloodthirsty" for sensational effect. As such, *Daily Scourge* makes up a story about Roger's identity, by only spreading the evil and monster side while blocking out facts to other effects. The fabricated stories, instead of news based on facts, cause Roger's identity crisis with the not correct-informed readers calling for his extermination.

The assertion of the *Daily Scourge* is not only a reminiscent of newspaper, but also an innuendo of all the media forms in our time. The escalation of transmitting speed made possible by new technology brings about an era of implosion in which media is the message, for "it is by the technological support that each 'message' is in the first place transitive towards another 'message,' and not towards a

human reality” (Baudrillard, *The Uncollected Baudrillard* 42). This implosion of information, however, “rather than producing meaning, it exhausts itself in the staging of meaning...it is a circular process—that of simulation, that of the hyperreal. The hyperreality of communication and of meaning. More real than the real, that is how the real is abolished”(Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation* 80, 81). In Roger’s case, the real existence and the endeavor he makes to form a human identity disappear in the implosion of information among newspapers. After the report of Roger as a human-monster, “other papers joined in, the publicity campaign was built up,” before long the monster was “the main topic of every newspaper” (*I was a Rat!* 122); data, words, pictures, abstract signs bounce back and forth between those papers, circulating and strengthening the human-monster image while stop short of reaching out of this simulation of reality. This “circular process”, as Baudrillard explains, goes against “the objective ‘message’ of real information, of meaning,” and “neutralize the lived, unique eventful character of that which it transmit, to turn it into discontinuous ‘message’, a sign which is juxtaposable among others” (Baudrillard, *The Uncollected Baudrillard* 42). In Roger’s case, the implosion of information among newspapers blurs the boundary of the real and the simulation of the real. Roger’s real, multi-dimensional existence disappears in the process of media transmission, with phantasmagoric character cast on him, so abstract that can be labelled on anyone else. In the implosion of information simulating the identity of Roger, the real existence of Roger goes absent from the public eye.

Besides, Pullman presents how media conspire with political, intellectual and legal forces to have its fabricated “fact” turned into truth unopposed. With the great public involvement created by the *Daily Scourge*, politicians smell their chances. The unpopular Prime Minister takes a close interest in the monster news for “it was a great help to have something else on the front pages of the papers, and even better to have something new for the public to hate” (*I was a Rat!* 118). Thus the Chief Scientist is sent to “find the monster as loathsome as possible and to spin out examination for as long as possible” (*I was a Rat!* 118). In order to avoid the newspaper turning public fury towards them, the Government decides to hold a tribunal under a High Court Judge. The alliance of important powers thereafter has been accomplished; Roger’s identity as a hybrid monster has now been made a scientific truth proved, an issue on political agenda and a legal case to be solved. The great forces conspire together and negate Roger’s effort to become a human boy. At the end of the story, the criticism levelled against media and its complice made more obvious through Roger’s words, “‘I could go on being a boy,’ said

Roger, 'If only they'd let me. I can do it quite well most of the time, except when they make out I'm something else under earth.'" (*I was a Rat!* 160)

## II

In *The Amber Spyglass*, written at the beginning of the 21st century, fundamentalist religion is dealt with as another force under question, and thereby brings us to reconsider the "truth" created by power institutions, by extreme religion in particular, in our own world. Like in *I was a Rat!*, Pullman focuses on the identity crisis those forces instigate for children.

The identity crisis is represented in *His Dark Material* in a metamorphic expression, the intercision of daemon from children. Daemon is a fictional incarnation of human identity with its human/animal dichotomy. As an integral part of human being in Lyra's world, the animal form of daemon signifies the corporeal nature. Besides, daemon is an embodiment of conscience on the part of its host legible in combat between good and evil, with moral consciousness as its core. Thus the doubling feature of daemon presents a combination of human identity, as Maria Warner observes that "[a] daemon—like Plato's daimon—is the personal, metamorphosing, animal familiar that everyone has in Lyra's world, ...an alter ego who plays the part of conscience, chorus, confidante, subconscious and superego all at once."<sup>②</sup> Besides the doubling motif, daemon also represents social identity: the rank of the daemon in the animal world corresponds to the social status of its host, as Maude Hines points out that while members of the aristocracy have diverse daemons, servants' daemons are always canine (39). Using an animal form to present the combination of multiple human identities is not as paradoxical as it appears, for our existence as human being and the relationships it entails in the social network—our relation with the self, with nature and with others—are all closely related to the self's interaction with its animal nature.

As to children, their daemons, unlike those of the adults, are capable of metamorphosis and will have its form settled till they grow up. In their growing up process, children have "their daemons changing to mood or necessity" (Hines 38); every conscious or unconscious response to the changing conditions and every choice made all cause the transformation of daemons. This transformation demonstrates character and quality formed in the process and also connecting "with growing awareness of multiple selves, contradictions, unpredictability" in a single person.<sup>③</sup> Daemon changing from something weak to something strong, for instance, can be an exhibition of its host's conscious choice to be strong, to fight against their natural desire or outside evilness. Once grow up, children's daemon



will settle at a fixed form, an embodiment of children's maturation with their identity formed, as is said in the novel that "when your daemon settles, you'll know the sort of person you are" (*The Golden Compass* 167). A seaman, for example, may have his daemon settle as a seagull, which means he is a kind of "tough old thing" and can "survive anywhere and always find a bit of food and company" (*The Golden Compass* 167).

The intercision of daemon off children therefore is a great threat to children as a repression of their initiative in making choices as to construct their identity. Children with their daemons cut off die quickly; those still alive are losing their human vigor and vitality, "like someone without a face, or with their ribs open and their heart torn out: something unnatural and uncanny that belonged to the world of night-ghost, not the waking world of sense" (*The Golden Compass* 214). Children are turned into soulless, ghost-like inhabitants, the walking dead with their ethical identity stripped of them.

It is the final book in the trilogy that reveals the motive behind the castration of children: the repression of free will necessary to the construction of absolutism and authoritarianism, to build "a permanent inquisition in every world, run directly from the Kingdom" (*The Amber Spyglass* 61). This absolute power institution is pursued in the name of truth, the theological truth to be more specific, which is brought under question in *The Amber Spyglass*. In *The Amber Spyglass*, the popular perception of Heaven and Hell, Good and Evil in Lyra's world turns out to be the lies fabricated by the first angle. The first angle claims that he is the Creator, It fabricates the "truth" about the Dust, claiming that Dust is connected with Original Sin and must be done away with. The fact is, the so claimed creator and "truth" about sin is to stop the forming of self-knowledge and to protect the authority of the first angle. Through intercision of daemon as to do away with dust, the first angle can have children more credulous and molded to his will, eliminating all the possible rebels and instable factor threatening his authority by preventing "conscious beings of every kind...become dangerously independent" (*The Amber Spyglass* 61).

Fundamentalist organizations are established to spread the fabricated "truth," with priest and nuns, scholars and scientists blinded and brain-laundried as disciples, preachers and the protectors. They conspire together in the name of truth and create a moral dystopia: the church turned into "fanatical persecutor of children, the inventor of hideous machines to slice them apart and look in their terrified little beings for any evidence of sin" (*The Amber Spyglass* 200); sinful act is committed for absolution is granted by the church in advance; Hell is replete with people both good and evil; weapons of large-scale destruction are made to

protect the “truth,” environment deteriorates and Armageddon is on the edge.

With religious truth put under question in *The Amber Spyglass*, the book invites us to reconsider power institutions in our modern world which claim to have truth at their hands. In this sense, the *Amber Spyglass* continues Pullman’s exploration in *I was a Rat!* of those dark forces capable of fabricating “reality” and “truth” and posing a great threat to children. In his lecture on the republic of Heaven written in 2000, Pullman writes “of all the dangers that threaten us at the beginning of the third millennium...one of the biggest dangers of all comes from fundamentalist religion”(qtd. in Tucker 124), and he picks out in particular the threats posed by extremists and terrorists. In a broader sense, the criticism encoded in *The Amber Spyglass* is leveled against all power institutions claiming to have truth at its hand with the tendency to authoritarianism and totalitarianism.

### III

*I was a Rat!* and *The Amber Spyglass*, written at the threshold of a new millennium, can be perceived as Pullman’s prophecy for the Twenty First Century. With the adventure of his protagonists, Pullman suggests ways of confronting those dark forces with ethical choices. Pullman shows that children can survive the challenge and can make the right choice to realize their moral maturation.

Ethical literary criticism grounds growing-up on its terminology of humanity as a composition of Sphinx Factor. Sphinx Factor is composed of human factor and animal factor: the animal factor “is the designation to the animal nature human being retains through evolution,” and the “human factor is the ethical consciousness that helps man realize its moral existence”(Nie 274,275)<sup>④</sup>. Thus growing-up entails two necessary stages: the first stage of natural selection and the second stage of ethical choice. Natural selection is a result of evolution, which gives man their human body. Ethical choice thereafter enables the forming of moral consciousness, and realizes human beings’ ethical identity. As to children, their birth is the result of natural selection through which they get the human form and inherit the animal nature retained through evolution. Compared with adults, children’s cardinal goal is to satisfy the natural instinct and therefore they are more of a natural being. In growing up, children start maturation and socialization process, the most important part of which “is the formation of moral consciousness”(Nie 267). The two stages of growing up as elucidated in ethical literary criticism is a further development of Rousseau’s theory on adolescence. Rousseau holds that “we are born twice”; “the first time for existence, the second for life,” and while children’s major work is to explore the physical world, adolescence need to raises their awareness of the self as

a moral being related with others in a social network.<sup>⑤</sup>

In *I was a Rat!* and *His Dark Materials*, children are depicted with their nature as ethically complicated and immature. Jossen points out that Pullman compares Roger to an animal, but pardons his behavior by “explaining that he merely follows his instincts, acting not as an immoral but as an amoral being” (205). From the perspective of ethical literary criticism, Pullman’s depiction of children presents a notion of childhood “as a stage of moral unconsciousness; Children are more of natural existence, closer to animal, lacking in moral consciousness” (Nie 269). In *I was a Rat!*, the metamorphosis from rat to a little boy can be seen as a metaphoric presentation of natural selection, and Roger’s first claim that “I was a rat” hints the animal nature retained thereafter. Roger acquires human body, but his scruffy habit shows his unawareness of humanity, and he himself has no great difference from animal. Roger is described as weak and vulnerable, a very “little boy” who is still at the starting point on the road of socialization and civilization. At this stage, Roger’s choices are mostly natural choices, and that’s why he constantly makes innocent mistakes though he tries really hard to accommodate to human society. What Pullman emphasizes in *I was a Rat!*, thus, is the fact that after the stage of natural selection, ethical consciousness needs to be developed as to grow up into a real human being, the first step of which is to distinguish man from animal, to know their difference, as shown through Roger’s choice of being a boy in the boy/rat options and of staying as a boy by learning the social rites and codes of manner while refraining from his rat’s habits.

Roger’s identity crisis caused by media and its complice is Pullman’s observation of the difficulty of growing up in the modern world where media, for commercial interests, are more attractive to the animal side of man and the sensational effect it causes, and where “biographers, satirists and journalists are eager to cut down anyone who might otherwise seem to be setting a reasonably good or possibly even a heroic example”(Tucker 117). For little children like Roger whose ethical consciousness is yet formed, this morally questionable environment manipulated by those powers thus transmits confusing information to them as to what it really means to be a human being. Under the pressure of those forces, the worst scenario, like what happens to Roger, is that children are forced to choices that satisfy their animal nature and unable to realize their ethical maturation.

