

ISL

文学跨学科研究

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

Vol.2, No.1, March 2018

ISSN 2520-4920

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 2, Number 1
March 2018



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 2, Number 1
March 2018

Editor

Nie Zhenzhao, Zhejiang University

Associate Editors

Wu Di, Zhejiang University

Wang Yong, Zhejiang University

Director of Editorial Office

Yang Gexin

Published by

Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

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

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

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

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

Galin Tihanov / Queen Mary University of London, UK

Knut Brynhildsvoll / University of Oslo, NOR

Stefan Collini / University of Cambridge, UK

Khairy Douma / Cairo University, EGY

Barbara Foley / Rutgers University, USA

Su Hui / Central China Normal University, CHN

Luo Liangong / 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

- 1-12 Engaging with the World: An Interview with Terry Tempest Williams
Zheng Zhaomei
Terry Tempest Williams
- 13-25 Core Concepts and Basic Theories of Narrative: A Conversation with
Gerald Prince
Shang Biwu
Gerald Prince
- 26-33 Remarks on Narrative Space
Gerald Prince
- 34-44 “The Hell of the Same”: On Ethical Confusions of Human Cloning in *A*
Number
Wang Zhuo
- 45-56 Ethical Choice and Tragical Chaos in the *Lais* by Marie de France
Junhyun Kim
- 57-66 The Reading Cultures and Ethical Codes of Germany and Japan in the
Eighteenth Century
Jeonghoon Yoo
Yong Hyun Kim
- 67-79 The Discourse Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism: History,
Arguments and Prospects
Li Maozeng
Wen Hua
- 80-89 The Taste of Picturesque and its Ethical Absence as Reflected in William
Gilpin’s *Observations on the River Wye*
He Chang
- 90-99 A Literary Ethical Criticism of the Marriage Narrative in Hanif Kureishi’s
Novella, *Intimacy*
Wang Jin
- 100-112 A Comparative Study on the Element of Revolt in Children’s Literature
from the Perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism
Xu Derong
Zhao Yifan

- 113-125 Humanism in the Unnatural Narrative: The Ethical Appeal and the Salvation of the Subject in *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*
Guo Wen
- 126-134 Further Reflection on the Tragedy of Madame Bovary from the Perspective of Virtue Theory
Sui Hongsheng
- 135-144 Music and “Uncanny” in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*
Gao Fen
Zheng Jieru
- 145-154 Literary Canon and Cultural Continuity: Leavis’s Construction of the “Living Tradition”
Xiong Jingya
- 155-161 Loyal and Flexible Translation and Dissemination of Chinese Literature: A Review of *Journey of Sinologists’ English Translation of Chinese Literature*
Chen Kaiju
- 162-168 A Masterpiece of the Research on Japanese Contemporary Social Literature: *Thirty Years of Social Literature: Bubble Economy, the End of Cold War, 3.11*
Liu Weiyang
- 169-176 The Becoming and Developing of British Children’s Literature: A Review of *From the Industrial Revolution to Children’s Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern British Fairy-tale Novels*
Zhang Shengzhen

目 录

- 1-12 投身世界：特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯访谈录
郑昭梅
特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯
- 13-25 叙事的核心概念及其基本理论：杰拉德·普林斯对话录
尚必武
杰拉德·普林斯
- 26-33 叙事空间简论
杰拉德·普林斯
- 34-44 “相同的地狱”：《一个数》中人类克隆的伦理混乱
王 卓
- 45-56 玛丽·德·弗朗斯的短诗里所显露的伦理选择和悲剧性的混乱
金峻顯
- 57-66 18世纪日本和德国读书文化和伦理观的互动
柳政勳
金容铉
- 67-79 文学伦理学批评话语建构管窥
李茂增
温 华
- 80-89 “如画”趣味背后的伦理缺场：从吉尔平的《怀河见闻》谈起
何 畅
- 90-99 哈尼夫·库雷西小说《亲密》中的婚恋叙事及其文学伦理学反思
王 进
- 100-112 文学伦理学批评视角下儿童文学中“反抗”元素的比较研究
徐德荣
赵一凡
- 113-125 非自然叙事的人文主义思考：《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗？》中的伦理诉求与主体救赎
郭 雯
- 126-134 德性论视域下包法利夫人悲剧的再思考
隋红升

- 135-144 石黑一雄《小夜曲：音乐与黄昏五故事集》中的音乐与“暗恐”
高 奋
郑洁儒
- 145-154 文学经典与文化遗产：论利维斯的“鲜活的传统”
熊净雅
- 155-161 忠实而又灵活的中国文学译介：《汉学家的中国文学英译历程》述评
陈开举
- 162-168 日本当代社会文学研究的集大成之作：评《社会文学的三十年——
泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》
刘玮莹
- 169-176 英国儿童文学的产生和发展——评《从工业革命到儿童文学革命：
现当代英国童话小说研究》
张生珍

Engaging with the World: An Interview with Terry Tempest Williams

Zheng Zhaomei & Terry Tempest Williams

Abstract: Terry Tempest Williams (1955-) is author of fifteen books including the environmental literature classic, *Refuge: An Unnatural History of Family and Place*. Her work has been translated and anthologized around the world, and *Refuge* was translated into Chinese in 2010. Williams is a Rachel Carson Honor Roll inductee, winner of a Lannan Literary Fellowship, and winner of the Robert Marshall Award from the Wilderness Society. In addition to her work as a naturalist and writer, Williams has been active in the struggle to conserve public lands. In the interview, Williams upheld Albert Schweitzer's call for "a reverence for life", hoping to spark a higher consciousness of inclusion, parity and respect for all humanity and non-humanity, especially the marginalized and the silenced. Williams believes that in the face of the deteriorating environmental crisis, a writer's responsibility lies not only in the writing but also in action to save the earth.

Key words: Terry Tempest Williams; environmental literature; environmental activist; engagement

Authors: **Zheng Zhaomei** is Lecturer at Foreign Languages School of Hubei University of Education (Wuhan 430070, China), and Ph.D. student in the Center for Comparative Literature and World Literature of Shanghai Normal University (Shanghai 200234, China). Her research is mainly focused on English Literature and American Literature (Email: emmazzm@163.com); **Terry Tempest Williams** has grown up in Utah and developed a lifetime interest in the natural world that surrounds her. This is apparent in her education and work. She holds a B.A. in English and an M.A. in environmental education from the University of Utah and has worked as a teacher at Navajo Reservation in Montezuma Creek, Utah, and as naturalist in residence at the Utah Museum of Natural History. She is the Annie Clark Tanner Scholar at the University of Utah's Environmental Humanities Graduate Program and also teaches at Dartmouth College. In 2017-2018 academic year, Williams is writer-in-residence at the Harvard Divinity School (Email: ttwillet@gmail.com).

标题: 投身世界: 特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯访谈录

内容摘要: 特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯 (1955-) 是美国著名的自然文学作家, 先后出版十五部著作, 其中《心灵的慰藉: 一部非同寻常的地域与家族史》被誉为美国自然文学经典之作, 于 2010 年译入中文。威廉斯获得过诸多奖项和殊荣, 如入选“蕾切尔·卡森荣誉榜”, 荣获“兰南文学奖”¹, 以及美国最具影响力的民间自然资源保护组织奖项: 由美国荒野保护协会授予的罗伯特·马歇尔奖等等。本次访谈围绕威廉斯对身份认同、文学创作和中美文化交流等几个方面展开, 有助于加深理解作家的创作理念。威廉斯在访谈中, 重申阿尔伯特·施韦泽提出的“敬畏生命”的思想, 呼吁将所有人类和非人类都纳入到同一个命运共同体中, 以包容、开放和尊重的态度对待一切事物, 尤其是被边缘化、被消声的事物。威廉斯强调在环境危机日益严重的今天, 作家的责任不仅仅局限在书斋中的写作, 同时应付诸行动, 投身保护地球的实践中。

关键词: 特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯; 环境文学; 环保人士; 积极参与

作者简介: 郑昭梅, 湖北第二师范学院外国语学院讲师, 上海师范大学比较文学与世界文学专业博士生, 主要学术研究领域为英美文学和生态批评; 特丽·坦皮斯特·威廉斯是美国当代杰出的作家、博物学家和环保人士。她成长于犹他州盐湖城, 自幼与大自然亲密无间, 在犹他大学获得环境教育学士、硕士学位后, 曾任犹他州自然历史博物馆驻馆自然学家; 此后, 在犹他大学环境人文研究生项目中聘为安妮·克拉克·坦纳学者, 同时执教于闻名遐迩的常春藤学院之一——达特茅斯学院。2017-2018 学年, 受聘为哈佛大学神学院驻校作家。

Zheng Zhaomei (hereafter Zheng): Ms. Williams, your *Refuge: An Unnatural History of Family and Place* was translated into Chinese in 2010, and since then more and more Chinese readers and critics have become interested in your writings and yourself as well. We are curious that you are playing many roles at the same time: a writer, a feminist, a Mormon, a scientist, an environmentalist, an activist, an educator, a speaker... some of which are considered as conflicting by critics. Just as Katherine R. Chandler and Melissa Goldthwaite commented that “tensions and oppositions abound in her work . . . As critics, we have set our sights on ferreting out how those contradictions contribute to a coherent vision.” Do you think yourself as multifaceted? Which role(s) do you think are the most important and which most challenging?

1 “兰南文学奖” (the Lannan Literary Award) 是兰南家族于 1989 年设立的, 用于奖励以英语写作的优秀作家的文学奖, 分为诗歌、小说和非小说三类, 每类奖金为 15 万美金, 是世界上奖金数额最高的文学奖之一。威廉斯荣获了 1993 年度“兰南文学奖”非小说类奖。

Terry Tempest Williams (hereafter Williams): When I was young, I often wondered am I an artist or an activist? Am I a Mormon or a feminist? Am I citizen of the American West or a global citizen? Now, I don't worry about that any more. I am a writer engaged with the world. I believe in engaging both the internal and external landscapes, simultaneously. Perhaps, this is what it means to be an integrated human being. There are times I teach, there are times I speak, there are times I write. And there are times, I am deeply quiet and contemplative in the desert. For me, it is always about being present. I see no contradictions. I am comfortable with paradoxes. I am a Mormon woman who is a radical soul in a conservative religion. Though I am not "active" in a religious sense, it is my culture and one of the communities I am committed to, even if I am an edgewalker. What is my coherent vision? I believe in a world that is interconnected and interrelated. I believe we have a responsibility to take care of the places we call home, both large and small on this beautiful planet we call Earth. I want to be present in this moment in time, and speak on behalf of Beauty and Justice; I want to speak as truthfully and passionately as I can in the name of community, both human and wild. And I want to contribute through my voice on the page and in the world to help illuminate what Albert Schweitzer calls "a reverence for life." I want to be strong enough to not avert my gaze to what is difficult and hard.

I want to hold opposing views at once and embrace a complexity that allows us to grieve and dance, at once. I want to embody a sacred rage and a calm heart. I want to love the Earth enough to change.

You ask what is the greatest challenge? To live with my hypocrisy as a human being, knowing my very presence on the planet is contributing to its destruction.

Zheng: You come from a Mormon family, and you often claim yourself as a Mormon woman and an heir to a rich spiritual tradition. But Mormon readers often express frustration with your unorthodoxy and criticisms of the faith's emphasis on conformity, authority, and patriarchy. Are you struggling with your religious culture?

Williams: Octavio Paz said, "If we are interested in a revolution of the Spirit, an evolution of the Spirit, it requires both love and criticism." I feel both for my Mormon Culture. Although I am no longer orthodox, by that I mean I no longer believe in much of the Mormon theology, I still believe in the power of community, the force of prayer, and living a wholesome life rooted in place, deep tenants in the faith that raised me. So much of who I am is rooted in my religious background.

But there is also much about Mormon culture that I find not only stifling,

but aligned with “toxic masculinity.” I have witnessed the effects of structural racism within Mormonism, the ways in which Native People are viewed as “Lamenites,” how African-Americans were not allowed to hold the priesthood through much of my youth, and how women are still not allowed to hold the priesthood in a world where men and women are increasingly sharing equal power in the world.

Harold Bloom calls Mormonism an “American Religion.” I think this is an astute analysis. America is in crisis. The old forms of governance are no longer working for us, nor are the old structures of power. We are in a process of reimagining everything. One of the great qualities of Mormonism is its capacity to adapt. It is one of the reasons the religion has been so successful. The Church will change as its members change. Whatever criticism I offer to my home religion is with the hope of developing an edge of awareness and attention to social issues that might spark a higher consciousness of inclusion and parity for women, indigenous people, people of color, gay people, and trans -- that power not just be concentrated in a hierarchy of aging white men, but a more generous sharing of power will be cultivated in diversity giving rise to a broader and deeper sense of humanity that naturally expands to a spiritual solidarity of care and consciousness that extends to how we treat the Earth.

You ask if I am struggling with my religious culture. I struggle with the Mormon Church’s Patriarchy and power that renders others’ voices mute. I also deplore the intermingling of Church and State in the Utah, done behind closed doors. This has been evident in the current issue of Bears Ears National Monument and Senator Orrin Hatch’s actions to undermine Native People’s sacred lands. On Monday, December 4, 2017, President Donald Trump gutted Bears Ears National Monument by 85%. He acknowledged Orrin Hatch and all the other politicians in the state from the Congressional delegation (all Mormon) to the governor’s support. It was a terrible act of disrespect to the sacred lands of the Hopi, Navajo, Ute, and Zuni Nations. This was backed by the quiet support of the Mormon Church and acted out on the land by largely rural Mormon communities in places such as Blanding, Utah.

It’s complicated. But by eliminating 2 million acres of protected land, that land is now open to fossil fuel development. The state of Utah will benefit from that business and conversely, so will the Mormon Church. This is a corporate religion supporting corporate takeover of America’s public lands. It begs the question, “What is truly sacred?”

Zheng: Richard Jefferies was a British novelist and essayist in 19th century who helped pioneer the field of modern nature writing. *The Story of My Heart* is an autobiographical description of his “soul life” in nature, which was first published in 1883, but not much read and known today. A new edition of the book was published in 2014, as rediscovered by you and your husband, Brooke Williams, which gives modern readers a chance to meet Richard Jefferies who now has been rescued from obscurity. Why do you think it is important to bring this book back into print so that another generation could encounter Jefferies’ s ideas?

Williams: Brooke and I fell in love with Richard Jefferies book, *The Story of My Heart*. We felt it explored the beauty and magic of the world we live in, a world that honors the mysteries that surround us — a life beyond materialism and cynicism that is informed by a mystical engagement with the world. By paying acute attention to Nature, we enhance our “soul-life,” the understanding that we belong to something much greater than ourselves. Jefferies explores a form of Earth Justice based in carrying for a world, both human and wild. We are not the only species that lives and breathes and loves on this planet. Jefferies does not believe in an anthropocentric view of God — God exists in all things — We become conscious of the Great Mysteries and liberate ourselves from the oppression of small thinking and living.

Zheng: In essays alongside Jefferies’ original work, Brooke and you contemplate dilemmas of modernity, the intrinsic need for wildness, and what it means to be human in the 21st century. During the process of delving into the love letter to nature, your relationship with each other and with the natural world has also been strengthened and refreshed (Torrey House Press). Could you tell us how it is achieved?

Williams: If you are talking about how we have maintained and flourished in a marriage that has expanded over four decades... Well, I think it is different for everyone. For us, it has been a daily adventure. If Thoreau said, “In wildness is the preservation of the world,” we could say “In wildness is the preservation of our marriage.” Brooke and I have always known that our love for each other included our love for the natural world. Our commitment is rooted in our community, both human and wild. We have consciously created a marriage filled with open spaces and mystery like the open spaces we love. We have never had a plan, we just trusted the next step before us and discussed it fully. We are in constant communication and communion with each other and the day at hand. We have honored the landscape of the imagination and dared to break set with

convention. We both have a high tolerance for uncertainty and risk. It has not been easy at times, but we have always known that growth comes out of the vitality of the struggle. I not only love, Brooke, but I respect him and cherish his curious, wild mind and his joyous, kind spirit. We have been lucky and we have never taken each other for granted, nor do we take the privilege that is ours for granted. We have beautiful friends who challenge and inspire us and families that support us, though we may disagree on many things. We believe in serving something larger than ourselves and that has been trying to serve a consciousness found in wild nature. And it is this that has been our spiritual grounding where our love and intimacy resides.

Zheng: You have complained about the hustle and bustle of modern life in an interview given by Michael Toms in 2000. “More and more I find that is the issue: how to create time, how to create buffers around us so that we are doing nothing. I think that may be our biggest disease right now — the disease of busyness.” And in *The Story of My Heart*, Richard Jefferies points out the importance of idleness. Do you think he has given us a cure?