While *I was a Rat!* emphasizes the initial stage of growing up, *His Dark Materials* is concerned with older children at the threshold of adolescence. Through the two protagonists Lyra and Will, *The Amber Spyglass* shows the moral implication of being a human and presents growing up as a constant choice-making

process, just as Tucker observes that Lyra and Will set an example of the fact that “all human beings have to make important choices throughout their lives, the better they choose, the better it will ultimately be.” (114)

Considering that the very ethical crisis is caused by lies preached as truth in *The Amber Spyglass*, it is quite natural that Pullman has truth as its quintessential core in Lyra’s adventure. As a mischievous child, Lyra has a specialty to make up innocent lies and make them sound genuine like truth. When Lyra confronts Harpies at the land of the Death, she quite naturally chooses to lie to them, but this time Lyra learns her lesson. The harpy “no-name” reacts violently to Lyra’s lies and attacks her while calling her Liar; The harpy is so furious that “the word echoed back from the great wall in the fog, muffled and changed, so that she seemed to be screaming Lyra’s name, so that Lyra and liar were one and the same thing” (*The Ambers Spyglass* 293). The pun of Lyra’s name shows Pullman’s moral intention for “the whole episode is a reminder that Lyra’s very name...can also be heard as ‘liar’ as well” (Tucker 109). Through all her childhood, lying is a handy solution Lyra knows and capable of making to protect herself and to survive, but at the Land of the Death Lyra gets her epiphany as a ritual of maturation: She realizes that lies do not work: “I can’t do it anymore—I can’t do it! I can’t tell lies! I thought it was so easy—but it didn’t work—it’s all I can do and it doesn’t work” (*The Amber Spyglass* 294). And thereafter Lyra chooses to tell the true story of human experience to those ghosts and harpies thirsty for the liveliness of it. It is Lyra’s true story that feeds the evil-cultivated harpies with warmth and kindness. They discard their intension to kill and instead try to help those ghosts to enter the other world: “It was true. Because we had no idea that there was anything but wickedness. Because it brought us news of the world and the sun and the wind and the rain. Because it was true” (*The Amber Spyglass* 317). Lyra learns from her choices “the necessity of evolving a true and creative imagination, as distinct from a fanciful one” and “this capacity of shaping meaningful stories with unmediated experience is what Percy Bysshe Shelly called ‘the great instrument of moral good’” (Lenz 7). This instrument of moral good is different from reality mediated and “truth” fabricated by power institutions. Lyra’s different choices and their consequences decode the moral implication that in truth there lie the good and the beautiful.

Through Lyra’s choice, Pullman presents what he sees as the genuine truth. Different from those manipulated by power institutions as unopposed moral regulator, truth is “drawn on knowledge of what it is really like to be alive, aiming to get everything exactly right as she sees and feels it” (Tucker 109). It is Pullman’s moral solution to a time with reality mediated through media, with “truth”

fabricated to control, a time in which “human life and its meaning are devalued, and in their place various individuals and objects, rituals and traditions are invested with ultimate value”(qtd. in Leet 175). The ghosts, when entering into the new world, urge Dr. Mary Malone to tell true stories, “They need the truth. You must tell them true stories, and everything will be well” (*The Amber Spyglass* 432).

From unmediated life experience come lessons important to learn, just like Mary learns through her own choice of stopping being a nun that flesh and earthly love is beautiful, something integral to humanity, and just like Lyra and Will learn from their choices that dark forces are inevitable and they cannot escape to a utopia world but should take their responsibility to set things right. Pullman reveals to children the causes of evil in their own world, and the alternative way of growing up in search of the genuine truth, as Tucker points out “Lyra stands for the author himself, and his corresponding efforts to get at what he sees as the genuine truth in his imaginative vision of the world, however much this might offend various interested parties along the way” (109).

In *I was a Rat!*, Pullman unveils to his children readers a world in which media simulates the reality, with little kids at the stage of natural selection as the most vulnerable victims. In *The Amber Spyglass*, Pullman continues his observation of reality and truth mediated through power institutions and once again warns his children readers of an ethically questionable world. Unlike *I was a Rat!*, Lyra and Will are presented as heroic example bravely taking initiatives; they are “shown throughout to be independent, largely insulated from social influences and very much their own creations” (Tucker 117). With these two moral examples, Pullman makes it clear that it is our choice and deed decide who we are, and defines what is good and what is evil; growing up into a morally mature adults does not mean to preach and judge with virtuous codes but to practice them in daily choices, just as his character Mary Marlowe makes clear that “good and evil are names for what people do, not for what they are” (*The Amber Spyglass* 447).

### 【Notes】

① See Jack Zipes, *Breaking the Magic Spell: Radical Theories of Folk and Fairy Tales*. (Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002) .

② ③ Qtd. in Maria Warner, “Magic and Transformation in Contemporary Literature and Culture,” The Robb Lectures in 2004. <<http://www.auckland.ac.nz>>.

④ Quotations from Nie are all translated by the author of this paper.

⑤ Qtd. from Jean-Charles Seigeuret, *Dictionary of Literary Theme and Motif A-J*, <<https://books>>.

google.dk> July. 1, 2016.

### 【Works Cited】

- Baudrillard, Jean. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Fria Glaser. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- . *The Uncollected Baudrillard*. Ed. Gary Genosko. London: Sage Publications Ltd., 2001.
- Hines, Maude. "Second Nature: Daemons and Ideology in *The Golden Compass*." *His Dark Materials Illuminated: Critical Essays on Philip Pullman's Trilogy*. Ed. Millicent Lenz & Carole Scott. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2005. 37-47.
- Joosen, Vanessa. "Philip Pullman's *I was a Rat!* and the Fairy-Tale Retelling as Instrument of Social Criticism." *Fairy Tales Reimagined*. Ed. Susan Redington Bobby. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2009. 196-210.
- Leet, Andrew. "Rediscovering Faith through Science Fiction: Pullman's *His Dark Materials*." *His Dark Materials Illuminated: Critical Essays on Philip Pullman's Trilogy*. Ed. Millicent Lenz & Carole Scott. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2005. 174-87.
- Lenz, Millicent. "Awakening to the Twenty-First Century: The Evolution of Human Consciousness in Pullman's *His Dark Materials*." *His Dark Materials Illuminated: Critical Essays on Philip Pullman's Trilogy*. Eds. Millicent Lenz & Carole Scott. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 2005. 1-22.
- McLuhan, Lewis H.. *Understanding Media: The Extension of Man*. Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1994.
- 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.]
- Pullman, Philip. *The Amber Spyglass*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000.
- . *I was a Rat!*. New York: Yearling, Random House Children's Books, 1999.
- Tucker, Nicholas. *Darkness Visible: Inside the World of Philip Pullman*. Cambridge: Wizard Books, 2003.
- Warner, Maria. "Magic and Transformation in Contemporary Literature and Culture." *The Robb Lectures in 2004*. <<http://www.auckland.ac.nz>> May 1st, 2016.

责任编辑: 杨革新

# **A Study of the Formation of Japanese Language Literature in Colonial Korea: Japanese Magazines, Japanese Translations of Joseon Literature, and Traditional Japanese Poetry**

Inkyung Um, Byeongho Jung, Hyosun Kim

**Abstract:** This study aims to examine Japanese language literature in Korea since the early 1900s through the relationship between Japanese language literature and Japanese magazines, Japanese translations of Joseon literature, traditional Japanese poetry, which were the major areas of Japanese literature during the Japanese colonial era. The literature analyzed in this research had not previously been included in the study of Japanese literature or even colonial Japanese language literature. Even before the Japanese annexation of Korea, Japanese language newspapers and magazines had already been launched in major Japanese communities in Joseon. It is apparent that Japanese language literature in the early twentieth century was formed around the literary columns in these medias. These Japanese language literary activities in Joseon were carried out with a close connection with the both domestic and international literary worlds, such as those of Manchuria and Taiwan. After the 1930s, the development of Japanese language literature became complex due to diverse literary and cultural phenomena, and because of its sensitive response to local issues.

**Key words:** Japanese language literature in Korea; Japanese magazines; Japanese translations of Joseon literature; traditional Japanese poetry; Border Crossings

**Authors:** **Inkyung Um** (lead author) is Associate Professor at the Global Institute for Japanese Studies of Korea University. She specializes in the study of Japanese colonial literature and traditional poetry. Email:uik6650@korea.ac.kr **Byeongho Jung** (corresponding author) is Professor at the Department of Japanese Language & Literature of Korea University. He specializes in the study of Japanese Modern literature. Email:bhjung@korea.ac.kr **HyoSun Kim** (corresponding

author) is Associate Professor at the Global Institute for Japanese Studies of Korea University. She specializes in the study of Japanese colonial literature and translation. Email: uzzanzi@korea.ac.kr This work is supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant funded by the Korean Government (MEST) (NRF-2007-362-A00019)

**标题：**朝鲜被殖民期间日语文学的生成研究：日语杂志、朝鲜文学的日语翻译和日本传统诗歌

**内容摘要：**本研究旨在通过对日本殖民朝鲜时期日语文学与日语杂志、朝鲜文学的日语翻译和日本传统诗歌之间的关系来考察始于 20 世纪早期的“朝鲜半岛日语文学”的全貌。本研究所涉及文学作品未被收录入日本文学，甚至未被收入殖民时期的日语文学。早在日本吞并朝鲜之前，日语报纸、杂志已在朝鲜日语社区中广泛发行。显而易见，20 世纪初日语文学已通过上述媒体的相关栏目获得发展。在韩半岛形成的日语文学活动与日本的“内地”文坛，以及和“满族”或“台湾”这种“外地”文坛均密切相连。20 世纪 30 年代之后，因多元文学、文化现象的出现和文学本身对地方问题敏感反应上的差异，日语文学的发展日趋复杂化。

**关键词：**韩半岛日语文学；日语杂志；朝鲜文学的日语翻译；跨境

**作者简介：**严仁卿（第一作者），韩国高丽大学 Global 日本研究院副教授，主要研究方向为殖民地日语文学与朝鲜传统诗歌；郑炳浩（通信作者），韩国高丽大学日文系教授，主要研究方向为日本现代文学；金孝顺（通信作者），韩国高丽大学 Global 日本研究院副教授，主要研究方向为殖民地日语文学及其翻译。

## **1. Introduction: Japanese Literature and Japanese Language Literature in Korea**

In the early 1890s after the Meiji Restoration, Japan saw the formation of a nation-state and the initial writing of various histories of Japanese literature. At that time, Japanese literary history was based on the following perspective:

Looking back, our country, Japan, is one of the oldest countries in the East. The light of literature was already shining in Japan when the Western countries were still in the complete dark....The literature of the past is indeed the flower of national culture and a treasure of the nation. The fact that we have this 3,000-year-old treasure is evidence that Japan is the mother land of the East, which makes us proud. (Haga 263-64)



This perception of the country's history reveals an attempt to establish a national identity based on the logic of a nation-state. Such Japanese literary histories were used for school textbooks in order to instill into students, the custodians of Japan's future, a sense of excellence and pride regarding Japanese culture and pride.

In Japanese literary history, literature was often considered an extension of the general humanities rather than as pure literature or language art.

The canonization of literature occurred as the concepts of nationalism and language arts were emphasized in the Japanese literary histories written during the formation period of a modern nation-state after 1890. Canonization played an important role in sustaining Japanese literature throughout the 20th century. This shows the origin of an integration of Japanese literature, Japan, Japanese people, and the Japanese language. That is, throughout the 20th century, Japanese literature supported an integration logic formed during the foundation period of a nation-state. However, as Masahiko Nishihara pointed out, after the publication of Kurokawa So's *Anthology of Japanese Literature in Other Countries* (1996), a collection of literary works in the Japanese language written outside the Japanese territory during the age of Japanese imperialism, the notion of an integration among Japan, the Japanese people, the Japanese language, and Japanese literature started to unravel (Nishi 181). An increased interest in Japanese language literature in colonial countries after the publication of Kurokawa So's literary anthology, the existence of Korean literature in Japan closely related to this colonial literature, and the emergence of non-Japanese native bilingual writers, such as Minae Mizumura and Ian Hideo Levy demonstrate that Japanese literature does not have to be integrated with Japan, Japanese people, and the Japanese language.

Despite the active research on Japanese language literature in colonial countries since the late 1990s, studies have focused primarily on great Korean and Japanese writers. Such studies act to complement Japanese literature. There is therefore a need to explore literary works written by Japanese writers in Joseon, which have been excluded from the literature of colonial Korea. Such research may reveal the entire picture of Japanese language literature in colonial countries. The present study aims to examine Japanese language literature in Korea since the early 1900s through the relationship between Japanese magazines, Japanese translations of Joseon literature, traditional Japanese poetry, and Japanese language literature, which were the major areas of Japanese literature during the Japanese colonial era. Because a large amount of Japanese language literature written by Joseon people has emerged since the Manchurian Incident in the 1930s, this study will

investigate the characteristics of Japanese language literature in Korea before this period through the review of the formation and development of Japanese language literature.

## **2. The Publication of Japanese Language Magazines in Colonial Joseon and the Development of Colonial Literature**

In a strict sense, Japanese language literature in colonial Korea refers to the literary phenomena that occurred after the forced Korea-Japan annexation in 1910. However, Japanese writers had been creating and distributing Japanese works in Korea for some time before annexation. This means that Koreans who read Japanese literature existed even before the Japanese colonization of Korea. Japanese collective migration to Korea occurred with the opening of the Busan, Wonsan, and Incheon ports to Japan after the conclusion of the unequal Japan-Korea Treaty of 1876. Responding to Japan's colonization fever, the number of Japanese residents in Korea drastically increased from 2,066 in 1880 to 171,543 in late 1910, the year of Korea-Japan annexation.

Between the *Japan-Korea Treaty* of 1905 and the 1910 Korea-Japan annexation, Japanese settlement corporations or Japanese resident organizations were established in major regions in Korea, and those regions were given Japanese names (Takasaki 96). With the formation of Japanese communities in major regions in Korea, Japanese media sources, such as newspaper *The Chosen Shinpo* (December 1881), were also created in places in order to represent the interests of Japanese residents and create a network among them (Ri 5). At first, Japanese language newspapers played the role of a network in Japanese communities in Korea. As the number of Japanese residents drastically increased after 1900, Japanese language magazines emerged in Seoul and Busan. Approximately seventy magazines were already being published in the 1900s. Among these, the following magazines actively published Japanese language literature: *The Corean Telegraph Newsletter* (December 1902-December 1903), *The Corean Peninsula* (November 1903-May 1906), *The Chosen Hyoron* (1904), *The Corean Industrial* (1905-1907), and *The Corean and Manchurian Industrial* (1908-1914). These Japanese publications generally took the form of a general-interest magazine. Although the structure varied by magazine, each had several special columns (literary page), such as short stories, literature, and included Japanese language novel extracts, literary criticisms, poetry, Tanka or Haiku, Chinese poetry, and essays.

A key question here is what led to the creation of these literary columns and works. Some Japanese scholars advocated that Japanese literature should be settled

in Korea. Through Japanese literature, they tried to build “superior” Japanese cultural communities in Korea, which were distinguished from “non-civilized” Joseon communities. Such proponents of a stronger Japanese literature presence in Korea also espoused a paradigm of an absence of Joseon literature. Their logic was that in an absence of original Korean literature or art, Japanese language literature needed to be transplanted and cultivated in Korea. This logic clearly shows the colonialist nature of early Japanese language literature, with claims that Joseon required civilization through the transplantation of imperial Japanese culture (Jung 387-412). This colonialist nature of Japanese language literature based on an Asian peace logic and the transplantation into Joseon logic was revealed in *Joseon Pyeongron* declaration that aimed to represent the opinions of the Japanese residing in Joseon and establish a long-term plan for the 100 years of Japan. The same attitude feature in the publication of *Joseon* magazine that actively justified the colonization of Joseon, which was represented by the residency-general ruling for Koreans and the world, and advocated the civilization of Joseon by decorating barbaric Korea with civilization.

Thus established, Japanese language literature in colonial Korea broadened and stabilized after the Japanese annexation of Korea in 1910. Along with the oldest and the most viewed Japanese language magazines published in Korea during the 1910s, *The Chosen Review* (1913-1943) and *The Chosen and Manshu* (1912-1941), there was a flurry of publication of Japanese language literary works. The fact that even *Korea Education Research Association Magazine* (1915-1923) featured literary and novel columns clearly shows this phenomenon.

During this decade, perhaps because Korea had been colonized by Japan, Japanese residents in Joseon attempted to produce serious criticisms about literature and comprehensively manage the formation of Japanese language literature in colonial Korea. With a focus on Japanese language authors who had been active since the early years, they wrote a series of criticisms that constitute an abridged history of Japanese language literature in Korea. Japanese writers residing in Joseon longed for the birth of a brand of Joseon-based Japanese language literature that could showcase the local character. They began to write criticisms that encouraged the creation of such literary works. In literary columns, there were also a number of novels with a colonial Joseon setting, reflecting this writing trend.

In the early 1920s, novels began to highlight the hierarchical relationship between landlords and tenant farmers, and even featured unscrupulous landlords, as can be seen in a quote in a literary column of a Japanese language magazine, “That bastard is a hypocrite....He doesn’t have any real love for tenant farmers.

He is an anachronist who considers us, tenant farmers, Russian serfs or slaves. I cannot work under such a bastard anymore” (Yamaguchi 17). These works clearly showed a hierarchical conflict between capitalists and laborers rather than focusing on the ethnic discrimination between Japanese and Joseon people. Underpinning such literary works was the intensification of labor issues and the emergence of the proletarian literary trend in Japan. However, it can be said that Japanese regrets about and awareness of the national independence movement of Joseon that occurred in March 1919 also affected the creation of those literary works.

In addition, the late 1910s had seen not only an increase in literary works written by Joseon-based Japanese authors, but also in literature produced by Japanese authors residing in Manchuria or who used a Manchurian setting. These diverse Manchuria-related writings included a novel about migration from Joseon to Manchuria.

Therefore, during the 1910s and 1920s, Japanese language literature in Korea was regarded as colonial literature based on a new land and its local color. In an active response to this conceptualization Japanese language magazines also published localized colonial literature and extended the themes of literary works in diverse ways. Moreover, in 1925, with the publication of a literary coterie magazine of premedical students at Keijo Imperial University, *Seiryo*, highly educated Korean writers, including Jino Yoo, Hyoseok Lee, and Jaeseo Choi, emerged and published Japanese language literary works. After this preparation period, a number of Joseon writers began to create Japanese language literary works in the mid-1930s.

### **3. Japanese Translations of Joseon Literature and Learning about Colonial Joseon**

As shown above, a variety of Japanese language literary works were created and distributed in Korea from the early 1900s. In the formation of this Korean Peninsula-based Japanese language literature, Japanese translations<sup>①</sup> of Joseon literature played an important role. The translations were significant for a number of reasons. First, they reflected changes in Korea-Japan relations and colonial policies. Moreover, they showed the political nature of (translated) literature. In addition, they were the first foreign translation of traditional Joseon literature. Finally, they formed a part of the origin of modern Korean literature.

The Japanese translation of Joseon literature prior to 1930 can be categorized into three key periods. The first period is from the *Seikanron* (Japan’s debate regarding the invasion of Korea) of the 1870s to Korea to the Russo-Japanese War

(1904-1905). The period was marked by a trend of Japanese translations of Joseon literature, visible in the first general-interest Japanese language magazine published by a Japanese residing in Joseon, *The Corean Peninsula* (1903-1906). At the time, Joseon was in the spotlight as a new target for Japanese investment. The potential to provide privilege led to a Korean language publication boom. Japanese people wanted to obtain information about Joseon required for trade, business, or war. This Japanese interest in Joseon was heightened by their nation's victory of the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. However, there were insufficient publications to provide information needed for their political and economic purposes or settlement in Joseon. To meet demand, the magazine *The Corean Peninsula* was published. This magazine encouraged Japanese who were planning to enter the Korean Peninsula to migrate to Joseon, and provided information about economic benefits and settlement in Joseon.

Joseon literature was also translated into Japanese to introduce the tradition and culture of Joseon. For example, regarding the underlying meaning of the translation of the *Chunhyangjeon*, Husanoshin Ayukai said that the work provided a solid depiction of the static states of Korean officials and women. This assessment reveals the Japanese perception of Joseon literature and the significance of its translation. This translation purpose also affected methods. Only a rough summary or a shortened version of Joseon literature was translated, as shown in the following comment, On this occasion, the reporter tries to introduce general Korean novels through several translations of the summaries of Korean novels, including the aforementioned *Chunhyangjeon*. Therefore, the article was mainly about the author's ideals. For *Chunhyangjeon*, only its title was mentioned for this purpose. The unique cultural phenomena of Joseon were explained using detailed footnotes. Therefore, it can be said that Japanese translations of Joseon literature were practical and functional translations. Such translations used abridged or liberal translation methods for the purpose of introducing the customs and culture of Joseon.