Williams: I do not believe anyone can give us “a cure” to anything, especially, when it comes to how we manage and respect time. It is a daily practice, a conscious decision to slow down, to choose a more contemplative life over a frantic one. I schedule open days with as much resolve as I schedule public commitments. If I cannot see days free ahead of me, I cannot breathe. This is how essential my days of dreaming and writing and walking and being are to my creative existence. It also allows me to appreciate my days of engagement whether it is teaching a class or giving a talk or traveling to a far off place. There is a strange kind of balance in structuring a life that is both intensely public and deeply private.

Zheng: All your works are characteristic with a strong sense of place. You have employed three overlapping concepts to define your approach to place: poetics of place, politics of place and erotics of place. How are they related to one another?

Williams: Hmmm... what a great question. I have to think about that. Again, I think they are seamless — it’s how an ecosystem functions, all parts are integrated into the whole. Poetry, politics, place — all explored through love — yes, that is it — that is the landscape where I dwell daily. (I just have to say that it is snowing outside here in Cambridge and I am in heaven being in conversation with you, Emma, sipping cups of tea, a candle lit). Recently, I read these three lines from a poem written by W.S. Merwin:

Your absence has gone through me
 Like thread through a needle.
 Everything I do is stitched with its color.

The title of the poem is “Separation.” Perhaps, this is our daily practice to not be separated from the place where we dwell: the land, its people, its politics, and love ourselves enough to be present and engaged with one another, even in conflict, especially in conflict, with a full and brave heart. To truly listen to one another is the beginning of prayer. To create together is the beginning of ceremony. More and more, I feel we just have to empty ourselves to one another — give each other all we have in an honest and truthful way, understanding our weaknesses and limitations and face each other as imperfect human beings. It is in this space of humility, beauty reveals itself. In this tenderness, love creates a path we could not have seen without the gift of vulnerability and desire. This is how I understand an erotics of place — daring to love and engage with what scares us, what could literally kill us, emotionally and physically, but through our commitment to one another, we are brought into our highest and deepest selves and something real is brought forward.

Zheng: In your short essay “Why I write,” you compared writing as “the dance with paradox” and described your paradoxical attitudes toward writing as “I write to discover and I write to uncover……I write because I believe in words; I write because I do not believe in words…… I write because I trust nothing… Words are always a gamble……” Are you always writing in a state of paradox?

Williams: Isn’t being alive as a human being a paradox, as each day we inch closer toward death?

Zheng: A further question of paradox. The similar conflicts reappeared when you talked about the use of “I” in your writing in two of your earlier interviews. One is given by Ona Siporin in 1996, in which you said, “… I would love to write fiction. It would be such a relief because I’ m so tired of having to expose myself. I look at the first-person pronoun “I” and I just get sick to my stomach. [In fiction] I would not have to be a slave to facts.” And the other is given by Jocelyn Bartkevicius and Mary Hussmann in 1997, in which you said, “Often times we think when we use first person narrative, it closes the text, but I think once we have the courage to put “I” on the page we are free to work with the language and

the ideas.” Are you consciously revealing or concealing yourself from the readers while you are writing?

Williams: I am not consciously revealing or concealing myself to the reader, I am writing to tell the truth of my experience within the circle of ideas I am exploring. The interviews you are referencing are from the past, decades ago. I don’ t bother myself with those concerns now. I was younger then. The world was very different. Climate change were two words that had barely entered the public vocabulary. For so many years, talking about the weather was talking about nothing. Now it really is our survival. Climate change is upon us. The world is on fire. The world is flooding. Science is under siege. The rule of law in America is at risk. As writers, we have an obligation to expose the hard stories and bear witness to what we see. We must find the courage and the love to not look aw. Whether it is the BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico or emaciated polar bears wandering through the village of Kaktovik, Alaska on the edge of the Beaufort Sea or the cruelty of eviscerating Bears Ears National Monument, sacred home ground to the Hopi, Navajo, Ute and Zuni Nations, these are the stories that are commanding my attention. This is not the time to be thinking of what “I” means to a narrative structure in creative nonfiction. It is a time of focusing on what we can do together through daring acts of the imagination, using the gifts that are ours — each in our own way — each in our own time — in the places we call home. The question that is burning bright in me is how do we continue to keep “the open space of democracy” open?

Zheng: As an activist, you have been passionately active in social and environmental issues for decades. Here is a piece of news on the internet: in February 2016, you and your husband, Brooke Williams, protested climate change by bidding on Bureau of Land Management oil and gas leases at a Salt Lake City auction. Your winning bids on 1,120 acres of north of Arches National Park prompted you to incorporate your own energy company, Tempest Explorations LLC. In October, the Interior Department refunded your money and withheld the leases. Could you tell us what is going on with that?

Williams: We purchased these two oil and gas leases on February 16, 2017. Two weeks later, I was informed by my employer at the University of Utah, that due to changes in policies and procedures, it may be difficult to go forward with my job as an endowed professor at the Environmental Humanities Graduate Program that I founded in 2003. Six weeks later after painful negotiations, I resigned. The University said I was a danger to the students and university by taking field trips. This was a ploy t, they wanted me gone. The fossil fuel industry is a large

benefactor to the University of Utah. We now know the University had received pressure to get rid of me from the Utah State Legislature. Our oil and gas leases were revoked in October, 2016, by the United States Bureau of Land Management on the grounds that we had no intention of developing fossil fuels. We had said openly, that we would develop the fossil fuels only after science could show us that they were worth more above ground than below given the costs to climate change and a livable future. We are now appealing this decision with the U.S. government. Our legal case awaits its appearance before the Land Board of Appeals within the Department of Interior.

I am now Writer-in-Residence at the Harvard Divinity School.

Zheng: After the September 11 attacks in 2001, you said you have to come to believe that “there are many forms of terrorism and environmental degradation is one of them.” You have reiterated the point on several occasions since then. Do you still think it is the case today?

Williams: Never has it been more clear that the current war on America’s public lands under the administration of Donald J. Trump is an act of domestic terrorism. On Monday, December 4, 2017, he radically reduced Bears Ears National Monument and Grand Staircase-National Monument by 2 million acres, opening these now unprotected lands, sacred ancestral grounds of the Hopi, Navajo, Ute and Zuni Nations to oil and gas and coal development. In a word, this action is criminal. Lawsuits have been filed, but it is fair to ask after the lawsuits have been fought (and I feel certain we will win on the grounds of what Trump did are illegal), what lands will remain to protect.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is also under threat with republicans tacking on an obscure rider on the Tax Reduction Bill that seismic studies can begin on the Coastal Plain of the Refuge to begin drilling for oil. The 50-year conservation battle to keep the Arctic Refuge wild and free from fossil fuel development is a hair from being lost.

Zheng: In your latest book, *The Hour of Land: A Personal Topography of America’s National Parks*, you said, “I no longer see America’s National parks as ‘our best idea’, but our evolving idea” (35), why?

Williams: In 2012, President Barack Obama, a former community organizer chose to honor another community organizer and established the Cesar E. Chavez National Monument to honor the work of the United Farm Workers in Keene, California. The community of La Paz exemplifies the power of an evolving ethos

that cannot separate the land from the people who inhabited that land. We see that the national parks are not just one story that has been largely white and privileged, but multi-stories rooted in multiple identities that are all part of “the vitality of the struggle:” Stonewall National Monument that celebrates the LGBTQ community in their fight for equality; Harriet Tubman National Monument that honors the work of the Underground Railroad; and of course, Bears Ears National Monument that is handshake across history between Native Peoples and the United States government. We are evolving as a people in the United States of America and as a result, our view of our national parks and monuments are evolving, as well. We are coming to understand our darkest histories of privilege, racism, and the abuse of power that extends to the land — and as a result, the degree of our awareness is the degree of our consciousness and that is the bedrock of human consciousness.

Zheng: Both H el ene Cixous and Emily Dickinson, your favorite women writers have described the power of language. H el ene Cixous says, “The only book worth writing is the book that threatens to kill us.” Emily Dickinson says, “If I read a book and it makes my whole body so cold no fire can ever warm me, I know it is poetry. If I feel physically as if the top of my head were taken off, I know that it is poetry.” And you also say, “I write knowing I can be killed by my own words, stabbed by my syntax, crucified by both understanding and misunderstanding at once.” In what way are you influenced by them? Do you believe and hope your writings are as powerful as theirs?

Williams: I cannot hope my words are as powerful as another. I can only try to make my words as powerful as the emotions I feel, that is my task and challenge. Helene Cixous instructed and inspired me to write out of the body, to follow my own instincts laid bare by blood, bones, and the tissues of truth, not the structures laid down by the patriarchy. Cixous asks us to speak the language women speak when there is no one there to correct us. Call it a liberation theology of language. She asks us to write not out societal oughts and shoulds, but out of our dreams and desires and what ifs and why nots — to locate through the language of our bodies our own pleasures the creative tensions between transgression and transmission. It is this heat born out of earthly revelation that frees us and reimagines our world, both personally and politically.

Emily Dickson’s poetry reads like Buddhist koans. She shows us why the precision of language matters. I read her seemingly simple poems with a dictionary as though it is a hand lens looking at the veins and serrated edges of leaves as one proceeds to identify and key out a new plant never seen before. I admire Emily

because she did not care about the outside world of opinion, only the internal compass of her own soul born out of deep reflection and the integrity of solitude. Her love of the nature, birdsong, and the living world was not just to serve as symbol and metaphor but her love affair with all things alive and trustworthy.

Zheng: You said it is writing about the questions that keep you up at night. In *Pieces of White Shell*, the question is “What stories do we tell that evoke a sense of place?” With *Refuge*, it is “How do we find refuge in change?” With *Leap*, it is “How do we breathe life into the orthodoxies that we are a part of?” It’s the questions that propel you. What is the question on your mind now?

Williams: Is Earth not enough?

Zheng: You have had a dialogue with a famous Chinese naturalist writer, A Lai in June 2017, at Shanghai Normal University. You said at the end of the dialogue you had learned that besides a love for home and wild nature, you and A Lai also shared a grief. In many ways both of your hearts were broken with the deteriorating environmental crisis. As one of your books entitled *Finding Beauty in a Broken World*, can we assume that you are still hopeful to restore the relationship between nature and humanity? If yes, how can we find hope in the midst of grief and despair?

Williams: If we can stand in the center of grief and truly be present with all we are losing and stand to lose on this beautiful, broken planet we call home, then I believe we can walk through the darkness into joy. I am not so interested in hope as I am in cultivating faith and conscious actions in the name of community.

Zheng: You have been appointed writer-in-residence at the Harvard Divinity School 2017-2018 academic year. What is your plan for teaching and writing during your stay in Harvard?

Williams: I am learning, reading, thinking, contemplating — feeling the closeness and distance of being away from home and consequently, writing with a new sense of clarity. The Harvard Divinity School is liberating me in ways I cannot yet discern, I can only feel it — being in a place where I don’t have to check my words or fight for an idea — the ideas are already being discussed, implemented, deepened.

And yet, I see a place for me here which is an embodied poetics of place. What I know is not an abstraction but an intelligence akin to the stratigraphy of stone walls in the Grand Canyon. Exposure. Erosion. Experimentation. Elemental love.

I think it begins here. Every day is a revelation. And when I returned home to the desert, every day is a revelation there, too. One of the mind; one of the body; How to bring these two places of knowing together in prayer?

I am offering a Salon, an open space for students to talk about the truth of their lives in relationship to this moment in time. And next semester, I am co-teaching a class called “Apocalyptic Grief, Radical Joy.”

Who knows where we will travel? I am so excited to explore these ideas with the students here at the Divinity School. What a gift it is to be here. I trust the process of life. Had I not resigned from the University of Utah, heartbroken and stunned by being exiled — I would never have had the opportunity to be here. I am so grateful for the processes that shape us.

We can never know what is dreaming us into being. We can only be present in the moment before us and respond with the fullness of an open and courageous heart.

And dear dear Emma, we have said nothing about the transformative time in China!

Love to you, Terry.

Zheng: Yes, exactly. During your stay in China last June, you’ ve been to bustling metropolitan cities such as Beijing and Shanghai as well as smaller cities or little towns such as Dali and Wuzhen and have noticed their differences. But even the latter places where a more traditional and tranquil lifestyle is preserved are also endangered in the process of modernization. The transformative time in China is a worthwhile topic. Thank you very much for your concern about it.

Williams: You are welcome. Maybe we can go on this topic when I come back to China next time. I’ ll see and find more about how China is being transformed.

Zheng: That’ s a good idea. Thank you very much for accepting my invitation for this interview. I’ m looking forward to meeting you again in China!

责任编辑：张连桥

Core Concepts and Basic Theories of Narrative: A Conversation with Gerald Prince

Shang Biwu & Gerald Prince

Abstract: Gerald Prince is Professor of Romance Languages at the University of Pennsylvania. The author of *A Grammar of Stories* (1973), *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (1982), *A Dictionary of Narratology* (1987), *Narrative as Theme: Studies in French Fiction* (1992), Prince is a leading scholar of narrative poetics. Developing such key concepts as *narratee*, *narrativity*, *disnarrated*, and *narrative grammar*, Prince has helped to shape the discipline of narratology. In 2013, Prince received the Wayne C. Booth Lifetime Achievement Award from the International Society for the Study of Narrative, an organization that he presided in 2007. During Prince's visit to SJTU for the Summer Seminar on Narratology, Professor Shang Biwu interviewed him on a wide range of issues concerning narrativity, the definition of narrative and of a minimal story, the distinction between narrative and non-narrative, the correlation between classical narratology and post-classical narratology, and postcolonial narratology.

Key words: definition of narrative; narrativity; minimal story; postcolonial narratology

Author: Shang Biwu is 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).

标题: 叙事的核心概念及其基本理论：杰拉德·普林斯对话录

内容摘要: 杰拉德·普林斯是宾夕法尼亚大学罗曼语系教授，国际叙事学研究协会前主席，国际叙事学研究协会终生成就奖获得者。作为当今世界最杰出的叙事学家之一，普林斯在其学术生涯中开创性地提出了受述者、叙事性、叙事语法、未发生叙述等概念，出版《故事语法》(1973)、《叙事学：叙事的形式与功能》(1982)、《叙事学词典》(1987)、《作为主题的叙事：法国小说研究》(1992)等系列权威论著，有力地促进了叙事学的发展。2017年夏，普林斯教授应邀在上海交通大学暑期叙事学讲习班授课。期间，尚必武教授就叙事性、叙事的定义、最小故事、叙事与非叙事之分、经典叙事学与后经典叙事学之间的关系，以及后殖民叙事学等相关话题同普林斯展开对话。现

就对话内容整理刊出，以求教于读者。

关键词：叙事的定义；叙事性；最小故事；后殖民叙事学

作者简介：尚必武，文学博士，上海交通大学外国语学院教授，教育部“长江学者奖励计划”青年学者，主要从事叙事学、文学伦理学批评、英美文学研究。本文系国家社科基金重大项目“当代西方叙事学前沿理论的翻译与研究”【项目批准号 17ZDA281】的阶段性成果。

Shang Biwu (Shang for short hereafter): Dear Professor Prince, thank you for lecturing in SJTU Summer Seminar on Narratology and for taking part in this conversation about narrative studies. I am very pleased to say that some of your works — including *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* and *A Dictionary of Narratology* — were translated into Chinese,¹ and that both are well received by their Chinese readers. As an admirer of your work, I have also translated your article “Classical and/or Postclassical Narratology” (2008).² When presenting to you the Wayne C. Booth Lifetime Achievement Award bestowed by the International Society for the Study of Narrative, Hilary Dannenberg said that “In terms of ideas, Gerald Prince’s rigorous theorizing of narrative in its many aspects has informed, inspired and encouraged many other scholars of narrative. The following key areas and concepts were invented or developed in his work: the narratee; the disnarrated; narrativity; narrative grammar; scholarship of the French novel; the art of studying narrative through minimal narratives; postcolonial narrative; narrative and gender.”³ I agree with every word said by Dannenberg. Undoubtedly, you’ve made tremendous contributions to narratology as an enterprise and discipline. So, our conversation will begin with an issue we are very curious about. How did you start your career as a narratologist?

Gerald Prince (Prince for short hereafter): That’s an interesting question. I was interested in a French writer, a very famous one, Jean-Paul Sartre, the famous existentialist and existentialist-Marxist philosopher. I was interested in his philosophy but I “mastered” his philosophy. And I was interested in his theater, but I also “mastered” his theater. What was left was his novels and short stories. I decided

1 See 杰拉德·普林斯：《叙事学：叙事的形式与功能》，徐强译。北京：中国人民大学出版社，2013年。杰拉德·普林斯：《叙述学词典》，乔国强、李孝弟译，上海：上海译文出版社，2011年。

2 See 杰拉德·普林斯：《经典/后经典叙事学》，尚必武译，载《叙事》（中国版）第五辑，唐伟胜主编，广州：暨南大学出版社，2013年，第147-154页。

3 Hilary Dannenberg, “2013—Gerald Prince.” <<http://narrative.georgetown.edu/awards/Boothprince.php>>

to do a thesis on the relationship between his view of the world and the narrative techniques that he used. And when I started my thesis, it was at the same time as the French founders of narratology were beginning to publish their work. So, as a student, I read their work and my first book was on Sartre's metaphysics and narrative techniques. And I used many of the narratological concepts that were being developed. That's how I became a narratologist.