The second period of Japanese translation of Joseon works occurred around the Japanese annexation of Korea in 1910. Japan gave a strong display of its imperialism after the forceful Korea-Japan annexation. It founded the Japanese Government General of Korea to take over the legislative, administrative, judicial, and military commandships of Joseon, and expanded its territory and forces. The first governor Masatake Terauchi attempted to disseminate the Japanese language to Joseon people in order to nurture loyal and honest imperial subjects who could serve Japan well, such as practical workers, low-ranking officials,

and clerks. However, since the number of people who could read Japanese was only 0.5% of Joseon population in the early colonial period, it was difficult to use only the Japanese language for controlling the education and administration of Joseon. Therefore, immediately after the Korea-Japan annexation, the Japanese Government General of Korea began to teach the Korean language to Japanese educators and officials who were responsible for the education or administration of the Joseon people. Under this circumstance, a large number of Joseon literary works were published magazines such as *The Corean Industry*, *The Corean and Manchurian Industry*, *The Chosen and Manshu*, and *The Chosen Review*. *The Chosenin* was particularly active in the translation of Joseon literature. A variety of Joseon literary works, including popular songs, folk songs, children's songs, traditional poetry, proverbs, new style poetry, novels, and unofficial historical stories, were translated in this magazine. It is unique that unlike previous practical and functional translations these translations of Joseon literary works used literary translation methods, which pursue the parallel writing of original texts, the use of dialects, the delivery of cadence, and literal and complete translation, to preserve as much as possible the texture of the original language. The original Korean poems were Namseon Choi's *Taebaek Poetical Works* (Sonyeon, 1910), *Taebaeksanga*, and *Taebaeksanbu* <sup>②</sup> (Shinmungwan, 1910). *The New Style Poetry of Joseon* was the first modern free verse whose structure of lines and verses completely deviated from a set pattern. The translation and publication of this work showed Japan's interest in the modern literature of Joseon. Thus, this pure interest in Joseon literature not as an information source but as literature itself was relevant to Japan's Korean language education policy for Japanese educators and officials. The last period of Japanese translation of Korean literary works is the cultural policy period from the 1920s to the early 1930s. Two characteristics marked Japanese translations of Joseon literature during this period. First, the stabilization of the colonial policy brought Japanese language literature or translations by Japanese-speaking Joseon intellectuals. Second, efforts to translate Joseon literature were led by the Japanese government. During this period, numerous modern literary works of Joseon were translated into Japanese, including the representative modern Korean writer Kwangsu Lee's *Kashil* and *Yujeong*, Iksang Lee's *Tree of Spirits*, Dongin Kim's *Potatoes*, Jinkeon Hyun's *Hometown and Piano*, Seohae Choi's *Starvation and Slaughter* published in *Joseonshiron* (1926). In addition, the special Joseon literature issues of *The Osaka Mainichi Newspaper*, including *A Collection of Stories by New Writers in the Korean Peninsula* (1934), *A Collection of Short Stories by Joseon Writers* (1935), and *A Collection of Stories by Women Writers in*

*the Korean Peninsula* (1936), were also published. In the 1920s, some modernist poets and Korean authors of the magazine published by the Keijo Imperial University, *Seiryō* attempted to test Korean as a modern language. They also translated their work into Japanese or created literary works directly in Japanese. A spontaneous classical literature publication project was carried out. Classical literary works of Joseon were also translated into Japanese and published in several Japanese books, including *Popular Joseon Novels* (1921), *Seonmanchongseo* (1922-1923), and *Masterpieces of Joseon Literature* (1924).

Under the support of the Japanese Government General of Korea, these classical works of Joseon were systematically collected, recorded, and translated into Japanese by government officials or professors of Keijo Imperial University. The purpose of this project was shown in *Popular Joseon Novels* published by Jayutogusa. Hajime Hosoi stated that *Popular Joseon Novels* was published in order to understand Joseon, which Japan should guide and lead with the great spirit of Japan-Joseon harmony as a brother country, under the watchful eye of the international community. However, *Popular Joseon Novels* actually emphasized Joseon's subservient attitude towards China or corruption in the ruling class of Joseon. Japan criticized the nature of the Joseon people and traditional cultural values of Joseon as the harmful consequences of Confucianism, which was a forced belief from China for Chinese convenience in ruling Joseon. That is, unlike its stated purpose—promoting harmony between Japan and Joseon by understanding the unique nature and culture of Joseon people, Joseon literature was rearranged, modified, and bluntly interpreted in the translation process. These translations stressed the difference between China and Japan, and thus, Japanese translations of Joseon literature were used for colonial learning and the development of ideologies needed for the rationalization of colonial ruling. These distorted or altered translations of Joseon literary works were distributed to Japanese communities in Joseon and Japan. They formed the images of Joseon people and culture, and some of them were even included in traditional Japanese culture. For example, a children's tale of Joseon, *Marriage of Mice (The Chosen and Manshu)*, 1924), which had been translated into Japanese by Tomo Imamura, was retranslated into Korean (by Jeongim Park) and introduced to Korea as an old tale of Japan. In addition, the distorted Japanese translation of Joseon literature also affected Joseon intellectuals who could speak Japanese. It became the source of modern Joseon literary works, and some of them have even been canonized as traditional literary works of Joseon up to this day. For instance, the narrative structure and characters of *Seokgatap Legend*, whose national spirit was well known to have been inspired by Jinkeon

Hyun's novel *Muyeongtap*, had its origins in the Japanese translations of Korean literature, *The Legend of Gyeongju* by Kintaro Osaka (*The Chosen*, 1921) and Play: *Muyeongtap Story* by Yoshimitsu Hamaguchi (*The Chosen and Manshu*, 1924).

As described above, Japanese translations of Joseon literature during the colonial period before the 1930s established the colonial learning trend, switching its purpose, target, subject, and method depending on changes in Korea-Japan relations and colonial policies. This clearly shows how translated literature was utilized for politics. At the same time, it was the starting point of introducing Joseon literature and culture to other countries. Japanese translations of Joseon literary works also became a part of the origin of modern Korean literature, and some of them were even included among traditional Japanese literature. The various problems inherent in the Japanese translations of Joseon literature cannot be solved by a single country, whether Korea or Japan. This issue should be handled using a de-boundary research approach.

#### 4. The Development and Role of Traditional Japanese Poetry in Korea

The section above provided a brief overview of Japanese language literature in Korea. However, the mainstream of Japanese language literature that was continuously created throughout Korea from even before the Japanese annexation of Korea to the end of Japanese colonization era was traditional Japanese short poetry, such as Tanka, Haiku, and Senryu. In particular, Haiku and Tanka absorbed diverse discussions about traditional Japanese poetry that occurred during the Meiji period. They were even reflected in Haiku and Tanka of Joseon, and became a major genre of Japanese language literature in Korea.

Prior to 1910, Tanka and Haiku in Korea were already key genres of Japanese language literature. Rooted in Gyeongseong (Seoul) and Busan based on literary associations that were not developed in other genres, Tanka and Haiku were created through public contests offered by literary columns of the media. Later, they became a literary communicative device among Japanese residents of Joseon. Early Tanka and Haiku contained a sense of anxiety and alienation experienced by people who had migrated from Japan—from a center or inland—to Joseon—an edge or outland.

A flag of surrender in the midday heat, which seems to belong to Russian  
troops

(日盛りや露軍に見ゆる投旗)

To Housaien, a year has passed since my ill wife went back to my country



( 芳哉園へ病む妻を国に護りて年越へむ )

Ten years have passed in Joseon, and I am going to be an old man  
without any friend in my hometown

( 韓ぶりて十年過ぎなば故里に知る人も無き翁とならむ )

Standing in an open field with a flag, I can understand the feeling of  
Hideyoshi who gained a victory with a smile

( 麾あげて大野に立てば秀吉が笑んで勝得し心偲ばる )

These works from the early 1900s are good materials through which to learn the nature of Japanese residing in Joseon. In addition to their depiction of the Japanese dream of a manly takeover of the continent, as shown through their setting in the Russo-Japanese War and the Japanese colonization of Joseon, these works contain an uneasy sense of alienation. In addition, some Tankas cited Japanese mythology and classics, strengthening the psychological bonds and sense of cultural superiority of Japanese residents of Joseon. For Haiku, *kigo* ( 季語, seasonal words) were required elements. Haikus in Joseon often tried to seek Joseon-style sources, but there was no development in Joseon-style *kigo*. During this period, traditional Japanese poetry appeared as a mainstream of literature in various media, but it was only a sporadic attempt to show the nature of Joseon.

As unique sources and scenery and customs of Joseon were the subject of *Senryu*, a form that had flourished in Joseon during the 1910s, numerous literary clichés on the characteristics of Joseon emerged. The Joseon-published *Chosen Senryu* (1922), the first book of Dozaemon Ryukenshi, who came to Joseon in 1911, clearly shows how traditional Japanese poetry developed in Joseon during the 1910s after the Japanese annexation of Korea. According to this book, *Senryu* columns were published in various Japanese language newspapers and magazines in early 1910s Joseon. Among a total of 300,000 phrases, approximately 4,600 were selected and included in the *Chosen Senryu*. Although *Senryu* was considered as having the weakest literary value and foundation among traditional poetry forms, it was pretty popular at the beginning of the twentieth century. This enables us to guess the greater popularity of Haiku, which had wider distribution through contests and literary columns offered by newspapers or magazines unlike *Senryu*. Although it is very difficult to find in Korea existing Haiku and *Senryu* works similar to those of Japan, there is a record that they were already included in specialized magazines, published throughout Joseon. Based on the existing record, during the 1910s, the *kigo* of Haiku could not be specialized in Joseon, whose weather differed little from that of Japan. In fact, *Senryu*, which focuses primarily

on personal matters, was able to convey the characteristics of Joseon by depicting its social conditions, scenery, and customs.

The Japanese authorities, including the Japanese Government General of Korea, who had executed unauthorized reign over Joseon during the 1910s, began to practice cultural governance after the March First Independence Movement of Joseon in 1919. Consequently, Japanese language poetry became wide spread in the early 1920s. In other words, the Japanese language poetry circle gained the ability to publish regular magazines based on its strong literary associations, and this brought a dramatic change in the literary world of colonial Korea. This trend was largely led by Japanese Tanka writers who came to Joseon in the early 1920s. In particular, it is worth noting the range of social intercourse of Japanese residents in Joseon, which was revealed through the magazine *Shinjin* and activities of Shinjin Association, a literary association that strived to become the power of the Tanka literary circle in Joseon.

The Potonamu Association published the first Tanka magazine *Potonamu* in Joseon in 1922, and it became a vehicle for most Tanka writers in Joseon until early 1923. However, in July 1923, in partnership with Morio Ichiyama, a businessman with a wide circle of acquaintances, Gyotai Hosoi launched the magazine *Shinjin*. Although *Shinjin* was a newcomer, it succeeded in becoming mainstream in the Tanka literary world in Joseon through a series of special articles related to Joseon. The first issue of *Shinjin* resonated with Tanka writers not only in Joseon but also in Japan (Aikawa 15-17). Published in Joseon while the printing business in Tokyo was suffering due to the Great Kanto Earthquake in 1923, the quality of *Shinjin* was high enough to surprise the central Tanka literary circle in Japan both in terms of content and printing.

*Shinjin* used two methods to influence the Joseon literary world during the 1920s: a special project related to traditional Joseon poetry and the promotion of cooperation and solidarity with Japanese writers residing in Joseon in other fields. It is very important to note that these two methods were also devised by Morio Ichiyama, who had striven to establish the Tanka literary world in Joseon ever since the publication of *Shinjin*. In early 1926, Ichiyama carried out a special project to collect the opinions of Japanese major Tanka writers about the shape of the Tanka literary world in Joseon. He discovered that the majority of Japanese Tanka writers wanted to see the unique characteristics of Joseon. He therefore later led a project on traditional Joseon poetry (such as folk songs and ancient songs) through *Shinjin*, following the first method described above. The second method of *Shinjin* was collecting literary works from a variety of Joseon and Japanese writers who decided

to contribute their writings to its special issues, responding to the request of Morio Ichiyama. The contributors included writers, professors, teachers, journalists, critics, pottery researchers, folklorists, poets, Haiku writers, landscape gardeners, and painters, who were the leading cultural figures in Japan and Joseon.

In these special issues, the connection between traditional Japanese poetry and Joseon folklore is visible in the interface between Shinjin Association and the Namsan Senryu Association in the late 1920s. This interaction involved the participation of Tomo Imamura in special research on Korean folk songs. Imamura, a representative Senryu writer affiliated with the Namsan Senryu Association, continuously presented Joseon related sources and authored several tomes about Joseon folklore. The decade's research on traditional Joseon poetry and ethnicity was led by Ichiyama of *Shinjin* by collecting literary works from Japanese elites residing in Joseon in diverse fields. This research was also connected to the Haiku and Senryu circles and Joseon folklore. This was the prosperous period in research on traditional Joseon culture. During the Joseon boom after the 1930s, various attempts were made to identify the local characteristics of Joseon in each literary field. Traditional Japanese language poetry forms, such as Senryu, Haiku, and Tanka, had been illustrating this local flavor since the 1910s. After the creation of the *Shinjin* in the 1920s, the traditional Japanese poetry world, which had barely maintained the publication of professional magazines by trial and error through local association activities, completely changed tack to dominate the field of identifying local characteristics. Although originally aimed at representing Joseon in the field of Tanka, the *Shinjin* continuously produced Ichiyama's special issues that attempted to explore traditional Joseon poetry, ethnicity, and folklore. Through these efforts, the *Shinjin* played a leading linguistic and cultural role in establishing local Joseon characteristics not only in the fields of Haiku and Senryu, but also in ethnology, folklore, and folk arts from the late 1920s to the 1930s.

## 5. Conclusion

This study examined the beginnings and development of the literature of Japanese residents of Joseon from early modern times to 1930. The literature analyzed in this research had not previously been included in evaluations of Japanese literature or even colonial Japanese language literature. Even before the Japanese annexation of Korea, Japanese language newspapers and magazines had already been launched in major Japanese communities in Joseon. It is apparent that Japanese language literature in the early twentieth century was formed around the literary columns in these media.

Under the pretense of understanding the customs and culture of Joseon as a ruler of a colonial country, these Japanese language media in Joseon translated Joseon literary works into Japanese and used them as colonial learning tools. Here, it should be pointed out that Japanese translations of Joseon literature, which were supposed to be a literary act, were used for various political means by Japanese elites. The canonization of these Japanese translations as traditional Joseon literature is yet a problem in current academic circles.

Moreover, traditional Japanese language poetry emerged through, developed in, and disappeared from the literary columns of Japanese media in early twentieth-century Joseon. Based on strong literary associations, Japanese writers residing in Joseon made attempts to express Joseon through Japanese poetry, using Tanka, Haiku, and Senryu, at times independently and sometimes in solidarity.

These Japanese language literary activities in Joseon were carried out with a close connection with both domestic and international literary worlds, such as those of Manchuria and Taiwan. After the 1930s, the development of Japanese language literature became complex due to diverse literary and cultural phenomena, and because of its sensitive response to local issues. Therefore, without understanding the whole picture of Japanese language literature and culture during this period, it is impossible to identify and interpret literature and the culture of East Asian countries (including Japan, Joseon, Manchuria, and Taiwan) from a modern perspective. Almost a half-century history of Japanese language literature in Joseon, which continued until colonial liberation in 1945, should be investigated not from a single country's perspective but from an East Asian perspective. This investigation requires a border-crossing research method rather than a subdivided and closed-border research method for more accurate examination. Based on this critical thinking, the academic association East Asia and Contemporary Japanese-Language Literature was founded in 2013. An international journal, *Border Crossings: The Journal of Japanese-Language Literature Studies*, was also published in 2014, and a variety of border-crossing studies have been conducted through it.

## 【Notes】

- ① Takayuki Nakane defined translations by Joseon writers during the 1930s as “an intermediate step toward creation,” “a pre-creation writing method chosen by Joseon writers, who lack creating ability”, or “a pre-creation writing method commanded by the Japanese Government General of Korea.” See Takayuki Nakane. *Cultural Magazine Representing “Joseon”* (Tokyo: Shinyosha, 2004) 243-63.

② Although their outcomes cannot be easily predicted, there were some excellent attempts: *The Chosen Haiku Anthology* (1930) and A Collection of Haiku poems: *The Chosen* (1930) in the field of Haiku; *The Chosen: A Collection of Tanka Poems* (1934), *The Chosen Natural Features Tanka Collection* (1935), and *A Collection of Tanka Poems: The Chosen* (1937) for Tanka; and *The Chosen Natural Features Senryu Anthology* (1940) for Senryu.

### 【Works Cited】

- Aikawa, Kumao. "Outlook of the Tanka Literary Circle and Shinjin Joseon." *Shinjin* 10.7 (1932): 15-17.
- Haga, Yaichi. *The National History of Literature Ten Chapters*. Tokyo: Huzanbou, 1899.
- Jung, Byeongho. "The Studies on Formation of 'Japanese Literature' in Korea and Japanese Imperialism of 'Literary Art' Section in the Early Modern Times." *Journal of Foreign Studies* 14 (2010): 387-412.
- Nishi, Masahiko. "Toward the Cross-border Reading of Japanese Language Literature." *Ritsumeikan Studies in Language and Culture* 22.4 (2011): 181.
- Ri, Sotetsu. *A History of Japanese Owned Newspapers in Joseon*. Tokyo: Kadokawagakugei Press, 2009.
- Takasaki, Sozi. *Japanese People in Colonial Joseon*. Tokyo: Iwanamishoten, 2002.
- Yamaguchi, Byokanten. "Son of a Tenant Farmer." *The Chosen and Manshu* 197 (1924): 17.

责任编辑：徐 彬

# 论宫本百合子小说创作的伦理选择

## A Study on Miyamoto Yuriko's Ethical Choice in Her Novel Writing

金周英 (Jooyoung Kim)

**内容摘要：**宫本百合子是日本极具代表性的无产阶级女性作家，虽出身资产阶级，却始终追求自由平等的伦理观。因此她自传体小说中的主人公也都是践行自由平等伦理观的理想形象。百合子的小说取材于自己的真实生活经历。虽然在实际生活中，她未能做出如小说主人公般如此极致的伦理选择，但这些人物的形象也是她自身的投影。百合子经过不断蜕变，最终成长为一名坚定的无产阶级文学家。其实她在处女作中所选择的写作素材，就为她今后的文学方向奠定基础。作中人物始终都能做出坚持忠于本心的伦理选择，其内在动力便是追求自由平等的信念。百合子文学理念的实质正是努力缩小贫富差距、男女差距，同时也是一种要求打破思想性阶级差异的强力呐喊。正是经历一系列艰难的伦理选择，百合子从一名资产阶级富家女蜕变成坚定的无产阶级作家。从她的这种伦理选择中，我们也可以对无产阶级文学的表现形式进行分析。

**关键词：**宫本百合子；伦理意识；伦理身份；伦理选择

**作者简介：**金周英，文学博士，建国大学亚洲与离散研究中心副主任，研究方向为日本文学、女性主义文学以及离散与多元文化研究。

**Title:** A Study on Miyamoto Yuriko's Ethical Choice in Her Novel Writing

**Abstract:** Miyamoto Yuriko is a female writer representing Japan who wrote for the proletariat class. Although from a bourgeois background, she made an ethical choice to push for the equality of people. Her life as an egalitarian activist is represented in her writing that glorifies the ethical choice of the figures in her works. To be sure, the ethical choices made by the author do not exactly translate into those made by the fictional characters. Nonetheless, her autobiographical novels feature protagonists who go through experiences similar to the author's. Her inclination to egalitarian activism is projected in her art. The itinerary of Yuriko becoming a proletarian writer is the subject of her own novels from her debut work to her major works. The principle behind the acts of the autobiographical characters is the cause of equality as the motivation of ethical choices. This was the ideal of

Yuriko's literary work that called for levelling the gap between the rich and the poor, male and female, and finally for the abolition of class distinctions. This shows the question of ethical choice through which the writer grows up from a bourgeois to become a writer for the proletariat. And it suggests the possibility of proletarian literature that deals with the ethical choice made by a writer while growing up.

**Key words:** Miyamoto Yuriko; ethical awareness; ethical identity; ethical choice

**Author:** Jooyoung Kim is Deputy-Director at The Center for Asia and Diaspora, Konkuk University (Seoul 143-701, Korea). Her research interests are Japanese literature, Feminism literature, Diaspora and multicultural studies. This paper was supported by the KU Research Professor Program of Konkuk University. Email: jooyoki@konkuk.ac.kr

日本作家百合子的小说取材于自己的真实生活经历，虽然在实际生活中她未能做出如小说主人公般如此极致的伦理选择，但这些人物的形象也是她自身的投影。百合子经过不断蜕变，最终成长为一名坚定的无产阶级文学家。关于百合子的文学作品，笔者认为有两个问题值得关注。第一是百合子经历一系列艰难的伦理选择，从一名资产阶级富家女蜕变成无产阶级作家。第二是她以成长过程中的伦理选择为主题，不断创作无产阶级文学作品。从伦理实践和伦理选择的角度研究百合子，能为研究日本无产阶级文学提供有益的参考。

从文学伦理学批评理论来看，百合子的文学作品鲜明地体现出伦理身份和伦理意识等问题<sup>①</sup>。面对不同的伦理身份，百合子曾一度陷入苦闷之中。一个是天生的作为特权阶层的资产阶级伦理身份，一个是自己想追求的作为无产阶级作家的伦理身份。这种关于伦理身份与伦理选择的思考，也成为她自传体小说的创作主题。最终，百合子坚定地选择无产阶级作家的伦理身份，即使面对残酷的镇压也坚持不转向，创作出很多有价值的文学作品。

### 一、作为动机的伦理选择

学界对宫本百合子的评价从来都是毁誉参半的。先来看一些肯定性的评价。面对日本帝国主义的压迫，百合子进行不屈不挠的抵抗；在残酷的状况下，严格地讲，作为社会主义作家只有她一个人坚持没有转向；甚至还被誉为“唯一的存在”（岩濑宏子 146）。相反，批判者则认为，百合子通过作品所塑造出的自传体主人公形象与其实际生活相背离，具有强烈违和感。例如，出身资产阶级的百合子为实现民主社会理想而奋斗一生的做法虽值得尊敬，但还是无法摆脱“尽享特权阶层生活之人”（渡边澄子 76）的指责。