Shang: In order to set up a kind of companion to the address by Hilary Dannenberg, I'd like to mention her article "Gerald Prince and the Fascination of What Doesn't Happen" (2014). In this article, Dannenberg claims that "The focus on the concept of *narrativity* in Gerald Prince's work demonstrates a keen interest in uncovering the ways by which a narrative can interest or fascinate the reader. Studying narrativity involves the investigation of the relative effectiveness or tellability of particular narratives, or what Prince has also called 'narratability'" (Dannenberg 304). Narrativity is a very essential notion in the arena of narrative inquiries. Without narrativity, we would hardly have the genre "narrative." On the one hand, narrativity is a kind of property or feature, which could be fruitfully used to draw a distinction between narrative and non-narrative. On the other hand, narrativity denotes a kind of degree, which makes some narratives look more narrative-like than other narratives. Could you say something more about the concept "narrativity"?

Prince: I think you said two things that are important. On the one hand, all narratives have narrativity, but on the other hand, some of them have a lot of it and some of them have so little of it that you don't even notice that they are narratives. So, the question is: what are the features that make you see more or less quickly that this is a narrative, this is a good story, this is a narrative that's very narrative. Among these features, there is the fact, for instance, that the events are represented as definite, as certain, rather than as possible or probable. No good story can hesitate for too long a time. It is fine to say "Well, I am not sure whether she did this or that, and I am not sure whether she was happy or not." But it's not fine to go on saying that you don't know what you're talking about, because narrative has to be positive. You can raise questions about some events. But the events have to be positive. They have to be discrete. They have to be bounded. They have to involve some conflicts, whether these conflicts are internal or external. They have to involve human or human-like experiences. For instance, weather reports are narratives: "Tomorrow it will rain and then it will snow" is a little narrative. But it's a lousy story. Why? Because there is no human experience that is talked about, because there is no conflict that is talked about, because it is just a relating of events.

Given that it's a weather report, we are not quite sure that the events will happen. Very often, it says it won't rain, and it rains. And I'm without an umbrella! That's really annoying.

Shang: I think each one of us is trying to be as good a narratologist as you are, but we encounter some obstacles. For example, most of the time, though we do have some good arguments and we also have the narratological framework or the narratological toolkit ready to realize them, we still don't know how to articulate them with much clarity. When talking about your narratological scholarship, Thomas G. Pavel says, "One of the most striking features of Gerald Prince's work is its unswerving commitment to conceptual and stylistic clarity" (Pavel 298). Clarity is the keyword in Pavel's compliment. Do you have any secrets for writing narratological works with so much clarity?

Prince: I'll tell you something. If I don't understand myself, it's no good, but if I understand myself, then it's clear, because I am not that smart. So, if I understand what I've written, it means that it's clear. It's very important to understand what you're saying, to understand what you've written, to master what it is that you are saying, and not to try and hide your ignorance with a lot of words. Really, if you can understand what you're saying, it's good. If you don't understand what you're saying, it may be good in certain contexts, but not in narratology.

Shang: At least, we know what we're talking about now. I also agree with Pavel, who argues that "A rigorous but open-minded thinker, a genuine innovator, and a wise adviser, Prince is an inspiring example of creative scholarship in narrative studies" (Pavel 303). I can't agree with him more. You started your career as a classical narratologist and you published *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* and *A Dictionary of Narratology*, but you are open-minded in that your ideas go with the climatic change of narratology. For example, in the 1980s, when Susan Lanser proposed a feminist narratology, she argued and fought fiercely with Nilli Diengott. You showed your support for Lanser, which she was very much grateful for, and she mentioned it in her own article "A Prince for All Seasons, With Notes Toward the Delineation of a *New Yorker* Narratee," when she paid tribute to your scholarly achievements. The other thing is that you have a wonderful way of working for the discipline of narratology by raising inspiring questions. For all these years, I've been working hard to answer the questions you list in "Forty-One Questions on the Nature of Narrative" (2000). You begin with "What is the difference, if any, between narrative, nonnarrative, and antinarrative" and you end with

“What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for something to be (a) narrative?” I think even today these questions are very much worth our efforts to answer them. Since you are here with us today, I will use this rare opportunity to invite you to answer some of the questions you raised a decade ago. As we know, human beings are storytelling animals. We enjoy stories, we try to be persons with stories, and we try to tell our stories very well. It is no exaggeration to say that story and storytelling constitute the way of our life. I will single out some questions you mention about stories. For example, question twenty-nine: “Are all narratives stories?” And question thirty-four: “What is a minimal story?”

Prince: Yes. First, let me point out that these are questions, which means I don’t necessarily have the answers. And even, originally, I wanted my title to be followed by a question mark: “Forty-One Questions on the Nature of Narrative” and a question mark. Because many of the questions involve more than one question. It’s more than forty-one questions. And I even wanted to put a question mark after my name, because who exactly is Gerry Prince? Gerry Prince, in some sense, is all the people who have worked on narrative. But Brian Richardson told me: “You cannot put a question mark after the title and especially after your name.” So I didn’t. I go back to your questions. One question is “Are all narratives stories?” I think my answer would be no. Stories are particular forms of narratives. Stories are narratives where the beginning and the end of the narrative are transformationally related. So, a story could be something like “She was rich, she played poker, she lost her money, and she became poor.” There is a transformational relation between the beginning and the end, “she was rich” and “she was poor.” Whereas many narratives do not necessarily have this structure. Earlier, I gave an example. “Tomorrow it will rain and then it will snow.” Well, there is no necessary link between rain and snow. It can rain and it can snow and then it can become sunny and then we can go out and then we can have dinner and so on. There is no transformational relation between the beginning and the end. So, my answer to the question “Are all narratives stories?” would be no. There are narratives that are not stories and they usually are not particularly interesting as narratives. They can be informative but are not necessarily interesting. But you also have narratives that are stories, where the beginning and the end (the beginning, the middle, and the end) cohere together, are related transformationally to each other. That would be my answer to the first question. “What is a minimal story?” I think the question is not that difficult. A minimal story is not any kind of minimal narrative. A minimal story is a story presenting a single event, one that does not presuppose and that does not imply the beginning or the end. For instance, “She was rich, she played poker, and she became poor.” That’s

a minimal story. There is only one event: “she played poker.” But this one event does not presuppose the fact that she was rich. She could be poor and play poker. And this one event does not imply the fact that she became poor, because she could play poker and win money. So, the one event does not presuppose the beginning and does not imply the end. That’s enough for a minimal story. Slowly, you can expand it, and I think I spoke about it a little bit today. You can expand a minimal story. You can add any number of events: “She played poker and she wasn’t very lucky and she continued to play and her luck didn’t change and she became poor.” I already expanded it a little bit. Or I can expand it further and say: “and then she played more poker and then she became rich.” Given a minimal story, I can expand it indefinitely. But a minimal story represents a single event, one that does not presuppose the beginning or imply the end. That’s what a minimal story is.

Shang: Ok, thanks for telling us a wonderful story about playing poker and then losing all the money and then winning all the money to become worthy again. A wonderful story. Let’s go from issues like story and minimal story and narrative to the very definition of narrative. As we know, generally it is agreed that, given that narratology is a theory of narrative, a fundamental concern, a primary concern, will be the definition of narrative. Without narrative, how are we going to do narratology? Basically, we have two types of definitions of narrative: in a narrow sense, narrative is mostly related to fiction, while in a broad sense, anything can be narrative. Let us go back to the last two questions on the list. “What are the advantages and disadvantages of a restrictive or an expansive definition of narrative(s) and narrativity?” and “What are the necessary and sufficient conditions for something to be (a) narrative?” First, could you comment on the two competing attitudes about the definition of narrative?

Prince: Yes. I like a narrow definition more than a broad one, because with a narrow one, even though it is narrow and may miss some narratives, at least you know what you’re talking about, whereas with a broad one, if everything is narrative, then it’s not very interesting to talk about. If someone tells me “This bottle is narrative,” I say “OK, fine,” you know. But it’s not that fine. So, I prefer a restrictive definition.

Shang: Regarding the distinction between narrative and nonnarrative, what are the necessary and sufficient conditions for something to be a narrative?

Prince: You do have to have the representation of at least one event. That is absolutely necessary. If you don’t have the representation of an event, of something that

happens, you don't have narrative. So, something like "My name is Gerry Prince" is not a narrative. It's a statement. It's a piece of information. Something like "How are you?" is not a narrative. It can be answered by a narrative: "Sometimes I get tired, I am not doing well because I got sick, etc. etc." But "How are you?" is not a narrative. Or take this little poem in English: "Roses are red, Violets are blue, Sugar is sweet, and so are you." It's not a narrative. It's a poem of affection and love. It does not involve any event. So, the necessary condition is that a narrative has at least one event. With sufficient conditions, you do have people who argue differently. Some people say that there has to be a human agent or a human patient. There has to be something related to human experience. For them, to say something like "It rained and then it snowed" is not enough to make a narrative. You have to have something like "It rained and I got wet and then it snowed and I got a cold and I became sick." That's a narrative. Because you have human experiences. Other people say that a single event is not enough: the representation of a single event is merely an event description. You need more: two events or even three events. Or you need the form I call a story, with beginning, middle and end. The point is that sufficient conditions sometimes vary with the theorist. But the necessary condition is: you have to have events. You have to have a change that is presented, that is mentioned, that is talked about. You have to have that change. When I was a kid — the following is for people who have a very broad definition of narrative — when I was a kid, I knew a good joke. A good joke for a kid. I was three or perhaps two. You have a painting. It's white. And you ask "What is it about?" Somebody tells you: "It's a story." "What's the story?" "Well, it's about a meadow, a cow in a meadow, and it ate all the grass and it left." Is the white painting a narrative? I don't think so. A narrative has to represent events. It has to mention a cow eating all the grass. It cannot leave everything to your imagination. So, the necessary condition is: it has to be the representation of at least one event. Maybe it should be two or three. That is arguable. But there has to be at least one.

Shang: When we talk about narrativity, narrative, and stories in terms of narratology today, I think that a very frequently talked about topic is the distinction between classical narratology and postclassical narratology. Since the time when David Herman initiated this distinction in his article "Scripts, Sequences, and Stories: Elements of a Postclassical Narratology" (1997) and the consequential collection *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis* (1999), since then, we have all these discussions about postclassical narratology and classical narratology. Some scholars do not really agree with Herman about the distinction between the two.

Meir Sternberg is a typical example.¹

Prince: Yeah.

Shang: I was very pleased to read your article “Classical and/or Postclassical Narratology” (2008). In the title of this article, you used “and/or”. Are there any reasons for doing so?

Prince: Yes. The reason why I said “and/or” is to show that there is a hesitation in the very definitions of classical and postclassical. If I say “classical and postclassical narratology,” I put together two things; I do not necessarily oppose them. I do not necessarily say it’s either one or the other. No. I say “classical and postclassical.” They are together somehow. If I say “classical or postclassical,” there’s possibly a choice to make. You may have to choose between one and the other. There is a stronger opposition between them. I wanted to show in the title that classical and postclassical narratology are not necessarily opposed. They can even be considered as going together (“and”) rather than being in conflict (“or”). That’s why I used both.

Shang: So, this way, we shall know why you have written all your articles on the one hand with much clarity, while on the other hand with much ambiguity.

Prince: Yeah. Because in the article, on the one hand, I say that — and I said it today, earlier — I say that postclassical narratology is really a prolongation, an expansion of classical narratology. It asks the same questions and also other questions. But I also say in the article that, on the other hand, there are differences between the two and we cannot ignore them or hide them under the rug. Classical narratology is much narrower and perhaps, in a sense, because it’s narrow, more rigorous. You know, because it’s more constrained. Postclassical narratology is perhaps less rigorous but it is richer because it asks many more questions. And I think that what happened in the field of narratology is that people, after a while, got bored with the narrowness, with classical narratology, and said “the hell with rigor! We want to ask certain other kinds of questions.” There was a session that was supposed to take place at the last narrative conference. It was supposed to be a session where there would be three participants: myself, Thomas Pavel, and Roy Sommer, who is a postcolonial narratologist and a postclassical one but with strong classical ideals. And the session was going to be called: “Narratology: Happiness, or Rigor.” It didn’t quite take place. Why? I wrote to Roy Sommer. I said: “When are we going

1 Meir Sternberg, “Reconceptualizing narratology: Arguments for a Functionalist and Constructivist Approach to Narrative.” *Enthymema* 4 (2011): 35-37.

to propose the session?” and I didn’t get any answer. So, I thought: “ok! maybe he was drunk when he said ‘this is what we’re going to do next year.’” I didn’t get any answer, so I joined another session. But then Roy wrote to me saying: “So, when are we going to work on the session?” I said: “I wrote to you three months ago!” He said: “I never got your email!” And, indeed, I had sent it to the wrong address. So, it didn’t quite happen. But I like the notion of happiness or rigor. I was going to represent rigor, I think, and Thomas Pavel was going to represent happiness, and Roy Sommer was going to try and show how you can be happy and rigorous at the same time. But can you? I really think that the story of postclassical narratology is that people were rigorous but they weren’t happy, so they decided to be happy and forget about rigor. That’s how I tend to view the field.

Shang: Ok, but anyway we shall be very tolerant.

Prince: Yes.

Shang: We shall be happy and let other people be happy.

Prince: Yes, yes.

Shang: And then, in the article, you observed and you argued that postclassical narratology actually is not anti-formalist. Instead, you believe that “it is very much interested in form, its definitional powers, its systematic investigation” (Prince 117), and so on and so forth. And then, very interestingly, you conclude the article by saying: “Whether narratologists adopt classical or postclassical positions, whether they focus on specifying the nature of narrative grids or on exploring the ways various factors can inflect these grids, whether they give all or only some of their attention to form, the elaboration of such models is crucial to the coherence of the discipline and to the systematic study of its object. In other words, and at least in this sense, whatever direction it follows, narratology should continue to be formalist” (Prince 122).

Prince: Yes.

Shang: So, the question is, basically: if we believe that, in a way, all narratologists are working like formalists, it can be confusing to our followers, and in particular our students, or even the participants of the seminar on narratology; because, apparently, there is a kind of “contextualist turn,” and we really need to take all sorts of contextual elements into consideration. So, the problem is: what are we going to do with the formalist baby and the contextualist bathwater? Could you possibly

elaborate on this issue?

Prince: Well, that's a good point, Shang, I think. Because what I meant by "whatever positions you adopt, you have to be formalist," what I meant by that is that you should never forget form. Sometimes, you get so interested in context that you forget text and form. Sometimes, you ask so many different questions that you forget questions that are much more pertinent to narrativity, to plot, to point of view, to fundamental narratological categories. So, what's important, really, is to always remember form, is not to forget form by asking too many different questions. For that, I think one has to exercise tact and tell oneself — even as one is exploring context, even as one is asking questions that do not seem to be classical questions — one has to remind oneself, from time to time, that, "well, now, enough, I have to go back to form." That's what I meant. And one learns how to do it or one can decide not to do it. You know, after all, you are free not to do it, but for narratology it is important to remember that certain questions are fundamental and have to be asked again and again, regardless of how much you want to talk about context or you want to talk about things that are not particularly narrative. I'll give the following as an example: suppose you read a funny story, a story that makes you laugh. Well, comedy is not necessarily narrative. You can have comedy in non-narrative forms. So that if you read the comic story and you talk only about the comedy and not about the story, to my mind, you are not really doing narratology. You have to be able to combine the two, to combine your reflection on comedy with a reflection on the particular narrative techniques that foreground the comedy, that increase the comedy, that make it more interesting, or even more funny; you always should remember the narrative aspects of it. That's what I meant.

Shang: Thank you. Let's go back to the very issues of formalist pursuits and also contextual elements. Because I realize that, when commenting on classical and/or postclassical narratology, somehow, as I mentioned, you are very much open-minded and willing to explore some aspects of narrative in relation to ideology, and even history, and still other notions. In particular, you try to open and expand narratological inquiries into some neighboring fields. So, I was very happy to see you try to bring a happy marriage between postcolonial theory and narrative studies in your excellent and ground-breaking article "On a Postcolonial Narratology" (2005). On the one hand, I was very much pleased to see that you were going to go in this direction; on the other hand, to my regret, you stopped your exploring in this direction. To my knowledge, possibly, this is the only article you have written on the issue of postcolonial narratology. If we are going to pursue the line on postcolo-

nial narratology that you have outlined in that article, could you possibly elaborate some future directions or potential aspects? What are your suggestions about this fertile field?