虽然存在种种争议，但百合子在文学作品中主张两性平等思想，在女性解放主义研究中备受瞩目，多年来一直被持续研究。这与其他无产阶级作家

作品的命运明显不同。笔者当然也是力赞她女性解放的思想，但同时也在担心，今后百合子的文学是否也会如消失的无产阶级文学般，被淹没在滚滚的时代大潮之中。

阅读百合子的无产阶级文学作品时，读者会认为她在自传体小说中塑造的主人公形象就是作者本身。其实这与百合子的实际生活环境是十分相背离的。中川成美认为，“百合子以她强烈的追求自我存在的意志，创作值得日本文学铭记之作，在文坛开出美艳的花朵”。她还认为，并不应该单纯地称颂或批判百合子本人，而是应更加关注她的作品。“这种刚强的性格虽是百合子作品魅力之所在，但也成为招致读者种种批判的原因”（中川成美149）。读者之所以有这样的评论，是因为在阅读作品时下意识地将作家的实际生活和作品中主人公的生活相联系。但归根结底还是由于百合子是以自己为素材进行的文学创作，才让读者产生这种错误认知。本论文所涉及的几部小说都是百合子的自传体小说，都与她个人的实际生活密切相关，因此更印证读者心中“作家本人就是作品主人公”的想法。但是笔者认为阅读百合子文学时，应着重把握以下方面。小说家宫本百合子通过她的文学作品，从伦理层面塑造一个崭新的、十分理想的人物形象，读者对这一形象也产生深刻的共鸣。百合子自传体小说中都是理想型的主人公形象，而这些主人公都和她自己的生活经历相似。可以说，这是因伦理身份而产生的不同伦理选择及其衍生问题<sup>②</sup>。

百合子自传体小说的创作方法与其坚持自由平等的伦理观密不可分，我们将在下文中详细论述。但首先应明确一点，那就是自传体小说是百合子的记忆重组，并不是她所生活的全部的真实世界。作家在现实生活中经历种种伦理选择的矛盾与挣扎，于是在文学作品中塑造出理想的人物形象来处理这种伦理选择问题。因此为避免混淆，本文将把现实生活中的作家称作“百合子”或者“作家”，把作品中的主人公称为其作品中的人名或“作中人物”来加以区分。

下面我们先通过藏原惟人的评论和百合子的亲笔传记（宫本百合子全集，别册，1981）中的记叙来看一下作家同作中人物的相似之处。宫本百合子是长女，1899年出生于东京，父亲是著名建筑师，母亲出身于知名学者家庭。成长于典型富裕阶层的百合子于1911年进入御茶水女校学习，但她并不满足于学校所教授的知识，反而沉醉在俄罗斯文学、特别是托尔斯泰的文学作品之中。

百合子17岁那年，发表处女作《贫穷的人们》，因此被誉为“天才少女作家”，开始在文坛崭露头角。她虽出身富裕的资产阶级家庭，却是以贫穷家庭的人群为素材创作这部作品。1918年，19岁的百合子去了美国，成为哥伦比亚大学的一名旁听生，并在那里遇到她的第一任丈夫荒木茂。次年10月，二人不顾家人的反对，毅然步入婚姻殿堂。然而，在富裕环境中长大的百合



子是理想主义者，在艰苦环境中长大的荒木茂是现实主义者。两人性格和理想信念上的矛盾无法调和，最终在 1924 年结束了这段长达 5 年的婚姻生活。二人的离婚是由于不同的家庭背景和社会阶级造成的，也是由于不同的伦理身份导致的。后来，百合子开始以自己的婚姻生活为素材创作作品，于是有了《伸子》。

1927 年（俄罗斯革命爆发 10 年后），她同汤浅芳子一起去了莫斯科。此后三年中，她深入体验社会主义生活，并用 7 个月左右的时间环游英国等西方资本主义国家。如此一来，她发现资本主义的矛盾，开始接受社会主义思想。1947 年百合子发表的作品《道标》就描述了她的思想转变过程。选择社会主义理想，为后来她与另一社会主义运动指导作家——曾长期担任日本共产党党首的宫本显治的婚姻埋下伏笔。至此，百合子确立无产阶级的伦理身份，这种身份认同也使她更加坚持无产阶级作家的伦理价值观。

百合子自传体小说中的每个主人公都有着不同的出生和成长经历，但这些经历都是以百合子的真实生活为原型。她人生中三次非常重要的伦理选择也被融入在作品之中。即发表处女作《贫穷的人们》，毅然决然与黄荒木茂结婚，以及接受苏维埃体制并加入共产党。富裕家庭出身的百合子曾在农村祖母家中居住，目睹穷人们的贫困潦倒生活后，选择为穷人们发声，继而创作出处女作《贫穷的人们》。这时的百合子虽还未摆脱天生的资产阶级伦理身份，但她已经开始有要帮助弱势群体的想法。小说人物伸子的登场，则是百合子人生第二次重要的伦理选择的文学体现。主人公伸子努力打破身份阶层差异，追求自由平等的伦理观。她无视贫富差距，选择和自己喜欢的贫困工读生结婚，这充分体现出此作品不轻视穷人的价值取向。但伸子的婚姻最终却走向破裂。因为她穷苦的工读生丈夫佃回到日本后成为大学教授，却不知何时堕落成伪善的资产阶级。伸子坚持追求自由平等的伦理理想，但丈夫的堕落却让她陷入困境。

《道标》中主人公的名字也是伸子，这个伸子是更为积极革命的明朗形象。这与选择苏维埃社会主义理想的百合子的第三次伦理选择紧紧呼应。《道标》的作中人物为成为无产阶级作家进行深刻的理论性检讨。这一检讨的前提正是消除阶级差别。有了这种思想认识后，主人公的伦理身份成功蜕变为合格的无产阶级作家。以上是对宫本百合子的人生选择，以及与其紧密相关的作中人物的伦理选择进行的简单分析。下面，我们将进一步讨论，这位资产阶级出身的日本社会主义女性作家在其自传体作品中所追求的伦理价值。

## 二、《贫穷的人们》中的伦理身份与文学伦理观

百合子的处女作中就奠定了她今后文学作品的价值走向。17 岁的少女作家在创作《贫穷的人们》时巧妙地融入人道主义感性写作手法。这是因为百合子受到 19 世纪初日本文坛主力作家流派——白桦派的人道主义思想的深刻

影响。

岩渊宏子认为百合子的作品“没有像托尔斯泰那般，达到实现将自身的幸福依附于他人的不幸，从而融入的自我谴责的伦理意识的高度”（岩渊宏子 29）。然而，笔者认为，要求一个 17 岁的少女作家的自传性文学人物达到托尔斯泰的伦理高度，未免有些过分。尤其是她认为百合子作品中的资产阶级主人公“缺少自我反省与否定”（岩渊宏子 30）的观点，笔者更加无法苟同。小说描述身为都市富家女的她去探访乡下祖母时，直面农民衣食不保的残酷现实，因而也导致她对下层民众态度的转变。

这些孩子的父母都是一些下地务农的贫苦佃农。主人公小姐跟他们搭讪说。主人公带着善意试图与孩子们搭讪，却出乎意料遭到孩子们冷言冷语的攻击。这里值得注意的是，主人公想通过“寒冷”这一感受来打开与孩子们沟通的大门。但事实上，这个形容词却包含着都市的浓烈优越感。因为农村的孩子们过于饥饿，他们无暇关注“寒冷”这一感性的形容词。故而孩子们会发出“哇！”地怪叫和“用不着你操心！”这样的怒骂。面对这样的侮辱，主人公自然而然对孩子们产生轻蔑感，并出现下文的自述。

在收割的时候，毫无怜悯和同情之心，从他们手里抢走一草袋、一草袋的粮食的，究竟是怎样的人呢？在那些稍稍见闻过世事、开始懂得大人生活的孩子们的心灵里，一定充满了对双亲的莫大同情，和对富人的猜疑吧！（宫本百合子，《貧しき人々の群》15-16）

以上引文中，百合子对掠夺佃农收获的地主阶层进行抨击，也包含她对自己富裕阶层伦理身份的反省。而这一认识过程是通过自我相对化、认识到差异和改变想法三个阶段完成的。

她能站在佃农家孩子们的立场上，了解到他们眼中自己的形象——富人始终是富裕的，吃穿远远超过他们，有着异样的打扮，是连说话的声调都是和他们截然不同的人。这便是自身相对化。不仅是吃的穿的以及异样的打扮反映出贫富的差异，甚至连“说话的声调”之类的语言差异也体现出贫富分化。至此，主人公发现这种差距是不可逾越的鸿沟，无法单纯地用怜悯来治疗。虽然“我”对“他们”表现地很亲切，但同时“我”还是无法抛弃富人的自尊心和对他们的蔑视感。

作者让主人公站在对方的立场上思考，充分理解语言差异中所体现的贫富差距。在遭受到穷苦孩子们的敌对态度后，开始反省自己的伦理身份，不断反省并改变自己的想法。主人公认识到自己和孩子们的差异后，感受到贫富之间的巨大差距，同时也理解孩子们对自己的敌对态度。于是她开始反省自己的伦理身份，不变改变自己的想法。诚如评论家们所指出的，此作品中穷人和富人的对立过于明显。但是对于一个生活在 19 世纪早期、且只有 17

岁的少女作家来说,要求她做到不用“我”和“他们”的二分法来进行区分,着实有些过分。在以下引文中,我们可以解到主人公是如何进行伦理选择的。

我不认为自己已愚蠢到有意识地表现高傲的程度。不过,自己日久天长成了习惯,一直满不在乎地接受着没有理由的奉承和谄媚,这是很可怕的。

我们都是为了生存才被创造出来的。在这一点上,难道我和他们有什么差别么?(宫本百合子,《貧しき人々の群》17)

作者明白一件重要的事情,那就是富人之所以“物质上没有痛苦地生活”,正是因为他们一直压迫剥削着“陷于痛苦、贫困和卑贱之中”的佃农。这是一种伦理补偿意识的回归。于是,主人公少女说自己发誓,要赶紧填起我和他们之间的鸿沟,修起一座的花园。主人公的伦理选择并非完美无缺,仅凭少女一人之力也无法改变这个世界。她在这个小村庄里目睹极度贫穷和残酷剥削的现实,想改变这种情况,最后却只能无奈地发现自身力量太过弱小。那些普通的资产阶级女性只会施以廉价的同情,但主人公却对“同情”的伦理价值进行深入思考,并因两个陷入绝境而自杀的农民受到强烈的心灵冲击。

当前,对于作家宫本百合子的批评,大部分是因为她与生俱来的富裕生活。她作品中的主人公们虽没有过着贫苦的生活,但都极度追求自由平等。或许百合子是将自己在现实生活中对于自由平等伦理观的追求,投射到自传体小说中的人物身上。在她之后的作品中,主人公们都追求选自由平等的伦理观,反对一切不平等的现象。这就是由于她与生俱有的资产阶级和后天自主选择的无产阶级之间的伦理身份矛盾造成的。

### 三、平等意识与无产阶级作家的伦理选择

1918年9月,刚发表完处女作的百合子跟随建筑家父亲去纽约。她父亲是去处理公司事务,在纽约呆了三个月就回国。父亲的原意是打算让百合子一直留在纽约。第二年,百合子成为一名哥伦比亚大学的旁听生。后来,她同研究古代东洋语言的荒木茂相遇,并不顾家人反对毅然结婚,并于当年12月回到日本。刚刚成年的百合子,就大胆地选择自己的人生方向。这也是其长篇小说《伸子》的素材来源。

这部小说是主人公伸子用第三人称进行叙述的。百合子以荒木茂为原型,塑造一个叫做佃的男性形象。伸子这一人物形象其实是作者的自我映射,下面本文将从伦理层面分析,为什么伸子会选择和佃结婚。首先从伦理意识层面来看,百合子认为她与生俱来的这种优越地位是建立在对穷人的压迫之上,面对弱势群体,她会不自觉地展现善意。她对佃就是如此。作品中,佃很早就辞别了母亲,在美国做了15年的工读生,一直过着贫苦孤独的生活。这种