Prince: You know, that piece, first of all, the origin of that piece is silly in a way. I am friends with Gayatri Spivak, who is a well-known postcolonial theorist. And we were talking about a postcolonial conference. She said: “You have to come.” And I said: “I would love to come.” But it was a conference by invitation and she wasn’t organizing it. She was being invited. Again, she said: “You should come.” I said: “But nobody is going to invite me to the conference.” Because I am not a postcolonial theorist. Then I said: “Wait a minute! I will write a piece on postcolonial narratology and I will be invited.” So I did. But I was not invited. But that’s just a “funny” story. In reality, what I do in the piece is explore various narratological features like point of view, like speed, like voice. But I examine them by wearing postcolonial glasses, the same way as Susan Lanser. When she does feminist narratology, she asks the question: what difference does it make if I read a text with feminist glasses or with masculine glasses? In the same way, I asked the question: what consequences are there if I read with various categories associated with the postcolonial in mind, the category hybridity, say, or the category of code switching (because language is very important in many postcolonial contexts, since you have to deal with the colonizer’s language and your own language if you are colonized)? What difference does it make? This is what one can begin to explore. I think there’s a lot to explore in what is said about the languages characters use and the hierarchy established between languages. There is a lot to be said about point of view, about the hierarchy of points of view and the accuracy of points of view. There is a lot to be said about the narrator’s voice: is it a divided voice or is it a unique and unified voice? These are things one can explore in either novels that are called postcolonial or in any narrative, even if it is not necessarily classified as postcolonial. One can raise these questions and ask “is the narrator in the text a unified voice or is it a divided voice?”, “is the divided voice a hybrid voice or semi-hybrid voice?”, and so on and so forth. That’s what I think people can study. Every category of narratology can be reconsidered with postcolonial glasses in the same way as every category of narratology can be reconsidered with feminist glasses or queer glasses or whatever kind of glasses you can think of.

Shang: Okay. Thanks. Let me ask a broader question. As you can see, most participants are young and willing to learn, but somehow when you are young and filled with energy, you don’t know where you are going to invest your energy, you are

ambitious but somehow aimless. So, this “evening with Gerald Prince” will definitely be inspiring. The question is: in an “imaginary storyworld,” if you were one of the participants in the seminar, and you just started here with your career of being a narratologist, what would you do next? What are the projects that you would carry on?

Prince: That is a very important and interesting question. I think I would, of course, read a lot of narratological texts and ask myself what aspects of narrative, even if not neglected, have not really drawn too much attention, and I think I would find a couple of them. I think emotions and affects have not been studied very much, and space has not been studied enough. For twenty years’ space was sometimes referred to in narratology, but people said that narrative is really a temporal form, it describes change, it tells us about time, and you can have narrative with no mention of space. It doesn’t mean that there’s no space, but there’s no mention of it. For a long time, space was not that important to narratology, and if you read Gérard Genette’s famous *Narrative Discourse*, he doesn’t mention space, he hardly mentions description. Then people began to be interested in things like description, things like the space of the story. But what people did not spend that much time on, and I think I mentioned it in passing today, people did not and still do not explore certain other spaces, not the space of the events but the space of the narrator, the space of the narratee, the space of the narration, and the relations between them. People do not do it but — I think I can mention it — for your journal *Frontiers of Narrative Studies*, there is going to be a special issue on geographical narratology. I think most of the papers will be concerned with the space of the narrated rather than with other spaces, but who knows! This is an area where there’s a lot of work to be done. So, for me, affective narratology is an area where there’s a lot of work to be done — emotions and how they structure narrative — and space and the relations between different kinds of spaces. To give a simple example, is the space of the narrator far or near from the space of the events narrated? Is the space of the narrator the same as the space of the narratee or a different space? Because we can be in the same space, like here, and I can tell you a story, or you can be in Europe and I in China and again I can tell you a story. All these relations should be studied systematically and they haven’t been. These are some fields to explore. Also productive is wearing different kinds of glasses, like postcolonial glasses and so on.

Shang: Thank you, Professor Prince, very much for taking time to be with us. Since, at the beginning, I quoted from Hilary Dannenberg, I’d better end up this conversation with quoting her again. She says that as a scholar and narratologist,

Prince's "own academic work attains a marvelous combination of rigorous academic focus, argumentation, analytical precision and expressive power coupled with his spirit of lightness, humor and wit which often shines through from underneath the academic precision...As a person he is kind, generous, and witty; he has a delightfully warm and gracious spirit; it is always a pleasure to engage in discussion with him on the subject of narrative and on many other subjects."¹ In particular, I quite agree with Dannenberg when she observes that Prince "has such incisive wit and observational skills, an admirable calmness, dignity, and gentle authority in his communicational style that conversation with him is both relaxing and stimulating. He is himself an ideal companion to Narrative."² With that, we shall end our conversation this evening, but we shall give warm applause to Gerald Prince for being with us.

Prince: Thank you. I want to add that I appreciate you as questioner and interviewer. I am very appreciative not only for the questions you asked but also for your attentiveness. Thank you very much.

Works Cited

- Dannenberg, Hilary P. "Gerald Prince and the Fascination of What Doesn't Happen." *Narrative*, 22. 3 (2014): 304-311.
- Pavel, Thomas G. "Gerald Prince and Narrative Studies." *Narrative*, 22. 3 (2014): 298-303.
- Prince, Gerald. "Classical and/or Postclassical Narratology." *L'Esprit Créateur* 48. 2(2008):115-123.

责任编辑：杨革新

1 Hilary Dannenberg, "2013—Gerald Prince." <<http://narrative.georgetown.edu/awards/Booth-prince.php>>.

2 Hilary Dannenberg, "2013—Gerald Prince." <<http://narrative.georgetown.edu/awards/Booth-prince.php>>.

Remarks on Narrative Space

Gerald Prince

Abstract: The founders of narratology paid relatively little attention to space in narrative but the importance of narrative spatial features and structures is now widely recognized and one can even speak of a spatial turn in the discipline. Yet, although many aspects of story space, of the space of the narrated, have been studied, few aspects of other spatial levels in narrative — the space of the narrating or discourse space, for instance, the space of the narration or spatial location of the narrator narrating, and the space of the reception or spatial location of the narratee — have been explored. Moreover, the relations between the different levels, including relations of frequency, of order, and of proportion, have been similarly neglected. Drawing on a variety of examples, from Iván Turguénieff's *The Diary of a Superfluous Man* to André Gide's *L'Immoraliste*, this paper discusses all four of the above mentioned spatial levels as well as fundamental links between them.

Key words: narrative space, frequency, order, proportion

Author: **Gerald Prince** is Professor of Romance Languages, Associate Faculty at the Annenberg School of Communication, and a member of the graduate groups in Linguistics and in Comparative Literature at the University of Pennsylvania. The author of several books including *Métaphysique et technique dans l'œuvre romanesque de Sartre*; *A Grammar of Stories*; *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*; *A Dictionary of Narratology*; *Narrative as Theme*; *Guide du roman de langue française: 1901-1950* and many articles and reviews in the fields of (narrative) theory and of modern (French) literature. In 2013, he received the ISSN Wayne C. Booth Lifetime Achievement Award (Email: gprince@babel.ling.upenn.edu).

标题: 叙事空间简论

内容摘要: 叙事学的奠基者们很少关注叙事的空间问题，但是当下叙事空间特征与结构的重要性被广泛认可。我们甚至可以说叙事学产生了空间转向。尽管人们已经对故事空间与叙述对象的空间有所研究，但是对叙事中的其他空间层面——叙述行为的空间或话语，比如对叙述空间或叙述者的空间位置，接受空间或受述者的空间位置等研究不足。此外，不同空间层面之间的关系，包括频率、顺序、比例等也同样遭到忽视。本文以伊万·屠格涅夫《多余人日记》和安德烈·纪德《背德者》为例，讨论了上述四种空间层面及它们之间的

内在关系。

关键词：叙事空间；频率；顺序；比例

作者简介：杰拉德·普林斯，宾夕法尼亚大学罗曼语系教授，著有《形而上学与萨特小说中的技巧》、《故事语法》、《叙事学：叙事的形式与功能》、《叙事学词典》、《作为主题的叙事》、《法语小说指南（1901—1950）》等，并发表了多篇关于叙事理论和现代法语文学的论文与评述。2013年，他被国际叙事学研究协会授予终身成就奖。

The founders of narratology paid relatively little attention to space in narrative. Barthes (1-27) is primarily concerned with functional, actional, and narrational, rather than spatial, analysis. Genette (*Figures III*) is justly famous for his exploration of temporal relations. Bremond (*Logique du récit*) studies the logic of narrative actions. Todorov (*Grammaire du "Décaméron"*) focuses on temporal sequences and their relations. As for Greimas (*Du sens: essais sémiotiques*), he too privileges time over space in his account of spatiotemporal programming and narrative programs. This relative lack of interest is understandable, given that early narratologists were particularly attentive to distinctive and essential narrative traits and elements. Narratives are representations of asynchronous series of events and any such representations not only involve temporal changes of states, temporal relations between them, and temporal links between the representing and the represented, but they also point to them. On the other hand, though represented events, no doubt, occur in space — though they “take place” — it is quite possible to represent them without explicitly referring to their spatial positions and dimensions.

Still, early narratologists did not entirely neglect narrative space. Hamon (*Introduction à l'analyse du descriptif*), for example, devoted considerable attention to narrative settings as well as to description and Chatman (*Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*) preferred a distinction between story space and discourse space (see also Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*; Prince, *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*; Sternberg, “Ordering the Unordered: Time, Space, and Descriptive Coherence”). Besides, students of narrative working in other traditions and having other preoccupations emphasized the importance of space. For instance, Bakhtin underlined the interdependence of time and space in narrative and showed that narratives model reality according to various chronotopes or time-space complexes and are definable in terms of them (Bakhtin 84-258). Similarly, Lotman (*The Structure of the Artistic Text*) pointed to the links between spatial configurations and symbolic force (e.g.

high/low and good/bad) or, more generally, between moves from one kind of space to another and plot deployment. Narratological work building in part on these traditions, like Zoran's ("Towards a Theory of Space in Narrative") discussion of different levels of spatial structuration in narrative, further increased awareness and consideration of the functioning of narrative space. So did the influence on narratology of possible worlds theory and, later, that of phenomenological and cognitive studies stressing the embodied nature of mind, say, or the receiver's creation of mental maps for navigating a narrative world (Herman, *Story Logic: Problems and Possibilities of Narrative*; Ryan, *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*; "Cognitive Maps and the Construction of Narrative Space"; "Space"; Ryan, Foote, and Azaryahu, *Narrating Space, Spatializing Narrative: When Narrative Theory and Geography Meet*). The importance of spatial features and structures is now widely recognized and one can even speak, like Buchholz and Jahn, of a spatial turn in narratology (Buchholz and Jahn 551).

Yet, although many aspects of story space, of the space of the narrated, have been studied, few aspects of the other spatial levels in narrative — for example, the space of the narrating or discourse space — have been explored and the relations between the different levels have been similarly neglected. Along with the space of the narrating, these levels include the space of the narration or spatial location of the narrator narrating and the space of the reception or spatial location of the narratee. In what follows, I will discuss various features of all four levels and various links between them. Note that I will not deal with the notion of spatial form associated with Frank (221-246), that I will not examine spatial imagery and the fundamental spatial schemata affecting many facets of language or cognition, and that I will not consider the spaces that are mentioned or evoked by the narrative but do not constitute locations of actually occurring events (e.g. "She said that she often thought of Paris and London"). Nor will I consider the space of the narrative text as material object, the space of the medium through which the narrative is manifested (sign, oral, or written language, pantomime, painting, sculpture, etc.). As Chatman argued, the level of narrative manifestation is different from the level of narrating or discourse (Chatman 23-24). Saying "Veni, vidi, vici" and writing it entails the use of different media and yields narratives with different manifestations but identical narratings. The same can be said of (oral or written) narratives like "Veni, vidi, vici" and "I came, I saw, I conquered." Of course, the medium of manifestation affects the powers and concrete shape of the narrative: "For instance, it is clear that verbal narratives express narrative contents of time summary more easily than cinematic narratives while the latter more easily show spatial relations." Of course,

too, “manifestation must further be distinguished from the mere physical disposition of narratives — the actual print in books, movements of actors or dancers or marionettes, lines on paper or canvas, or whatever” (Chatman 25, 26).¹

The space of the narrated is the physical environment in which the situations and events represented take place. It contains many or few entities, all of which partly determine its nature, and it can be differently dimensioned, open or closed, changing or unchanging, mobile or immobile, variegated or unvaried, and so on. The space of the narrating can likewise involve different dimensions and prove fixed or fluctuating, moving or stationary, diverse or homogeneous, and so forth. The space of the narration is the space in which the narrator’s act of narrating takes place. In many narratives, it is not mentioned at all. For example, we do not know where Proust’s Marcel or the narrator of *Père Goriot* or that of a simple story like “Mary was poor and then she married John and she became rich” produce their narratives. Some narratives, however, do mention the space of narration and even describe it. In *Heart of Darkness*, Marlow narrates at night aboard a cruising yawl at rest on the river Thames. *Manon Lescaut*’s des Grieux recounts his (mis)adventures to M. de Renoncour at the “Golden Lion” in Calais. Michel, in Gide’s *L’Immoraliste*, tells his story to his friends on the terrace of a house located at the edge of an Algerian village and the narrator-protagonist of *Diary of a Superfluous Man* notes the following the day before he dies: “I am writing these lines in bed. Since yesterday evening there has been a sudden change in the weather. Today is hot, almost a summer day. Everything is thawing, breaking up, flowing away. The air is full of the smell of the opened earth, a strong, heavy, stifling smell. Steam is rising on all sides. The sun seems beating, seems smiting everything to pieces” (Turgénieff 87). Like the space of the narrated and that of the narrating, the space of the narration can change and exhibit different characteristics, for instance if the narrator moves from one location to another. As for the space of reception, it can be (essentially) the same as the space of narration, for example when distinct narrators and narratees are *in praesentia*, as in *Manon Lescaut*, *L’Immoraliste*, or *Heart of Darkness*; and it can be different from that space, as in epistolary monodies or in *Père Goriot*, where the narratee is said to be reading Balzac’s novel “sinking into a comfortable armchair” (Balzac 2).² Of the many relations involving spatial levels in narrative, perhaps the most important and intricate ones are those that obtain between narrating and narrated space. Among them are relations of frequency: singulative, when a

1 As suggested by my examples, the level of manifestation itself comprises various levels.

2 Note that Genette (*Figures III*) hardly discusses the time of reception, which also deserves to be studied.

given narrated space or spatial unit is presented (depicted, described) once; repeating, when it gives rise to the same presentation more than once; and iterative, when two or more instances of its coming into play and being the focus of attention yield only one presentation.¹

There are also relations pertaining to order. The space of the narrated can be shown in a systematic or unsystematic way, whether it is presented all at once or bit by bit (as called for by the situations and events, their enhancement, or their clarification) and whether a character's point of view is adopted or not. For instance, a given space or spatial unit can be presented from top to bottom, left to right, or front to back. If a given pattern is established, it can be disrupted (which gives rise to "anatopias"). Besides, the presentation of a given space or spatial unit can be temporarily set aside for the presentation of another one.

Still another set of relations pertains to matters of extent or, rather, matters of scale, or proportion, or ratio. Just as it makes little sense to use a clock for measuring the duration of the narrating (what is the duration of the narrating in *Vanity Fair* or in Benozzo Gozzoli's *The Dance of Salome and the Beheading of John the Baptist* in hours, minutes, or seconds?), it makes little sense to use the metric system, say, for measuring its extent: what is the length of the narrating of an oral narrative or of a narrative pantomime in kilometers, meters, or centimeters? Moreover, given that the level of the narrating is distinct from that of narrative manifestation, it makes little sense to calculate the extent of a narrating in numbers of words and pages or in number of gestures. A more useful way of measuring narrating extent, I think, is establishing the number of narrative statements that constitute it, whether they are stasis statements (in the mode of IS) or process statements (in the mode of DO or HAPPEN). Narrative statements are independent of the expressive medium employed and "[b]oth the English sentence 'He stabbed himself' and a mime's plunging an imaginary dagger into his heart manifest the same narrative process statement" (Chatman 31-32). Similarly, the narrating in an oral or written narrative like "John ate a hamburger and then he went to sleep" consists of two process statements and, in an oral or written narrative like "Mary was unhappy and then she met Jane and she was happy," it consists of three statements, two in the mode of IS and one in the mode of DO. Given a narrated space or spatial component, there could be many or few narrating statements setting it forth or "stating" it. Perhaps one could speak of micronarrating (or micro spatial narrating) when little narrating betokens the narrated space and of macronarrating when, on the contrary, a lot of narrating

1 Here, like at other points, I use Genettean terminology. If frequency and some other narratological categories can pertain to events, they can also pertain to existents.

does, with mesonarrating designating intermediate possibilities.¹ These are obviously not very precise measures. Furthermore, for many if not all cases, there is no table specifying correspondences between narrating and narrated extent, number of narrating statements and size of narrated space. Given a verbal or painted narrative, how many statements are required for presenting a nine by twelve bedroom, a small kitchen, or a large living-room? Indeed, should we speak of micro, meso, or macro-narrating, our assessment would be a function of the relative quantity of statements devoted to various spatial units in a given narrative (imagine that ten statements present a huge room and two hundred statements present a tiny one); or it would be a function of what, based on our experiences and knowledge, we take to constitute a large, or average, or small number of statements: imagine that one statement is devoted to an entire town or that one thousand statements present a small closet.