生活经历虽成就他强大的生命力，却也造成他社会价值意识的极度扭曲。

从资产阶级社会的一般性认识来看，佃属于弱势群体，伸子属于特权群体。佃穷困万分，社会地位低下。而然，百合子坚持平等的伦理观，主张应平等地看待弱势群体。正如前文所分析的，作家虽承认自己的资产阶级身份，但却追求自由平等的伦理观。她认为不应该歧视那些受压迫的弱势群体，应该视他们为同等的生命。伸子在恋爱期间经常说：“我有了一个信仰。那就是爱可以改变世界”（《伸子》102）。她所说的“爱”并不局限于恋人之间，而是指自己的“信仰”，是因选择平等伦理观而衍生出的信念。

伸子选定住处时煞费苦心的理由，除此之外还有其它的。跟着父亲从纽约过来，是她想获得随心所欲地生活机会才赋予的动机。佐々家门中伸子是长女。强势的母亲暗自希望女儿各方面都能够按照自己理想发展，对作为小康之家女儿的伸子所要追求的人生无法容忍，并实施了压制。这样的话，伸子连自己想要的状态的一半都达不到。真正的自己的生活还没有开始，这样的意识在过去的三年中一直困扰着她。（宫本百合子，《伸子》41）

刚满19周的富家小姐，为了追求“自己想要的生活”，决定要跟家族决裂。“小康之家的女儿”，这是当时对日本天皇家族和贵族等上流社会小姐的称呼，现在可以理解为相当富裕的人家的女儿。但伸子却不喜欢这种资产阶级精英阶层的生活，她甚至认为“真正的自己的生活还没有开始”。

小说中佃首次亮相时，并没有对他的面部长相和外形做具体的描述，而是重点关注他的为人处世风格和性格。从一开始，佃的形象就没有明朗健康过。卑微的出身，低下的社会身份，都造就他那晦暗的奇怪性格。也就是说，小说中塑造的佃就是一个身份低微、完全没有任何社会背景的贫苦工读生形象。而伸子却是一种怀抱着远大理想、努力去理解体谅佃的正能量形象。

后来，伸子不顾父母的反对，毅然决然和佃在美国举办婚礼。由于自由平等的伦理观念的影响，她做出自己的人生选择。然而，伸子理想中的相互弥补差距、彼此平等的伦理观最终却没能实现。小说中所叙述的离婚原因，也被上升到“信仰”的高度，是因为那种“可以改变世界的力量”已被摧毁。也就是说，伸子没有遵从她作为佃的妻子的家庭伦理身份，而是明确自己作为作家的社会伦理身份。

从家庭制度层面来看，百合子提出离婚是她的一个伦理选择。同样的，当初能够忍受与丈夫的失败婚姻也是她的一个选择。百合子的文学创作始终坚守自己的理想，不为强权所改变。这一点从她去苏联体验生活，并加入日本共产党等选择中可明显体现出来。

从1927年开始，百合子正式接受社会主义思想。1930年一回国，她就

加入日本社会主义作家同盟。一年后，加入当时所谓的非合法政党——日本共产党。在那里，她结识小自己九岁的宫本显治。1932年，百合子再次步入婚姻殿堂。从她的文学价值取向来看，接受苏维埃体制、加入共产党以及与显治结婚，都是一连串伦理选择的结果。也就是说，百合子想脱离资产阶级身份的伦理选择与苏维埃社会主义理想产生深刻共鸣，这也成为她走上左翼作家之路的契机。

虽然第一段婚姻因与荒木茂产生政治分歧而失败，但第二段婚姻中百合子与显治有着共同的理想，两人在人生道路上一直相互扶持。百合子在处女作中确立的理想主义伦理观一直贯穿在她的生活之中。她之所以勇敢选择第二次婚姻，是因为接受苏维埃思想，对“社会”和“女性”有更深刻的伦理思考。正如下列引文，百合子以苏维埃体制为素材，将对女性的认识融入《道标》之中。

伸子所处的日本社会，女性无论具备如何出色的资质，结果都无法得到认可。作为一个职业女性、妻子、母亲、祖母以社会契约使社会保护得以实现，每每想到这些，都会让百合子十分感动。以此来鼓舞着同样也是女性的自己，从中获得创作的活力。（宫本百合子，《道标》243-244）

在百合子的文学中，美国和苏联都成为她选择配偶的契机空间。小说《伸子》的背景是美国，主人公的名字是伸子。从苏维埃视角来对日本进行批判性审视的小说——《道标》，其主人公的名字也是伸子。然而，两个伸子却因美国和苏联两种不同的生活经历，走上不同的人生道路。正是由于对苏维埃理想的坚定信念，百合子才有不断的前进动力。现在苏联早已解体，变成实行资本主义制度的俄罗斯。因此有很多声音都批评百合子对苏维埃的称颂<sup>①</sup>。是她作品中主人公的伦理选择是与百合子对苏维埃的无限憧憬紧密相关的。

目前对于百合子的批判，主要集中于作家富裕的生活环境，还有作中人物始终坚持信念的过于理想主义的完美形象。作中人物始终坚持着自己的伦理选择，勇敢面对一切困难与挫折，她们都在与生俱来的伦理身份与无产阶级的伦理身份中做出忠于本心的选择。出身富裕阶层的少女，因目睹穷人们痛苦呻吟的现实而对自身的资产阶级的伦理身份进行深刻反省，并一生致力于填补贫富之间的鸿沟。百合子文学理念的实质正是努力缩小贫富差距、男女差距，同时也是一种要求打破思想性阶级差异的强力呐喊。

## 【Notes】

①本稿所用的伦理身份和伦理选择的概念基于聂珍钊的《文学伦理学批评导论》附录二“文

学伦理学批评术语解释”。参见聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》（北京：北京大学出版社，2014年）。

②聂珍钊提倡文学作品通过进行伦理选择来解决伦理身份的问题。参见聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》（北京：北京大学出版社，2014年）263。

③本段文本宫本百合子认为正好是适用于“作为无法洞察斯大林体制苏维埃实际情况的不成熟的社会主义作家，[……]受到了种种的批判。”参见<《道标》と女ふたり旅>，《国文学解釈と鑑賞》899(79-4)（東京：至文堂，2006年）166。

### 【Works Cited】

- 岩淵宏子 北田幸恵 沼沢和子編：《宮本百合子の時空》。東京：翰林書房，2001年。  
[Iwabuchi Hiroko, Kitada Sachie, and Numazawa Kazuko, eds. *Space-time of Yuriko Miyamoto*. Tokyo: Kanrinshobo, 2001.]
- 岩淵宏子：《宮本百合子——家族、政治、そしてフェミニズム》。東京：翰林書房，1996年。  
[Iwabuchi Hiroko. *Yuriko Miyamoto—Family, Politics and Feminism*. Tokyo: Kanrinshobo, 1996.]
- 宮本百合子：《貧しき人々の群》，《宮本百合子全集》第1巻。東京：新日本出版社，1979年。  
[Miyamoto Yuriko. *A Group of Poor People. The Complete Works of Miyamoto Yuriko*. Vol.1. Tokyo: Shinnihonshuppansha, 1979.]
- ：《伸子》，《宮本百合子全集》第3巻。東京：新日本出版社，1979年。  
[---. *Nobuko. The Complete Works of Miyamoto Yuriko*. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Shinnihonshuppansha, 1979.]
- ：《道标》，《宮本百合子全集》第7巻。東京：新日本出版社，1979年。  
[---. *Signpost. The Complete Works of Miyamoto Yuriko*. Vol. 7. Tokyo: Shinnihonshuppansha, 1979.]
- 中川成美：“もう一つの庭”，《国文学 解釈と鑑賞》71-74。東京：至文堂，2006年。  
[Nakagawa Sigemi. “Another Garden.” *Japanese Literature Interpretation and Appreciation* 71-74. Tokyo: Shibundo, 2006.]
- 澤田章子：“《伸子》の情熱と知性”，《いまに生きる宮本百合子》。東京：新日本出版社，2000年。  
[Sawada Akiko. “Passion and Intelligence of Nobuko.” *Miyamoto Yuriko Live in Now*. Tokyo: Shinnihonshuppansha, 2000.]
- 渡辺澄子：“百合子と反戦・平和”，《国文学解釈と鑑賞》71-74。東京：至文堂，2006年。  
[Watanabe Sumiko. “Yuriko and the Anti-war and Peace.” *Japanese Literature Interpretation and Appreciation* 71-74. Tokyo: Shibundo, 2006.]

责任编辑：张连桥

# 评《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》

## A Review of *Conflict and Integration of Art and Morality: An Ethical Study of Oscar Wilde*

聂珍钊 (Nie Zhenzhao)

**内容提要：**《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》（刘茂生著，社会科学文献出版社，2016年6月）主要以文学伦理学批评为研究方法，结合英国维多利亚时期的历史、政治、社会背景，在文本细读的基础上，系统地论述了王尔德创作的伦理思想在其艺术实践中的形成与发展过程，揭示了王尔德艺术实践中的伦理内涵及其内在关联，着重探讨了艺术与伦理道德既冲突又互相融合的具体特征。该著坚持了文学伦理学批评方法所倡导的重视文本分析，突出文学批评方法的实践性特点，分析科学，解释辩证，说理充分，结论客观。无论是从方法论上看，还是从研究中得出的观点和结论看，都具有突出的创新意识，是一项王尔德研究的开拓性成果，为重新认识与反思王尔德及其在英国文学史中的重要地位提供了成功的研究范例。

**关键词：**王尔德；文学伦理学批评；唯美主义；刘茂生

**Title:** A Review of *Conflict and Integration of Art and Morality: An Ethical Study of Oscar Wilde*

**Abstract:** Liu Maosheng's new book *Conflict and Integration of Art and Morality: An Ethical Study of Oscar Wilde* (Published by Social Sciences Academic Press(SSAP) in June, 2016.) mainly focuses on the textual anatomy of the historical, political and social backgrounds of the Victorian Era which was vividly depicted in Wilde's works. The book, with the method of Ethical Literary Criticism, systematically expounds the ethical and artistic ideals of Oscar Wilde's literary career; it also reveals Wilde's ethical connotations and discusses the conflicting yet integrated characteristics of his writing. The book sticks to an emphasis on textual analysis which is highly evaluated in the study of Ethical Literary Criticism; hence, it offers us the rational analysis, dialectical interpretations and reasonable conclusions. It also offers us innovative methodologies and inventive perspectives. It should also be considered as a trailblazing breakthrough in Wilde's study to help us to better reflect on Oscar Wilde's artistic contribution to English Literature and to set a remarkable example for future study.

Keywords: Oscar Wilde; Ethical Literary Criticism; Aestheticism; Liu Maosheng

**Author:** Nie Zhenzhao is Professor of Literature at Konkuk University. He also serves as Editor-in-Chief of two journals well-known in humanities: *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* and *Forum for World Literature Studies*.

经过多年打磨，国家社科基金资助课题的结项成果《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》已经最终完成，并由社会科学文献出版社出版。这部著作还作为优秀成果入选《江西省哲学社会科学成果文库》，得到江西省哲学社会科学成果的出版资助。《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》是刘茂生教授多长期深入研究王尔德的学术结晶，代表着我国王尔德研究的新发展，新成就，甚至可以说它是我国王尔德研究的标志性成果。它的出版将进一步推动我国的王尔德研究，提升我国王尔德研究的水平，的确可喜可贺。

奥斯卡·王尔德（Oscar Wilde, 1854-1900）是爱尔兰戏剧家、小说家、散文家和诗人，也是19世纪八十年代唯美运动的主力 and 九十年代颓废派运动的先驱，英国唯美主义的代表人物。在英国文学中，他以题材新颖、手法独特、风格迥异以及传奇人生而闻名于世。就维多利亚后期英国戏剧而言，王尔德是最成功的戏剧家中的一个。时至今日，他写作的剧本还在继续上演。不仅如此，他在小说、童话和小说创作方面的影响也经久不衰。王尔德是一个极其睿智的“才子和戏剧家”，在他逝世后的100多年的历史中，他在作品中写下的那些似是而非的妙言隽句，仍然魅力不减。王尔德的创作往往用警句式的表达方式阐释人生哲理，寓意深刻。王尔德的创作能够给人以启发和警示，具有永恒的伦理价值。王尔德作为一个英国作家，他既是英国文化遗产的创造者，也是整个人类文化遗产的创造者。因此，王尔德的创作也将作为人类宝贵文化遗产的一部分，永远流传下去。

王尔德是较早介绍到中国的外国作家之一。早在20世纪初的1909年，周树人、周作人兄弟合译的《域外小说集》在日本东京出版，其中就收录有周作人翻译的淮尔特（即王尔德的最初译名）的童话《安乐王子》（今译为《快乐王子》）。这大概是最早介绍到中国的王尔德的作品。1915年11月，陈独秀在《青年杂志》第3期、第4期上发表论文《现代欧洲文艺史谭》，在文中将王尔德同易卜生、屠格涅夫、梅特林克一起并称为“近代四大代表作家”。1918年，王尔德的著名喜剧《温德米尔夫人的扇子》被沈性仁女士以《遗扇记》的剧名译成中文发表。1921年，王尔德的另一部著名剧作《莎乐美》被田汉以《沙乐美》的名字译成中文在《少年中国》杂志上发表。在新中国成立前，王尔德的《温德米尔夫人的扇子》和《莎乐美》是在我国文坛被翻译和改编最多的两部作品。1922年，穆木天译的《王尔德童话》在上海出版。1936年，凌璧如翻译的王尔德的长篇小说《格雷的画像》由上海中华书局出版。随着王尔德作品被介绍到中国，对王尔德的研究实际上也开始了，例如1921



年5月《小说月报》刊载的沈泽民撰写的《王尔德评传》，1923年徐志摩在南开讲授的王尔德课程，1924年梁实秋发表的《王尔德的唯美主义》，1924年村彬发表的《唯美派怪杰王尔德》，1929年上海世界书局出版的王古鲁编著的《王尔德生活》等。

王尔德虽然是较早介绍到中国的英国作家之一，但是对王尔德的研究直到20世纪八十年代才真正展开，并成为我国学者研究得最多的英国作家之一。除了有不少年轻学者撰写博士和硕士论文外，还有不少学者把王尔德作为自己的研究课题，申请国家社科基金或省级社科基金的资助。迄今为止，我国已经发表了大量与王尔德有关的研究论文，出版了不少的王尔德研究专著。2000年，中国文学出版社出版了《王尔德全集》。这表明，王尔德研究在中国已经取得了丰厚的成果。但是，如果对我国的王尔德研究进行反思，我们也会发现大多数王尔德研究基本上都有一个预设的研究前提，这就是王尔德既是英国唯美主义的倡导者，也是唯美主义的践行者。正是由于这个预设前提，我国的王尔德研究带有明显的主观倾向，他创作的艺术形象也就顺理成章地被看成是超越道德的唯美主义的艺术形象，他的作品也因此而被看成了唯美主义的艺术实践。

对王尔德这种基于唯美主义立场的研究尽管从唯美的角度评价和理解了王尔德的创作思想和艺术品格，但是这种唯美主义观点的预设也限制了王尔德研究的深入和发展，从而使王尔德研究长期自觉或不自觉的设置唯美主义的研究轨道上，导致在一个较长时间内王尔德研究被局限于唯美主义的评价中。许多中国学者已经意识到了这种唯美主义研究的局限性，意识到王尔德研究面临的窘境，并寻找新的视角和方法以打破这种局面。实际上，上世纪八十年代以来我国学者大量的王尔德研究，就是企图打破研究现状以求创新的努力。

本世纪初以来，有一批学有成就的年轻学者开始以王尔德为研究对象，撰写学位论文，为我国的王尔德研究增添了新的动力。他们发表了一批研究成果，把王尔德研究推向了一个新的阶段。这个时期的王尔德研究出现了一个新的特点，这就是王尔德研究的伦理转向。可以说，刘茂生教授的博士论文《王尔德创作的伦理思想研究》（华中师范大学出版社，2008年）就是这种转向重要标志。

王尔德研究的伦理转向是对王尔德研究唯美化倾向的反拨以及对研究新方法的探索，而这种伦理转向一直接延续到现在，并没有结束，还在继续发展。现在，刘茂生教授的新著《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》就要问世了。这部著作继续沿用文学伦理学批评的方法展开研究，在许多方面都有自己的新发现，新观点。因此，这部著作既代表着刘茂生教授在2008年基础上的王尔德研究的继续和发展，也代表着我国王尔德伦理批评研究的新成果。

刘茂生教授的《艺术与道德的冲突与融合：王尔德研究》这部著作具有

鲜明的特色，这就是继续采用文学伦理学批评的方法，细读文本，全面剖析王尔德艺术实践中所体现出来的伦理思想、伦理特征以及伦理与艺术相结合的特点，深入揭示王尔德作品中的道德内涵及其蕴藏的伦理价值。就创作思想而论，王尔德一贯坚持艺术与道德无关的唯美主义主张，但是在艺术实践中，王尔德也许在主观上企图对其唯美主义的创作主张进行实践，而客观上他的唯美主义创作主张并没有真正融合在其艺术创作中。相反，他是主张文学艺术的唯美主义，实践创作实践的道德主义，即在创作中始终坚持一条道德审美标准。可以说，王尔德思想上主张唯美主义，但创作上拒绝唯美主义，他塑造的所谓的唯美艺术形象并没有失去其道德特征。他在作品中塑造的一系列艺术形象如童话中的快乐王子、自私的巨人、小说中的道连、戏剧中的莎乐美等，不仅没有离开道德的基础，相反，他们与社会、道德有着非常紧密的联系。王尔德在其戏剧创作中，后来也逐步放弃了他所坚守的唯美主义艺术主张，在思想上也发生了改变，越来越通过自己的艺术实践关注社会、关注道德。刘茂生教授的这部专著，其最重要的价值就在于辩证地揭示了王尔德这种思想上的艺术主张与创作中艺术实践之间的背离，并通过对王尔德的艺术作品的伦理分析，对王尔德这种独特的艺术现象给予了深入解释，让我们能够接近真实的王尔德，认识真实的王尔德创作，理解王尔德作品的实质。

这部著作也体现了刘茂生教授一贯的研究作风，这就是坚持文学伦理学批评方法所倡导的重文本分析，突出文学批评方法的实践性特点。这部著作能够在细读文本的基础上，归纳出一个个伦理问题展开伦理分析，从而使研究的分析科学，解释辩证，说理充分，结论客观。在全面审视王尔德的唯美主义艺术主张与实践的矛盾之后，进而说明尽管王尔德表面上追求唯美主义，但他的艺术实践并没有坚持唯美主义，所谓的纯美也没有脱离伦理道德。

以往的王尔德研究，大多不能超越唯美主义的预设立场，因此这种研究就容易束缚在唯美主义的狭窄空间内，无法超越唯美主义的文艺非功利的藩篱。刘茂生教授的研究在方法上突破了以往王尔德研究的固有模式，他没有简单地否认王尔德的唯美主义艺术主张，而是坚持在王尔德唯美艺术主张中去分析他的真实的艺术实践，从而接近真实的王尔德艺术创作。这种研究与众不同地发现了王尔德唯美主义艺术主张中的真实的王尔德创作，这不仅挖掘出了王尔德创作中丰富的伦理道德内涵，也大大开阔了王尔德研究的视域，从而使王尔德研究摆脱了王尔德创作无关道德的唯美主义研究老路。

就研究内容看，刘茂生教授的这部著作也是目前王尔德研究中最全面系统的一本研究专著。这部著作将王尔德的创作分为三个阶段，对王尔德的全部创作进行了系统的分类研究。王尔德所创作的童话、小说和戏剧三种文学样式，被作者用伦理的思考融于一炉，不仅分别进行深入剖析和论述，而且还对三个创作阶段完整而富有逻辑联系的伦理关系进行了梳理。例如童话，

作者认为王尔德在其中寄托了自己对于理想社会的渴望，以唯美的形式艺术再现了美好但却充满自私、残酷的现实世界，揭示了童话中的伦理逻辑。再如小说，作者认为王尔德笔下的道连是一个唯美但却在伦理道德重负下经受痛苦的艺术形象，画像最终无法遮蔽隐藏在道连内心深处的所有道德印迹，在唯美与道德的抉择中，道连只能接受道德的惩罚。因此，他刺向画像是他的一种伦理选择。王尔德的戏剧的伦理特征是同他的戏剧的现实性联系在一起的。剧中的人物以及人物活动的社会背景，都是那一时期英国社会的生动呈现，反映了家庭矛盾、婚姻关系、政治冲突等诸多社会中的伦理问题。因此可以看出，王尔德借助三种不同的文学样式，按照一定的伦理逻辑在具体的作品中对一个个伦理问题进行解剖，从而在唯美主义艺术形式中注入了丰富的伦理内涵。

刘茂生在前人研究的基础上另辟路径，从唯美主义艺术立场转而从伦理的视觉考察王尔德的艺术创作，这是一种开拓性的研究努力，不仅革新了研究的方法，丰富了研究的内容，而且得出了全新的、符合逻辑的观点与结论。在文本细读的基础上，作者系统地论述了王尔德创作的伦理思想在其艺术实践中的形成和发展过程，揭示了王尔德艺术实践中的伦理内涵和内在关联，尤其是艺术与伦理道德既相冲突又相互融合的特点。这部著作结构完整，逻辑严密，证据充分，观点新颖，无论是从方法论上看，还是从研究中得出的观点和结论看，都具有突出的创新意识，是一项王尔德研究的开拓性成果，填补了我国学界对王尔德创作进行整体研究的空白，为重新认识与反思王尔德及其在英国文学史中的重要地位提供了成功的研究范例。

刘茂生即将出版的专著凝聚了他从事王尔德研究的全部心血，在表达祝贺的同时也希望他继续努力，不断攀登学术研究的高峰。同时我相信，他在王尔德研究方面取得的成果，也会成为他目前承担另一项国家社科基金课题“萧伯纳戏剧研究”的坚实基础。我们期待刘茂生在学术研究的道路上，继续秉承“德才谦恭，止于至善”的理念，并以此作为他为人、为学的最高追求！

责任编辑：章 柳



Published by  
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited  
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920



9 772520 492177 03