As Herman points out, the presentation of narrated space is “inextricably interlinked with the problems of perspective” (Herman 301). The latter may be that of a God-like narrator or that of a particular character, for example, and the position of the focalizer like the distance between focalizer and focalized may vary or it may remain unchanged. Moreover, in any narrative, only some of the indefinitely many aspects of the focalized space are selected as the object of the narrating statements: one narrative may present visual and auditory features while another may favor olfactory or tactile characteristics; one may concentrate on invariant traits and another on variable attributes; one may privilege volumes as opposed to surfaces or contours while another one may prefer lines and edges. Besides the selected aspects may be presented in a haphazard way or an orderly one (from left to right, say, or from top to bottom).

If the narrating can state various aspects of the narrated space, it can also state various aspects of the space of the narration. As mentioned above, it is often the case that no information at all is given about where the narration or narrating act occurs (just as there is often no information about when it occurs). But, sometimes, such information is provided in a more or less organized, frequent, and detailed fashion. Likewise, though the narrating often does not state anything about the space of the reception, it occasionally presents some of the attributes of the latter and can do it at length or very briefly, once or repeatedly, and in a methodical or unmethodical manner.

Clearly, the amount, frequency, and kind of arrangement of narrating space used in presenting the space of the narration may be more or less significant when

1 A more discriminating measuring instrument might include, as extremes, meganarrating and nanonarrating.

compared with those used in the presentation of the space of the narrated or the space of the reception. Furthermore, the latter three spaces may be more or less different or distant from one another and the difference, like the distance, may be altered in the course of the narrative. As already noted, in *L'Immoraliste*, for instance, the marginal and isolated (“natural”) Algerian space in which Michel narrates is the same as that in which his three friends function as his narratees; but it is different as well as distant from much of the space where the narrated events occur (Normandy, for example, where nature and culture are in harmony, or Paris, which represents the height of artificiality) and both the distance and the difference change: Michel, who goes to Algeria for his honeymoon, travels from there to Normandy and then to Paris, moves back to Normandy, and, finally, returns to Algeria. Note that the space of narration, like that of reception, can function as a thematic, structural, or characterization device — in *L'Immoraliste*, for instance, it mirrors Michel’s marginalized status — and can also acquire significance through its relations to other narrative spaces. Consider a narrative in which the narration occurs in a prison cell but refers to events happening in wide-open spaces or a narrative in which the narration occurs in a war zone but the reception takes place in a peaceful hamlet.

There are, no doubt, many more spatial elements in narrative that should be examined, including various aspects of the spaces briefly discussed above and various aspects of their links. For example, a narrative may feature several distinct narrating instances, several discrete lines of action, several different narrators or narratees; it may contain logically impossible places or configurations; it may multiply paradoxical, metaleptic, or contradictory relations. Indeed, further examinations would not only add to the descriptive toolkit (and interpretive possibilities) of narratology but would also help answer questions about the role played by the different spatial levels in an actual receiver’s locating of narrative existents and events, for instance, about the links between the exploitation of (particular elements of) the different levels and specific real-world periods and spaces, or about the interaction of these levels with different media. In other words, they would contribute to the cognitive, historical, geographical, and material pursuits of narratology.

Works Cited

- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
- Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1985.
- Balzac, Honoré de. *Père Goriot*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1991.
- Barthes, Roland. “Introduction à l’analyse structurale des récits.” *Communications* 8 (1966): 1-27.
- Bremont, Claude. *Logique du récit*. Paris: Seuil, 1973.

- Buchholz, Sabine, and Manfred Jahn. "Space in Narrative." *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative*. Eds. by David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan. London: Routledge, 2005. 551-55.
- Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1978.
- Frank, Joseph. "Spatial Form in Modern Literature." *Sewanee Review* 53(1945): 221-246.
- Genette, Gérard. *Figures III*. Paris: Seuil, 1972.
- Greimas, A. J. *Du sens: essais sémiotiques*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.
- Hamon, Philippe. *Introduction à l'analyse du descriptif*. Paris: Hachette, 1981.
- Herman, David. *Story Logic: Problems and Possibilities of Narrative*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2002.
- Lotman, Jurij. *The Structure of the Artistic Text*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1977.
- Prince, Gerald. *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative*. Berlin: Mouton, 1982.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.
- . "Cognitive Maps and the Construction of Narrative Space." *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Sciences*. Ed. by David Herman. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 2003. 214-42.
- . "Space." *Handbook of Narratology*, 2nd ed. Eds. by Peter Hühn, Jan Christoph Meister, John Pier, and Wolf Schmid. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014. 796-811.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure, Kenneth Foote, and Maoz Azaryahu. *Narrating Space, Spatializing Narrative: When Narrative Theory and Geography Meet*. Columbus: The Ohio State U P, 2016.
- Sternberg, Meir. "Ordering the Unordered: Time, Space, and Descriptive Coherence." *Yale French Studies* 61 (1981): 60-88.
- Todorov, Tzvetan. *Grammaire du "Décaméron"*. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.
- Turgénieff, Iván. *The Diary of a Superfluous Man and Other Stories*. New York: Scribner's, 1904.
- Zoran, Gabriel. "Towards a Theory of Space in Narrative." *Poetics Today* 5.2 (1984): 309-35.

责任编辑：尚必武

“The Hell of the Same”¹: On Ethical Confusions of Human Cloning in *A Number*

Wang Zhuo

Abstract: Caryl Churchill’s five-act play, *A Number*, presents the subject of human cloning and the subsequent ethical confusions both in human relationship and human identity. This essay, from the perspective of ethics, will focus on four issues embodied in the following four questions. 1) Is *A Number* in the tradition of science fictional imagination or in the tradition of social drama? 2) Is human cloning in *A Number* Medicine or Metaphor? 3) Is human cloning an “identity-preserving” action or “identity-erasing” action? 4) Is a cloned man a man? Through the lens of ethical mirror, the fantasy of human cloning reveals something both charming and serious about the deep level structure of the society. More than that, what has been dramatized in *A Number* perfectly foregrounds the ever-lasting argument about man’s biological meaning and ethical meaning as well as man’s nature as a man.

Key words: Caryl Churchill; *A Number*; human cloning; ethical confusions; self-identity

Author: Wang Zhuo is Professor of English at Shandong Normal University and Director of Research Center for Foreign Literature and Culture at Shandong Normal University (Jinan 250014, China). Her major research area is modern and contemporary English and American literature (Email: wangzhuo_69@sina.com)

标题: “相同的地狱”: 《一个数》中人类克隆的伦理混乱

内容摘要: 卡瑞尔·丘吉尔的五幕剧《一个数》表现的是人类克隆和由此造成的人类关系和身份的伦理混乱。本文从伦理视角聚焦于以下四个问题: 1) 《一个数》是遵循科幻想象传统还是社会戏剧传统? 2) 《一个数》中的人类克隆是医学问题还是隐喻? 3) 人类克隆是“保存身份”的行动还是“抹杀身份”的行动? 4) 克隆人究竟是不是人? 通过伦理滤镜, 人类克隆揭示出关于社会深层结构中既令人着迷也令人担忧的伦理问题。不仅如此, 《一个数》还完美地前景化了关于人的生理意义、伦理意义以及人之所以为人的本质的永恒争论。

关键词: 卡瑞尔·丘吉尔; 《一个数》; 人类克隆; 伦理混乱; 自我身份

1 See Jean Baudrillard, “The Hell of the Same,” *The Transparency of Evil: Essays on Extreme Phenomena*, Trans. James Benedict (London and New York: Verso, 1993):113-123.

作者简介: 王卓, 文学博士, 山东师范大学外国语学院、外国文学与文化研究中心教授, 博士生导师, 主要从事现当代英美文学研究。本文为国家社科基金重大招标项目“文学伦理学批评: 理论建构与批评实践研究”【项目批号: 13&ZD128】阶段性研究成果。

The fantasy of human cloning has been haunting both the life and imagination of our time. In some sense human cloning, far beyond the sphere of biotechnology or medical practice, has become an issue of ethics, as this new technology has been challenging commonly held perceptions of man, of body, of family and social relations for a long time. The concept of human cloning has been provoking deep and often contradictory feelings, from fear to anxiety to fascination. The likely advent of a cloning era forces writers all over the world into a serious and philosophical meditation on human cloning both in terms of medical practice and social issue. Caryl Churchill's *A Number* is the product of this reflection. As a widely acknowledged playwright in English language and one of the world theatre's most influential writers, Caryl Churchill is always curious about the events which will decide the fate of human being and takes great effort to explore into the nature of those events and their relations both with the psyche and the body of man, which in some sense explains why human cloning will find its way into her works. Thus Churchill, together with her *A Number*, has been involved in an ever-lasting debate about the ethical nature of human cloning. This essay will focus on four issues proposed by Churchill in this play from the perspective of ethics. Or more exactly, this essay will attempt to answer four questions all of which have something to do with clone and its ethical meaning: 1) Is *A Number* in the tradition of science fictional imagination or in the tradition of social drama? 2) Is human cloning in *A Number* Medicine or Metaphor? 3) Is human cloning an “identity-preserving” action or “identity-erasing” action? 4) Is a cloned man a man?

A Number: From Science Fiction to Social Drama

The first performance of *A Number* was at the Royal Court Theatre in London on 23 September 2002. This five-act play presents the subject of human cloning and the subsequent ethical confusions both in human relationship and human identity. The story is structured around the conflict between a father, Salter and his sons, Bernard 1, Bernard 2, and Michael Black — the latter two are clones of the first one.

The play is far from interesting in terms of plot or characters. It is for two actors merely. One plays father, the other his three sons. And the scene is the same

throughout in Salter's living room. The story is revealed completely through the fragmented dialogues between the father and his sons. And a story about a series of cloned sons sounds surrealist and a little absurd. So in the 2002 production, the stage was described by a critic as a "bare blank design" (De Jongh). And the play was criticized for having "no relation to domestic realism" (De Jongh). But is that true? Is this play a mere absurd and meaningless fantasy of Churchill? After ten years' precipitation and with the rapid development of cloning technology, it seems that the critics are a little sloppy and incomplete. When cloned sheep and cloned monkey have already been claimed by scientists all over the world, cloned man is no longer an absurd fantasy in scientific fiction, but a serious social problem in social drama.

It is true that clone has been a fantastic issue in literary imagination ever since Mary Shelley gave birth to Frankenstein in 1818. For hundreds of years, many cloning literary productions follow "Frankenstein's footsteps" in science fictions (Turney 133). And with the development of movie industry, "Cloning has inspired many films and much concern" (Hope 1). Just as Derrida sums up neatly that the progress in genetics liberates our imagination (69).

But from the birth of Dolly, the cloned sheep on July 5, 1996, fiction becomes true and then the terrible possibilities are raised. When we realize that "Frankenstein myth becomes a reality" (Gaylin), and "SF effect" is no longer an imaginary one (qtd. Parrinder 8), we have to treat it seriously and in a matter of fact way. It is worthwhile to note that *A Number* was produced in the same year that the cloned baby Eva was produced.¹ Therefore to Churchill and to contemporary readers, Cloning is no longer the monsters in the Gothic strand once powerful in the Western world nor is it the frightening shadowy figures in science fictions in Western literary tradition. Against this background, *A Number* does have "relation to domestic realism" and is pertinent to domestic reality. The characters are "fully textured human beings, with ideas, feelings, personalities, passions, and foibles" that are very similar to our own, making the characters very "lifelike" (Rush 187).

In truth, Churchill in this play raised a few questions concerned with the ethical dimensions of human cloning, ranging from the ethical application of clone, the family ethic in a "posthuman" ear to ethical identity of cloned man (Ferreira 1).

1 The Raelians, a religious group believing cloning is the key to achieving immortality, claimed that the first cloned baby Eva, was born on December 26, 2002 in the U.S. and a few days later they claimed another cloned baby was born in The Netherlands. See Anne Berryman, "Who Are the Raelians?" *Time*, Saturday, Jan. 04, 2003. <http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,404175,00.html>.

And above all she made clear her negative attitude towards clone application in a dramatic way. In fact there are many writers, critics and scientists who retrospect cloning application from the perspective of ethics. Though a few do try to think about cloning in a positive way and try to see its potentially positive sides¹, most of writers and critics tend to judge it negatively. And Churchill is obviously one of them. The difference might be that Churchill presents cloning not as a pressing medical problem but as a metaphorical device serving to draw audience’s attention to identical problems. The tragic event, characters and mood of the play elevated *A Number* to a social drama with heavy moral load and classic tragic beauty, which in turn enforces the ethical power of the play.

Clone: From Medicine to Metaphor

Once science fiction is transformed into social drama, “we’ re at the start of a new ball game and that’s why we’ re all real nervous” (Barr 193). And this is what Maria Aline Ferreira called “millennial anxieties” (3). As far as *A Number* is concerned, this anxiety is more about the unethical application of clone technology than about the clone itself as a medical innovation. And the “millennial anxiety” is artistically exteriorized from two different aspects in this play. One is the ethical relations in the human society; the other is the ethical identity of man and cloned man.

Once we realize that clone is no longer a fantastic imaginary production, it is meaningless to be obsessed with the issue whether clone as a technology is ethical or not. And Once clone technology is fully developed, it is no use to appeal human being to “ban human cloning” (Kass 26). It is true that the ethical dimension of clone has always been the major concern of medical practices. Just as Tony Hope, professor of Medical Ethics at the University of Oxford and founder of the Oxford Centre for Ethics and Communication in Health Care Practice, observes, “the ethical values lie at the heart of medicine” (Hope 2). But when both the innovation and application of clone become unavoidable, it is more significant to go beyond the sphere of medicine to think about cloning. To Churchill and many contemporary writers and philosophers as well, clone is more than a medical technology, and its ethical dimensions are also beyond the medical order. As a technology, cloning is not a right or wrong choice. But once clone technology is used in an unethical way, it will become an evil seed. The way Salter, the father, used clone is far from ethical. He deserted his son in order to forget his painful past and had a son cloned

1 For example, Naomi Mitchison, *Solution Three* (1975); J.B.S. Haldane, *The Man with Two Memories* (1976); Davie Brin, *Glory Season* (1993). These books all imagine a future society in which cloned men are an integral part of the population and fully accepted by man and society.

in order to start a new life, so in some sense Clone helped him realize his evil and selfish wish. Salter's unethical act caused a series of tragic events he could hardly imagine and had no way to control. As a result, both his life and his sons' lives degraded into a chaotic state, and eventually ended with tragic deaths of his two sons.

But if we do believe that what Churchill concerns about in *A Number* is really or merely clone or the medicine practice of clone, we might have simplified her writing and her philosophy. Churchill is never so simple and direct. No matter in her *Cloud Nine* (1979) or in her *Top Girls* (1982), what the simple stories embody is Churchill's profound philosophical meditation on man, society and universe. For example, in *Cloud Nine*, a family story reveals how the way of imperialist thinking influences the interrelationship between men and their sexual desire. When Churchill tells us an extremely complex story about cloned sons, a series of cloned sons, we have ample reasons to read the story beyond the sphere of medicine. The ethical chaos caused by the unethical application of clone is only one of the inner conflicts of the play. On the much deeper level, *A Number* transformed Clone from a medical practice to a metaphorical philosophy about the ethical relations in human society through the subverted relations among family members. Clone in *A Number* is the "ethical thread" running through the play which influences everyone's life and Salter's action of having a son cloned is the "ethical knot" (Nie Zhenzhao 258). This twisted ethical knot has no way to clear but death. Tony Hope puts the question of cloning ethics in this way: "This question leads us beyond medicine to consider our responsibilities for the future mankind" (4). What Churchill does in *A Number* is such an ethical reconsideration about our responsibilities for man.

A Number in particular depicts such chaotic state of man resulted from clone technology in a "posthuman" society. Cloned man no matter legally or illegally created challenges the stable family relationships. Against the background of "posthuman" era, several issues foreground themselves: 1) the relations between mother and son. Mother is totally absent in this play, as she was dead when her son was only 2 years old. And because of her death, the husband cloned their son in a desperate mental state. So in a world where a son could be cloned without a woman's womb, the Oedipus complex, the founding stone and deep structuring device of societal coexistence will disappear altogether. 2) the relationship between man and woman. Human cloning, "through spontaneous parthenogenesis of cloning," could not only fulfill the female fantasy of bearing children without men, but also the male dream of "producing children without the help of women" (Ferreira 213). This potential of taking the reproduction away from women's bodies might cause greater imbalance between man and woman in terms of social states. 3) the

relationship between father and son. Father does not hold the authoritative position and no longer an authority figure in a post-Oedipus society. In this case we might have to reconsider the Symbolic Order proposed by Lacan (Rabate). 4) the relations between man and cloned man. When Bernard 2 learned somehow he was one of the cloned sons of his father, he was seized by panic. He cried to his father, “a twin would be a surprise but a number” (4). Bernard 1, the original son had to kill the cloned man in order to reserve his unique being in the world. The four different relations in a family are all at stake in a “posthuman” era in which “nothing then prevents its serial reproduction in the same terms Benjamin used when speaking of industrial objects or images” (Baudrillard, *Seduction* 171).

Family relation is an epitome of the society. The ethical confusions of the family in some sense are the reflection of the society. By imagining a chaotic picture of “posthuman” society in the near future, Churchill sends out an ethical warning to the world. This chaotic family tragedy was impressive enough to arouse man’s serious meditation on ethical dimension of clone application.

From A Man to A Number

Churchill’s philosophical meditation also stretched to cover the ethical identity of man against the background of genetic innovation. Or put it in another way, this play exteriorizes the “millennial anxieties” about human identity in a “posthuman” era. Maria Aline Ferreira once put, “I see the posthuman era dominated by the identity crisis of new, genetically engineered people, principally clones” (3). As to the relations between clone and identity, Tony Hope claims, Cloning is an “identity-preserving and identity-affecting actions” (Hope 51). Churchill in *A Number* shows that cloning does affect one’s identity, but as to whether it will preserve one’s identity, it is doubtful. Or it is very likely to be the opposite. Instead of a preserving action which gives man “nine lives,” Cloning might be an identity-erasing actions which causes identity confusions (LeGuin 205).

With the development of the plot in *A Number*, we learn that the reason Salter had his son Bernard 1 cloned is to preserve his perfect son. Just as Salter said to Bernard 1:

I’ll tell you a thought, I could have killed you and I didn’t. I may have done terrible things but I didn’t kill you. I could have killed you and had another son, made one the same like I did or start again have a different one get married again and I didn’t, I spared you though you were this disgusting thing by then anyone in their right mind would have squashed you but I remembered

what you'd been like at the beginning and I spared you, I didn't want a different one, I wanted that again because you were perfect like that and I love you.
 1(40)

Salter cloned a son instead of getting married and having another son simply because he believed that the cloned son could preserve the same identity of his original son. He had never realized that even if this would be true, he might have caused identity confusions to his sons with same faces, same cells and same names by making them all "a number" of the many sons.

Human clone brings identity confusions which are clearly reflected by the pronoun confusions in the play. When Salter was blamed by his original son B1 for his being cloned, Salter tried to defend himself, but the confused use of pronouns betrayed him:

Salter from you too they it's you they, just so they can do some scientific some research some do you get asthma do you have a dog what do you call it do you (19)

Critics tend to attribute the "weirdly stylish" (Myerson) chat to Churchill's innovation of a "futuristic" style (De Jongh). But they fail to notice the root of this "futuristic" innovation is the identity confusions resulted from clone technology, as the pronouns are in truth have the functions of realizing the interpersonal meaning in discourse (Li Zhanzi 124). What Salter's "unnatural narrative" tells is exactly his confused "narrative comprehension" about himself and his sons as well (Shang Biwu, 108).

Baudrillard once meditated on this confusions of double identity, and observed that when our fantasy of one's double "by genetic means" becomes true (Baudrillard, "Clone Story" 97), it was not fantastic at all. "The fear of losing one's identity and uniqueness, becoming one in an endless series of duplications" is becoming a nightmare haunting man nowadays (Ferreira 4). And theoretically, "this new technique of generation would in theory enable us to create as many identical individuals as might be desired. A living creature would be printed in hundreds, in thousands of copies, *all of them real twins*" (Rostand 14). The potential threat of cloning to our way of life is come into being. "Clones could thus come to be perceived as a menace in the sense that they might become the very embodiment of

1 All quotations from *A Number* are from Caryl Churchill, *A Number* (Royal Court Theatre, 2002) except the otherwise mentioned.

a more perfect ‘you,’ while encapsulating the capacity of infinite reproduction of the same”(Ferreira 32). The tragedy that Bernard 1 killed Bernard 2 and then killed himself was in essence a reflection of this identity crisis brought about by clone. Baudrillard observes that, the “disqualified original” would sooner or later “take revenge on his clone” (“The Clone or the Degree Xerox of the Species” 201). What happened between Bernard 1 and Bernard 2 justifies Baudrillard’s statement.

Churchill in *A Number* smartly plays the philosophical game of Cloned man being “in appropriate /d others” by presenting how hard it is to define the relations between man and his copies (Haraway 320). Salter believes that the copies belong to the original son (6). Bernard 2 himself believes that he is just a copy and not the real one(14), while Bernard 1 thinks that the clones are a threat to this bond with his father. The ethical confusions about self-identity brought about by clone raise an ever-lasting philosophical question about self and other, which since the late eighteenth century expressed the “modern intimations of inner demons,” and “the monstrous threat of the ‘many-in-the-one’” (Warner 165). Ursula K. LeGuin asserts that “the duplication of anything complex enough to have personality would involve the whole issue of what personality is — the question of individuality, of identity, of selfhood” (205). Schartz appeals, “we are not identical, nor do we wish to think of ourselves as clones” (Schwartz 212). This is the crucial question which lies at the core of human cloning and it is exactly the starting point of Churchill’s meditation in *A Number* which illustrates what Baudrillard means when he claims the process “from same to same” is terrifying (“The hell of the Same” 96).

From Man to Clone Man

Churchill tries to answer a crucial question about clone man: Is a Cloned Man a Man? The reason that she creates Michael Black, the illegal cloned son of Salter is to imagine in what way a cloned man might be different from man. Black looks the same with Bernard 1. But he behaves different from man in the sense he fails to do any ethical selection. Black is a mild-mannered teacher and a happy family man. But peeling this beautiful skin of man, we find that there is something missing in Black as a man. Salter is the first one who notices the problem with Black. Black seems normal, but also seems shallow and like everyone around him. When Salter, losing both Bernard 1 and Bernard 2, hopes desperately to learn something about Michael’s personal life, Michael talks eloquently about everything, war, politics and his wife’s ears but himself (46). Michael’s “quiet contentment” is “utterly baffling to the tormented Salter” (Jones). Michael had nothing specific to himself, nothing from deep inside his life to tell and he could only tell something about

somebody else. And even worse, he could not tell good from evil, nor could he make any ethical judgment on man or the world. All these suggest that Michael is a biological man but not a man in the real sense, because he couldn't make his "ethical selection."

The difference between biological selection and ethical selection is what professor Nie Zhen Zhao most concerned in his construction of Ethical Literary Criticism. Nie once turns to Bible to illustrate the distinction between the two selections. He observes that what God creates in the Garden of Eden is man in its biological sense. Only when Adam and Eve ate the forbidden fruits from the Tree of Knowledge, had they acquired knowledge and the ability to tell good from evil, and became man in the real sense. Ever since Adam and Eve make their ethical selection, they are completely different from their born selves in the state of ethical chaos. The different selves are the symbols of distinction between biological man and ethical man. The ways man realize biological selection and ethical selection are different: biological selection is the result of evolution, whereas ethical selection is the result of cultivation. Or put it in other words, biological selection is realized through man's struggling for survival, while man's ethical selection is fulfilled through cultivation by overcoming man's "animal factor" and consummating man's "human factor" (38).

In light of the above mentioned distinction between "animal factor" and "human factor," Black is a cloned man who has not overcome his "animal factor." His own identity recognition confirms this point:

Michael We've got ninety-nine per cent the same genes as any other person. We've got ninety per cent the same as a chimpanzee. We've got thirty percent the same as a lettuce. Does that cheer you up at all? I love about the Lettuce. It makes me feel I belong. (50)

It is obvious that Black feels that he belongs to plants and animals rather than man. The other characters in the play are also confused about whether a cloned man is a man or an animal. Salter tended to use "things" to call his cloned sons (4), which was strongly opposed by his cloned son Bernard 2:

B2 yes I know what you meant, I just, because of course I want them to be things, I do think they're things, I don't think they're, of course I do think they're them just as much as I'm me but I. I don't know what I think, I feel terrible. (5)

Cloning causes serious cognitive confusions of both man and cloned man. It seems that “the programmed reproduction of man will, in fact, dehumanize him” and both man and cloned man lost their self identity in a “posthuman” era (Kass 27). In this way, Baudrillard’s “the hell of the same” curse is artistically and realistically presented in *A Number*.

The story in *A Number* occurred in the near future is not only pertinent to a society in which cloning technology is developing in a dazzling speed, but also relative to man’s self identity, man’s inner demon and man’s relations in a philosophical and ethical sense. *A Number*, different from the fantastic sound and fury in some science fiction, is a serious meditation on some important ethical issues brought about by cloning technology. Through the lens of ethical mirror, the fantasy of human cloning reveals something both charming and frustrating about the deep level structure of the society. More than that, what has been dramatized in *A Number* perfectly foregrounds the ever-lasting argument about man’s biological meaning and ethical meaning as well as man’s nature as a man.

Works Cited

- Barr, Marleen S. “We’re at the start of a new ball game and that’s why we’re all real nervous: Or, Cloning-Technological Cognition Reflects Estrangement from Women.” *Learning from Other Worlds: Estrangement, Cognition, and the Politics of Science Fiction and Utopia*. Ed. Patrick Parrinder. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2001.193-207.
- Baudrillard, Jean. “Clone Story.” *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila Faria Glaser. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1981. 95-103.
- . *Seduction*. Trans. Brian Singer. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1990.
- . “The Clone or the Degree Xerox of the Species.” *Screened Out*. Trans. Chris Turner. London and New York: Verso, 2002. 196-202.
- De Jongh, Nicholas. “A Number.” *Evening Standard*. 27 Sept. 2002.
- Derrida, Jacques & Elizabeth Roudinesco. *De Quoi Demain: Dialogue*. Paris: Galilee, 2001.
- Ferreira, Maria Aline. “Introduction.” *I Am the Other: Literary Negotiations of Human Cloning*. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger, 2005.1-20.
- Gaylin, William, “Frankenstein Myth Becomes a Reality.” *New York Times*, 5 March,1972.
- Haraway, Donna. “The Promises of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics of Inappropriate/d Others.” *Cybersexualities: A Reader on Feminist Theory, Cyborgs and Cyberspace*. Ed. Jeny Wolmark. Edinburg: Edinburg UP, 1999.314-366.
- Hope, Tony. *Medical Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Jones, Oliver. “A Number.” *What’s On*, 2 Oct. 2002.

- Kass, Leon R. "Human Cloning Should Be Banned." *Cloning*. Ed. Paul A. Winters. San Diego, CA: Greenhaven Press, 1998. 26-48.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. "On Theme." *Those Who Can*. Ed. Robin Scott Wilson. New York: Signet, 1973. 204-205.
- Li Zhanzi. *Interpersonal Meaning in Discourse*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Education Press, 2000.
- Myerson, Jonathan. "A Number." *Independent*, 1 Oct. 2002.
- Nie Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.
- Parrinder, Patrick. "Introduction: Learning from Other Worlds." *Learning from Other Worlds: Estrangement, Cognition, and the Politics of Science Fiction and Utopia*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2000.1-18.
- Rabate, Jean-Michel. *Jacques Lacan: Psychoanalysis and the Subject of Literature*. New York: Plagrove, 2001.
- Rostand, Jean. *Can Man Be Modified? Predictions of Our Biological Future*. Trans. Jonathan Griffin. New York: Basic Books, 1959.
- Rush, David. *Student Guide to Play Analysis*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2005.
- Schwartz, Hillel. *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles*. New York: Zone Books, 1996.
- Shang Biwu. *Contemporary Western Narratology: Postclassical Perspectives*. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 2013.
- Turney, Jon. *Frankenstein's Footsteps: Science, Genetics and Popular Culture*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1998.
- Warner, Marina. *Fantastic Metamorphoses, Other Worlds: Ways of Telling the Self*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

责任编辑：杨革新

Ethical Choice and Tragical Chaos in the *Lais* by Marie de France

Junhyun Kim

Abstract: The twelve *Lais* written by Marie de France are meaningful when trying to grasp the perception and the reality of the concept of love in the Middle Ages, in other words, the characteristics of courtly love, of the meaning of medieval marriage in feudal societies, etc. Furthermore, the works of Marie de France cannot be neglected in the view of ethical literary criticism if we wish to tackle the problems of indifference and disregard for taboos, of ethical conflict and social balance, and of confusion and restoration of order, all themes that are expressed in numerous medieval literary works. When considering this, *Equitan*, which deals with the issue of a threesome love involving a king, his seneschal, and the seneschal's wife, is a good example to reassess how, within the frame of love, ethical choices and confusion can create conflicts, and how the tragedy of an individual who has lost all rational judgments and ethical consciousness is amplified into chaos and disorder within the social order, as well as to question what is the real nature of love.

Key words: Marie de France; *Equitan*; love; ethical choice; ethical chaos

Author: Junhyun Kim is Associate Professor at the Department of French Language & Literature of Korea University (Seoul, Korea). His research areas are Medieval French literature and Lyrics of the late medieval France, in particular François Villon (Email: Villon@korea.ac.kr). This study was supported by a faculty research grant from the College of Liberal Arts at Korea University in 2017.

标题: 玛丽·德·弗朗斯的短诗里所显露的伦理选择和悲剧性的混乱

内容摘要: 12世纪女诗人玛丽·德·弗朗斯留下的12篇《短诗》在研究中世纪对爱情的认识以及考察当时的社会面貌方面上,也就是探讨“宫廷式恋爱”的特征与中世纪的“结婚”以及分析封建社会与爱情的意义的问题上具有重要意义。此外,通过玛丽·德·弗朗斯的作品,我们还可以从文学伦理批评的视角上探讨中世纪的文学作品中的无差别性以及忽略禁忌、伦理矛盾、社会均衡问题、秩序的恢复以及无秩序等问题。从这一观点出发,在以王与臣下,还有臣下妻子的三角关系中出现的“爱情”的问题为主题的作品“equitan”解释以下的问题:探讨爱情以何种方式去引起伦理选择与混乱的

矛盾状况；丧失一切理性与伦理意识的个体所经历的悲剧如何在社会关系之中扩大了混乱与无秩序的状况；“爱情”的特性到底为何物。

关键词： 玛丽·德·弗朗斯；*équitant*；爱情；伦理选择；伦理混乱

作者简介： 金竣顯，韩国高丽大学法语法文系副教授，主要研究方向为中世纪法国文学，中世纪期抒情诗（弗兰索瓦·维庸）。

Introduction

When reviewing the *Lais* of Marie de France, a 12th-century woman poet in the reign of Henry II, the word ‘merveilleux’ (marvel) is often used as an inherent part of her literature. In *Guigemar*, for instance, we see a white hind with the antlers of a stag foretelling the protagonist’s destiny; in *Yonec*, a knight-bird flies in a high tower and turns into a human being; Lanval’s fairy transcends human beauty; in *Bisclavre (The Werewolf)*, the main character periodically turns into a werewolf, etc. As these examples show it, the *Lais* frequently tell about the transcendent world and various kinds of mysterious phenomena. But these elements are not intended to evoke supernatural fantasies, nor to put forward the narrative features of folk tales and legends. The poetess uses them as a ground upon which she can emphasize the value and meaning of love, in all the shapes it appears within human life and society.

Throughout the twelve *Lais*, which are thought to have been composed around 1160, ‘Love’ is depicted across a vast spectrum of aspects. In *Chievrefoil (The Honeysuckle)*, the sentence “You cannot live without me, nor I without you” (192),¹ helps to accentuate the fact that the love Tristan and Iseult share is just like “the honeysuckle that attaches itself to the hazel tree” (192),¹ with two bodies but one heart. The heroine of *Le Frêne (The Ash Tree)*, like Griselda in *The Clerk’s Tale of The Canterbury Tales*, finally finds happiness by showing devoted love and total sacrifice. *Milun* tells the story of two lovers who are united after long separation. As shown through these examples, Marie de France constantly emphasizes the significance of love, and the dualism of love and happiness throughout her *Lais*.

However, ‘Love’, provider of true happiness, can on the contrary be at the source of the most sinister tragedy, and lead to terrible endings through serious ethical confusion. These negative aspects often go beyond common sense and create ultimately a state of chaos and confusion, beyond the mere violation of taboos,

1 For the French version we used *Les Lais de Marie de France*. ed. Jean Rychner. Paris: Champion, 1983. English translations are from the version of *The Lais of Marie de France*. tr. Robert Hanning & Joan Ferrante. Durham, North Carolina: The Labyrinth Press, 1982. Subsequent references to this text are given by page number in parentheses.

where all rational judgments are disregarded. In this context, *Equitan* (the story of a king in love with a vassal's wife, attempting to murder the vassal with the help of his lover, and finally losing his own life in an absurd ending) suggests that the ethical confusion provoked by 'Love', along with its chaotic result, as well as all its implications must be carefully acknowledged.

I. Love in the Middle Ages and Marie de France

Prior to the analysis of *Equitan*, we ought to take a brief look at the perception of love in the Middle Ages as it may turn useful for further discussion. Marie de France emphasizes the importance of voluntary and faithful love, often implying that love is the starting point of happiness; yet it is worth noticing that the love described in the *Lais* does not always occur within the legitimate and proper frame of holy matrimony. Just like the 'fin'amor' professed by the troubadours of Southern France, and like 'l'amour courtois' (Courtly love), with its tales of love outside the marriage, of adulterous love, Marie de France writes love stories that resemble that of Lancelot of the lake and Queen Guinevere.

Andreas Capellanus, who was a contemporary of Marie de France, listed 31 precepts of love in his *De Amore (The Art of Courtly Love)*, and argued that "Marriage is no real excuse for not loving."¹ Following a similar line of thought, we read in *Laüstic (The Nightingale)* a story about a married woman who falls in love with a young knight who is well known for his prowess and great valour. In *Guigemar*, the main protagonist has a liaison with a lady who is noble, beautiful and wise and who happens to be married to a lord described as "a very old man exceedingly jealous." In *Yonec*, the knight-bird shares his love with a young and beautiful woman who is being guarded in a high tower by her husband. In *Eliduc*, the main protagonist of the eponymous lay, who is already married to Guildelüec, leaves his country to serve another king in a time of war and there falls in love with the king's daughter. Lastly the well-known love story of Tristan and Iseult as told in *Chievrefoil* serves our purpose to remind that the story that unfolds is happening between the king Marc's wife and the king's very own nephew. As with many works that sing courtly love, lovers who make love in the works of Marie de France do not feel any remorse nor regret about the immoral nature of their relationship. A mischievous husband is described as an antagonist who interferes with the love of two lovers, and the lovers are drawn as if they are not even concerned about the salvation of their souls that was so important in Christianity. Moreover as it is well shown in

1 See Andreas Capellanus, *The Art of Courtly Love*. Trans. John J. Parry. New (York: Columbia UP, 1960) 184.

Yonec, when writing about the evil schemes of the husband to kill the knight-bird, the author exclaims, “God, he doesn’t know what treachery the villains are preparing” (145), thus expressing feelings of compassion towards the lovers despite the illegitimate nature of their relation according to social standards.

However, this does not mean that Marie de France is actively advocating adulterous love. The world depicted by the 12th Century poetess in her *Lais* does not deviate too much from the reality of her times, centered on the male warrior within a feudal system unique to the Middle Ages. In the Middle Ages, the marriage system was almost entirely based on political and economic considerations, viewed as a means for the preservation of the family and clan as well as for the increase of wealth, influence and power. Married women were often separated from their husband who were away on wars, hunting, tournaments, and many other errands. The reality of medieval marriages inevitably produced unhappy marriages and the misfortune of women, and Marie de France’s view on adultery or on the victims of unhappy marriage reflects in great parts this reality. The *Lais*’ main point is to emphasize that voluntary and faithful love is the best virtue, true happiness and absolute value.

Marie de France is constantly stressing the true value and significance of love because the world she paints is a very abnormal and imperfect space, a negative world, a kind of ‘monde à rebours’ (world against Nature). In at least eight of the twelve *Lais*, sexual offenses or ethical violations play an important role in the development of the plot. For example, in the case of *Le Frêne*, after having scold a neighbour who had twins saying that she had two babies at the same time because she had sexual intercourse with two different men, a woman tries to kill one of her offspring when she herself gives birth to twins. Because of the gossip of a mother “deceitful and proud, evil-tongued and envious” (73), the heroine is thrown down under an ash tree near a monastery, and goes through all kinds of misfortune. In *Deus Amanz (The Two Lovers)*, a king, like the king from the folk tale who tries to marry his daughter who looks exactly like his dead wife, is left only with his daughter after he lost his wife, and in order to keep her by his side sets impossible conditions for the princess’s suitors. In another work, a wife who has become aware of the secret of her husband who turns into a werewolf, conspires with another man who has been in love with her for a long time, and hides her husband’s clothes to keep him out of the world of humans. This inverted world seems to reach its height with the lai of *Equitan*, where a woman loves the king her husband serves, and conspires with him to kill her husband.

II. Love in Equitan: The First Ethical Confusion

Many early researchers seemed to consider this *Lai* to be either an early work or a work by another author because of the ridiculous ending which would best fit a comic tale (*fabliau*), and also because the moral against adultery and depraved woman is so explicit and cliché (Hoepfner 150). However, as will be discussed in detail later on, one of the reasons why Marie de France wanted to save the adventures of those Bretons, i.e. the Celts, from the wreckage of memory, was the fate of Equitan and the woman who loved him so dearly. In this respect, *Equitan* can be interpreted on different levels, with the notion of edification understood in a deeper sense.

At the beginning of the work, Marie de France writes: “Equitan was a man of great worth, dearly loved in his own land” (60), thus leaving readers with the expectation that the hero will be like the beloved wise kings from the epic poems tradition; but in the following passage she stresses out that he “loves the sport and lovemaking; and so he kept a body of knights in his service” (60). After introducing the king in such a manner, she adds the following remarks: “Whoever indulges in love without sense or moderation recklessly endangers his life; such is the nature of love that no one involved with it can keep his head” (60).

The poetess does not so much tell that Equitan should have known that he had to abstain from loving his vassal’s wife, as she stresses that he should have had better knowledge of the nature of love (Burgess 41). That a deep understanding of love and a grasp of its characteristics are necessary to overcome the various temptations and dangers of love seems to be one of the key elements of Marie de France’s intention, but the story also acts as an ‘*exemplum*’ that shows what the destructive power of love is on a social level rather than on a merely personal level. Because though medieval literary works are not historical materials in a strict sense, they can be used to measure individual problems, personal and individual relations, violations and constraints that were part of a past society (Flori 22). Furthermore, *Equitan* also has significance in that it provides an opportunity to reflect on the ethical choices and reasons of a human being, and the results derived from them.

Immediately after the brief mention of the king, his seneschal is described as a “good knight, brave and loyal, who took care of his land for him, governed and administered it” (60). It is explained that the seneschal replaces the king in his duties because “he would never, no matter what the emergency, neglect his hunting, his hawking, or his other amusements” (60-61) except in case of war. The relationship between the king and his vassal revealed at the beginning of the work shows

the king devoting himself to the world of love and hunting while his vassal administers state affairs. On the other hand, the portrayal of the vassal's wife hints in a puzzling manner at the ending of their relationship: "This seneschal took a wife through whom great harm later came to the land" (61).

In a way that is reminiscent of the 'amor de lonh', namely 'love from afar' the troubadours sang, Equitan harbours a desire for his seneschal's wife even before seeing her. Of course, it is clear that for Equitan seducing his vassal's wife appears as a new conquest and another victory of love. However, it would be wrong to identify Equitan with the one who is determined to seduce the virtuous, married, innocent woman. Equitan takes the opportunity to go hunting on the land where his vassal lives and decides to convey his feelings to his wife as he will stay overnight in their house. But the moment he sees the woman, he gets a very deep wound in the heart, struck by Love's arrow. Enslaved by the god of Love, he eventually loses good sense, wisdom, and understanding. Equitan becomes "sad and depressed" (61), and as a result, he cannot sleep that night, blaming himself in mournful silence.

I think I have no choice but to love her — yet if I love her, I'm doing wrong; she's the wife of my seneschal. I owe him the same faith and love that I want him to give me. If, by some means, he found out about this I know how much it would upset him. (62)

In most medieval works, a knight is in love with a king or a lord's wife, but in *Equitan*, it is the king who loves his vassal's wife. The sighing monologue of Equitan is no different than that of the typical courtly lover who wishes that the woman he loves grants him a favor. Some researchers have expressed the opinion that the love a young knight harbours for his lord's wife, in other words courtly love, is some sort of a game that can help strengthen the ethical stance of the vassal-lord relationship (Duby 56-63). But the reaction of King Arthur after he discovers Lancelot and Guinevere's treason, as well as the tragic events that eventually led to the fall of his kingdom, shows well enough the results courtly love can have when it goes beyond reason. In short, if the vassal has a duty to control his emotions, King Equitan senses the reality of these constraints very weakly, and therefore the concern about vassal-lord relationship based on mutual trust and faithfulness is transformed in an odd manner, "Still, it would be a lot worse if I went mad out of concern for him" (62), as he puts forward both courtly love and selfishness:

It would be a shame for such a beautiful woman not to have a lover! What

would become of her finer qualities if she didn't nourish them by a secret love? There isn't a man in the world who wouldn't be vastly improved if she loved him. (62)

Through a very self-centered argumentation, he attempts to justify himself by saying that his being sick is more serious than his vassal's suffering, and that the love he harbours for a woman makes her a better person according to a twisted interpretation of courtly love. And he justifies it basing himself on the logic of courtly love. As a result, his thought turns into an argument that the vassal's best option is to endure and agree to share his wife with his lord.

And if the seneschal should hear of the affair, he oughtn't be too crushed by it; he certainly can't hold her all by himself, and I'm happy to share the burden with him! (62)

Despite the fact that feudal responsibility and courtly love have fundamentally incompatible attributes, the king makes the disloyalty in feudal sense a loyalty in terms of courtly love, and he turns a husband's right to a vicious virtue while he praises his own desire as a high virtue. The next day, Equitan reveals his desire to her, letting her know that she holds all power to comfort him or let him die. But strangely, as a response, she points out the difference of status between herself and the king.

I must have some time to think. This is so new to me, I have no idea what to say. You're a king of high nobility, and I'm not at all of such fortune that you should single me out to have a love affair with. If you get what you want from me, I have no doubt about it: you'll soon get tired of me, and I'll be far worse off than before. (63)

She points out that even if she were to allow such a love, this love wouldn't be shared equally between the two of them, because Equitan is a powerful king while she is the wife of his vassal, which means that he, as her king, would have all authority over her. Arguing that "Love is worthless if it's not mutual" (64), she concludes that a love with a poor but loyal man who also possesses good sense and merit is worth more than the love of a king. Moreover, she emphasizes the fact that anyone who aims higher in love than his own station in life entitles him to will be frightened by all manner of things. On the other hand, the powerful and rich man

is confident that no one will steal his mistress away whose favor he obtains by his authority over her. Oddly, in the woman's response, no argument can be found on ethics, moral or emotional aspects. Her love for her husband or the question of fidelity to husband is not mentioned at all, and she seems to be concerned only by the issues of equality and equity among lovers of different social status. To which Equitan responds that "if she places a high enough value on her love that she isn't inconstant" (64) any wise and courtly woman deserves to receive the faithful love of king or lord. The king then pleads his cause with this maxim, "Whoever is inconstant in love and gives himself up to treachery is mocked and deceived in the end" (64).

My dear lady, I'm offering myself to you! Don't think of me as your king, but as your vassal and your lover. I tell you, I promise you I'll do whatever you want. Don't let me die on your account! You be the lord and I'll be the servant — you be the proud one and I'll be the beggar! (64-65)

Equitan, who in the past was a conqueror of women, is now conquered by a woman and reveals a new identity, as the real king is transformed into a vassal of love. In the end, the wife of the vassal allows the king to love her. Of course, it is unclear whether the woman's acceptance of the love of Equitan is due to the aggressive courtship of the king, to the temptation of taking a high-ranked king as a lover, or to the fear of the king's anger were she to refuse him (Kinoshita *et al.* 66). The scene where the two people exchange rings and promises, just like at a wedding, gives the impression that the feudal pledge is transformed into a pledge of love, and it seems that Equitan has literally crossed into a world of love at the antipode of the real world (Sienaert 72).

III. Marriage and Murder Conspiracy: Ethical Confusion and Tragedy

After describing the two lovers, Marie de France anticipates the end of the work: "They kept their promises and loved each other well; they died for this in the end" (65). Their love affair lasted a long time without anyone hearing of it. And Equitan loved only his vassal's wife without looking at any other woman. With the seneschal holding court and hearing pleas and accusations in place of the king while the king himself was busy loving his seneschal's wife, the relations are turned upside-down since the vassal now rules over the king's territory often seen as the incarnation of his queen.

At this point happens an incident. Some courtiers start to show discontent over

king, who not only does not think about marriage, but even refuses to hear anything of marriage. To cite a similar example, in *Le Frêne*, vassal knights advise their king who lives with a woman of obscure birth without marrying her “to marry a noble woman, and to get rid of this mistress of his. They’d be pleased if he had an heir who could succeed to his land and inheritance; it would be much to their disadvantage if he was deterred by his concubine from having a child born in wedlock” (81-82). They add that, if their needs are not met, “they would no longer consider him their lord or willingly serve him if he didn’t do what they wanted” (82). In medieval times, it was not rare for the vassals to urge their king to marry. By urging the marriage of the king, they had in mind the birth of a legitimate heir to the throne as well as the preservation of their own rights as vassals of the family, and such consideration of interests between lord and vassals were indeed part of the reality of medieval marriage. At last, upon hearing this matter, his mistress gets so frightened she opens her heart to the king Equitan.

My lord, I’m crying because of our love, which has brought me to great sorrow: you’re going to take a wife, some king’s daughter, and you will get rid of me; I’ve heard all about it, I know it’s true. And — alas! — what will become of me? On your account I must now face death, for I have no other comfort than you. (66)

In order to appease his lover so deeply anxious, Equitan says: “Dear love, don’t be afraid! I promise I’ll never take a wife, never leave you for another. Believe me, this is the truth: If your husband were dead, I’d make you my lady and my queen; no one could stop me” (66). At the moment when the question of marriage, a social convention that had not been a big issue so far, is being brought up, the two lovers want to make their love and relationship legitimate, and the existence of the husband stands out back again. For the first time, Equitan combines his position as king and his position as a lover, and as soon as these two positions are combined, a tragic ending is to be expected (Sienaert 73). It may have been simply a word to appease the woman, but “once spoken, turn back upon the speaker and, like Guigemar’s arrow, Lanval’s promise, or the white lie of the lady of *Laüstic*, rebound uncannily” (Bloch 76). She was fast to reply, her husband’s death, it would be easy to arrange if Equitan were willing to help her. We can infer from the attitude of the woman who consciously accepts the prospect of an uncertain future that Equitan never intended, that she has lost her discernment about everything but love. Therefore, by speaking so, she reveals that she would in all her heart never have left her

lover's side, and she would never have thought of becoming a queen by marrying the king.

Equitan replies that he would do all she could demand of him, if he possibly could, "whether it turned out well or badly" (66). This answer is a concretization of the woman as his lord and himself as her vassal image he had drawn when he first confessed his love, and at the same time it tells us they are in a state of complete ethical confusion; as they are incapable of any other consideration besides love, they literally invert the metaphorical lord-vassal relations to the real feudal hierarchy (Kinoshita 47-48). The woman tells the king to go hunting on her husband's land, so that they can come to rest and bathe after the hunt in the forest. The woman explains that she plans to fill her husband's bathtub with boiling water to make him die suddenly without raising any suspicion, and the king replies he will do as she wishes. And about three months later, the woman prepares the ominous bath for her husband. However, as her husband rises early and goes out for a walk, she and Equitan cannot hold off their burning passion and make love on the lord's bed in front of the bathtub.

It is at this moment that the seneschal returns and sees the king and his wife lying together in full embrace. Equitan, "to hide his villainy", jumps "into the tub feet first, stark naked. He didn't stop to think what he was doing" (68). The King immediately lost his life in the scalding bathtub which was originally prepared for the death of his vassal. Seeing what happened to the king, the seneschal, as if he had turned into a cruel judge, "grabbed his wife at once and thrust her head first into the tub" (68). After telling the story of the death of the two lovers, Marie de France conveys the following lesson: "Whoever wants to hear some sound advice can profit from this example: he who plans evil for another may have that evil rebound back on him" (68). And she ends her story by the following comment, "all happened just as I've told you. The Bretons made a *lai* about it, about Equitan, his fate, and the woman who loved him so much" (68-69).

During the Carolingian Dynasty, it was considered a significant act of betrayal for a lord to commit adultery with a vassal's wife (Robertson 244). Also in those days, the crime of counterfeiting was considered a serious crime and was also punished by death in boiling water (Picherit 423). However, the deaths of two lovers in the last scene was not intended to reflect the actual penalties of the Middle Ages, but rather to give a meaningful, moreover ethical lesson to the audience through a punishment with symbolic meaning.

Conclusion

Someone saw in *Equitan* a rejection and a departure from the ideal love, which was formerly expressed by numerous troubadours (Hoepffner 158), while another researcher viewed it as the opposite take on the basic principles of courtly love (Lazar 195). However, when we look at *Equitan* from the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, it appears Marie de France paid particular attention in showing how love makes an individual lose all ethical consciousness, how social customs exert an ominous influence on personal lives, and finally how ethical confusion results in real disorder. Equitan, who was the king and judge, by two times stands at the crossroads of ethical choices, and chooses the symbolic and real role of vassal as a lover. When at the end of the work, Equitan exchanges his fate for his vassal's in the strangest figure of equality. Moreover, by entering in turn into the tub of their death, the two lovers also actualize an odd relationship of equality.

By showing that the lack of reason, the ignorance of taboos and the misunderstanding of the attributes of love lead to ethical confusion, Marie de France invites her readers to reconsider not only what equity between vassal and monarch, equity among lovers but also equity in the matters of love and power can be (Mikhailova 155). The king and his seneschal's wife are led to death by something resembling the passion of Racine's heroine Phèdre. As a result of the vassal's wife emphasis on a love based on equality and of the establishment of equity, so reminiscent of Equitan's name, the two people face a tragic end. If one borrows the expression of the 15th Century poet François Villon, one can say "Folles amours font les gens bestes" ("Foolish love makes people fools").¹ However, the present tragedy created by this lack of psychological and social equilibrium is not simply limited to the individual dimension. In a similar way that the adulterous love of Lancelot and the queen leads to the end of King Arthur's kingdom, the death of Equitan without an heir will bring chaos and disorder to a whole country, and there is no doubt that it would lead to terrible warfare with neighboring countries.

Works Cited

- Bloch, R. H. *The Anonymous Marie de France*. Chicago & London: The U of Chicago P, 2003.
 Burgess, Glyn Sheridan. *The Lais of Marie de France: text and context*. Manchester UP, 1987.
 Duby, Georges. *Love and Marriage in the Middle Ages*. Chicago: The U. of Chicago P, 1994.

1 François Villon, *Œuvres complètes*, éd. Jacqueline Cerquiglini-Toulet et Laëtitia Tabard, Paris, Gallimard, 2014, p. 73, line 629. English translation based on *Complete Poems*, ed. Barbara N. Sargent-Baur (Toronto-Buffalo-London: University of Toronto Press, 1994) 97.

- Flori, Jean. "Amour et société aristocratique au XIIe siècle: L'exemple des *lais* de Marie de France." *Le Moyen Age* 98 (1992): 17-34.
- Hoepffner, Ernest. *Les Lais de Marie de France*. Paris: Nizet, s.d., 1959.
- Kinoshita, Sharon. "Adultery and Kingship in Marie de France's *Equitan*." *Essays in Medieval Studies* 16 (1999): 41-52.
- Kinoshita, Sharon and P. McCracken. *Marie de France. A Critical Companion*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2012.
- Lazar, Moshé. *Amour courtois et "fin'amors" dans la littérature du XIIe siècle*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1964.
- Mikhaïlova, Milena. *Le présent de Marie*. Paris: Didier, 1996.
- Picherit, Jean-Louis. "Le Châtiment des amants dans le lai d'*Equitan* de Marie de France." *Le Moyen Age* 102.1 (1996): 419-424.
- Robertson, D. W. "Love Conventions in Marie's *Equitan*." *Romanic Review* 44.4 (1953): 241-245.
- Sienaert, Edgard. *Les Lais de Marie de France*. Paris: Champion, 1984.

责任编辑：郭 雯

The Reading Cultures and Ethical Codes of Germany and Japan in the Eighteenth Century

Jeonghoon Yoo & Yong Hyun Kim

Abstract: Texts whose themes are contrary to the social norms and ethical codes of their era, or which disseminate what are seen as unwholesome ideas, have been in many societies prohibited from being published or sold, or even from being read. This paper will examine such cases in Germany and Japan in the 18th century. These texts challenged the ethical norms of their societies, which were based on the authority of the Enlightenment and Christianity and of the Shogunate, respectively. In particular, Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and Chikamatsu Monzaemon's *Sonezaki Shinju*, iconic works of the two countries in the 18th century, led to an increase in cases of the social phenomenon of suicide. Criticism of the role these texts played in inspiring these acts and of what was viewed as their unethical contents helped rather than hindered their success, and this demonstrates that the officially-sanctioned ethics of the day and the desire of ordinary readers were in a relationship of mutual tension, and that the differentiation of the two countries' reading cultures from ethical codes was progressing. The study of the widespread social phenomena related to reading books which were seen as illegitimate in Germany and Japan is an important basis for research into the relationship between the reading culture of the 18th century and the ethical codes of the day, specifically as this evolution relates to social modernization.

Key words: Reading culture; Ethics; Goethe; Chikamatsu Monzaemon; Forbidden books; Suicide

Authors: **Jeonghoon Yoo** (lead author) is Research Professor at the Global Institute for Japanese Studies of Korea University. He specializes in the study of Japanese literature in the Edo & Meiji period (Email: cuttiyecysai@gmail.com). **Yong Hyun Kim** (corresponding author) is Associate Professor at the Department of German Language & Literature of Korea University. His research interests include literary theory and reading culture (Email: entmythos@korea.ac.kr).

标题: 18 世纪日本和德国读书文化和伦理观的互动

内容摘要: 书被禁止出版或贩卖有多种原因。这些原因包括违反社会制度与伦理观, 传播危险思想等。在 18 世纪的德国与日本, 挑战于建立在基督教与

幕府的权威之上的社会规范与秩序的书被列为禁书。当时两国具有代表性的畅销书——歌德的《少年维特的烦恼》以及近松门左卫门的《曾根崎心中》——引起了自杀的社会现象，被批评违反了当时的伦理观。然而对模仿自杀与反伦理性内容的批评反而帮助作品成为畅销书，这恰恰说明伦理观与大众需求相互间存在张力，以及读书文化开始分化这一现象。通过考察德国与日本同时出现的“禁书”这一社会现象，论文证明 18 世纪读书文化与当代伦理观的关系应该成为近代化研究的分析对象。

关键词：读书文化；伦理观；歌德；近松门左卫门；禁书；自杀

作者简介：柳政勳（第一作者），韩国高丽大学 Global 日本研究院研究教授，主要研究方向是江户明治时代的日本文学；金容铉（通信作者），韩国高丽大学德文系教授，主要研究方向是文学理论与读书文化。

Reading is a cultural modality that has undergone rapid development throughout the history of humankind, in which capacity it has played a critical role in the sharing and transmission of human culture. Despite its significance, however, reading has begun to fade from our culture, because of the extreme velocity of the technological advance of electronic media and the sharp increase in the number of electronic media consumers, as well as the fact that reading books is a skill that requires a longer period of time to master than the use of other media do. In light of this waning of the book as a cultural force, this study explores the era in which the book came to the fore, specifically in terms of developments in eighteenth century Germany and Japan, where reading books began to take root as a new form of cultural participation. Comparing social phenomena that revolved around reading in the two countries will be helpful in grasping the degree of influence of reading on the era's social and cultural environments, which were undergoing major transformations, and in shedding new light on the roles of reading and literature in today's competitive media landscape.

Let's take a brief look at the situation of Germany and Japan in the eighteenth century. Germany was seeing the development of the Enlightenment and civil society. In tandem with this, the country was going through a revolution in text-based cultural production, in the form of advances in printing and paper technologies, the diversification of texts (books, newspapers, magazines, and so on), the increase in the variety of books, and their mass publication and popularization (Faulstich 15-16). In this period, printed texts played an increasingly important role as a means for education and information transmission due to the development of the bourgeoisie. Meanwhile, as the reading population grew and the book market expanded, the literary community went through structural

changes: each stakeholder in the literary community was required to recognize their new roles and responsibilities in a novel cultural environment and act accordingly, with authors seeing themselves as producers, publishers as mediators, readers as recipients, and critics/translators as professional readers. These changes suggest that literature began to distinguish itself from other cultural fields and to gradually develop its own social system (Schmidt 280-285). During this time, novels emerged as a literary genre in the book market and gained attention from the public, giving rise to debates surrounding their ethical functions in civil society, the relationship between fiction and reality, and the boundary between “high-brow” and “low-brow” literature. In light of these issues, in eighteenth century Germany there was a pressing intellectual inquiry into the entire context surrounding the act of reading, or in other words, who read what, where, how, and why.

In the eighteenth century, Japan was in a similar situation to Germany. For a long period of time, reading had been regarded there as a luxury enjoyed only by the ruling class, including the nobility. Things began to change after the Japanese invasion of Korea (then Joseon) in 1592, as Joseon’s printing technology was introduced to Japan and Japanese society slowly began to change as a result. The country abruptly entered a period of stability when the Tokugawa Shogunate was founded and order was restored. And in the Genroku Era (元禄, 1688~1704), one that is generally considered to be the Golden Age of pre-modern Japanese culture, books began to be read by ordinary people for leisure purposes. Picture books (草双紙), specifically books with large illustrations and accompanying text, were published by the thousand and book rental stores (貸本屋), where people could borrow picture books, began to sprout up. Books like *The Life of an Amorous Man* (好色一代男) and *Five Women Who Loved Love* (好色五人女) explicitly depicted sexual acts between men and women; *Nansō Satomi Hakkenden* (南総里見八犬伝), a full-length novel that does not suffer by comparison with today’s fantasy novels, was published; and *Tōkaidōchū Hizakurige* (東海道中膝栗毛), a fiction about two men’s fantastic travels, gained popularity with readers. *Nisemurasaki Inakagenji* (偽紫田舎源氏), an accessibly written version of *The Tale of Genji* (源氏物語), which was already considered a classic, and *A Hundred Horror Stories* (百物語), a collection of stories that had been passed on orally, were also published. As the number of people who read for pleasure increased, book-related businesses, such as the above-mentioned book rental stores, publishing houses, and literary agencies, thrived. As the quantity of books sold increased, book genres diversified as well. Newly-emerged genres included fictions that cast aspersions on the Shogunate and the samurai class with a hint of satire and

humor, and they were soon banned.

In order to delve into developments related to reading in eighteenth century Germany and Japan, we will examine texts that created sensations, and the social and ethical issues that revolved around them. More specifically, we will look into *The Sorrows of Young Werther* by Goethe and *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* (曽根崎心中) by Chikamatsu Monzaemon (近松門左衛門), who was referred to as the Shakespeare of Japan. The focus will be on the reactions in the two countries when they were published and the influence they had on their respective societies, particularly, the tension between the theme of suicide and prevailing ethical norms.

On the Border between Good Books and Forbidden Books

Literary scholars and critics are asked to recommend worthy books, but when they ask themselves what the appropriate process and criteria are for selecting such books and for determining which are unacceptable, they often find themselves at a loss. For instance, it is unproblematic to discuss Hermann Hesse's *Beneath the Wheel*, a story about the emotional pain of adolescence, or Dazai Osamu's *No Longer Human* (人間失格) in class as a teacher, but one may hesitate to personally recommend them to teenagers. And when one does so, one may feel the need to explain the background of the novels before they read them, because these stories end very tragically, and they may have a negative influence on young readers. However, such concerns go beyond personal matters and are related to social concerns, and thus deserve further discussion.

In the eighteenth century, reading began to extricate itself from the influence of monarchs and patrons, in other words from royal families and elites. The cultural economy diversified so that authors became directly connected to readers in myriad ways, and a division of labor occurred as the book market expanded. Fields such as publishing, which mediates between authors and readers, and criticism, which helps readers choose books worth reading, emerged. These changes suggested that authors and publishers, who used to be sponsored by patrons, needed to compete fiercely to survive in the literary marketplace and to find ways to satisfy the needs of a wide spectrum of readers with diverse tastes. As the number of books available to readers increased, some began to be attracted to banned or disregarded books, rather than to those which were approved of. In other words, the gap between the desires of ordinary readers and the proclivities of professional readers grew wider, and ordinary readers began to form a reading culture of their own. However, this issue can be better understood only by considering both the logic of the book market and the social norms and ethical codes of the eighteenth century.

Sometimes, books that are beloved and praised by readers are banned from being published, sold, or read on the grounds that they run counter to the norms of the social system and its ethical codes, or that they spread unwholesome ideas. This is how censored books, which propagate ideas which are contrary to so-called “traditional customs and moral norms,” gain notoriety. Such texts in Germany and Japan in the eighteenth century were those that challenged the social order, which was based on the authority of Christianity and that of the Shogunate, respectively. The process of determining which books are forbidden emerges through critics’ harsh denunciations, publishers’ self-censorship, and the censorship and prohibition of sales ordered by a responsible authority. Interestingly, the fate of books takes an unexpected turn, which we can see from the examples of Germany and Japan.

In Germany: The Sorrows of Young Werther by Goethe

Johann Wolfgang von Goethe is one of the most celebrated German writers in the history of modern literature. Goethe’s *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, an epistolary novel, first appeared anonymously at the Leipzig book fair in September 1774, and became the first bestseller in Germany. Upon publication, the novel was instantly welcomed by readers, and literary criticism of it attracted even more public attention. It is the story of a man named Werther, who falls in love with a beautiful young girl, Lotte, despite knowing beforehand that she is engaged to another man. Werther suffers from unrequited love and sees no other choice but to take his own life. In the eighteenth century, when the philosophy of the Enlightenment took hold, however, suicide was regarded as an irrational act, while Church authorities for their part saw it as an offense against Christian values. Therefore, it is no surprise that this novel also faced harsh criticism.

It was extolled by the younger generation, but it was criticized by Enlightenment thinkers and those in authority in the Church (Flaschka 253). Those who praised the work thought that Goethe was a genius who followed the dictates of his own inspiration and imagination rather than confining himself to strict literary and ethical rules based on rigid rationalism. Meanwhile, Enlightenment thinkers believed that individualistic thinking and the option of suicide threatened the norms of civil society and the values of the bourgeoisie (Flaschka 263-265). In addition, the leaders of the Christian Church strongly criticized the suicide of Werther, arguing it was “an insult to life, the noblest gift ever bestowed by God.” (Flaschka 276). But these denunciations were self-defeating, as surprisingly, what made this novel so popular was precisely this harsh criticism, not favorable reviews.

A book review carried by a local newspaper in Altona argued that *The Sorrow*

of *Young Werther* should not be further published in order to protect the wholesome values of citizens from corruption. However, just as love becomes even more intense when it is forbidden, this article kindled young readers' interest in the young man's passionate and tragic love story, and many illegal copies of the novel were published and sold (Fuld 149). In addition, Johann Melchior Goeze, a pastor in Hamburg, severely criticized the novel as a disgrace and insult to Christianity and as validating temptations that led pious citizens to sin, rebutted favorable reviews of the book, and even demanded administrative measures to ban it (Flaschka 278-279). Considering that the book inspired some to commit suicide, Goeze's position is understandable. However, his full-throated criticism of it caused unexpected results, drawing the public to it and fueling its publication and sales (Fuld 149). In this way, ultimately the conflict between *The Sorrow of Young Werther* and the religious ethics and social norms of the time made the book a bestseller. In this light, we can begin to discern what the relationship was between reading culture in the eighteenth century and this novel, a banned book and an iconic text.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, pietism led to the internalization within individuals and the autonomization of religion in Germany. This was a Christian movement that reflected the diminished influence of religion in society after the Thirty Years' War, and which stressed personal religious introspection rather than the role of the church or the community (Schmidt 85-86). This tendency, together with the emergence of the bourgeoisie and the increase in individualism, brought about a new way of interacting with religious books, by reading and interpreting them alone. Changes in the cultural environment, namely the growth of printed texts, the spread of novels, and the increase in silent reading, brought about quantitative and qualitative changes in peoples' attitudes toward reading (Schön 28-32). To put it another way, the shift in Germany's social structure and cultural environment in the course of the eighteenth century made it possible for novels that challenged religious ethics and social norms to be published, sold, and embraced by ordinary readers. As discussed above, reading a novel is a personal act, but other acts carried out in relation to a written text are social matters that are intertwined with the interests of various social classes. *The Sorrow of Young Werther* is a good example, as the explicit, thoroughgoing critique of this novel made it an effectively illegitimate book, and the fact that it was forbidden made it popular.

In Japan: The Love Suicides at Sonezaki by Chikamatsu

The Love Suicides at Sonezaki (曾根崎心中), a play written by Chikamatsu Monzaemon (近松門左衛門) which premiered in 1703, caused a Shinju sensation in

Japan. “Shinju (心中)” is a Japanese term for a romantic double suicide. At the time, it was a common belief among Japanese people that lovers who were not allowed to marry one another in this life could wed in the afterlife if they committed suicide together. Inspired by the real suicides of a soy shop clerk named Tokubei (徳兵衛) and Ohatsu (お初), the courtesan with whom he was in love, Chikamatsu lyrically depicted their deaths in the context of the social conflicts in which they were immersed. Some of those who watched the play perceived their double suicide as a romantic act, and Chikamatsu became known in Japan as a playwright who described the aesthetic dimension of death beautifully.

The affirmation of double suicide contained in *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* faced a strong backlash from the intellectual mainstream. *Shinju Okagami* (心中大鑑), a book published one year after the play was first performed, reported thirty-six cases of such suicides in a two-year period. The first line of the book, “Shinju continues day after day”, satirizes the phenomenon. (Shirakura 339) Ihara Saikaku (井原西鶴), who is widely known as the writer of *The Life of an Amorous Man* (好色一代男), criticized it more harshly, saying that the increase in cases of double suicide was merely symptomatic of events in the lives of insignificant men and courtesans. He even argued that lovers committed double suicides not because they were passionate about their love, but because they simply wanted to escape from their reality of fallen reputations or poverty. Ihara’s opinion runs squarely counter to the viewpoint of Chikamatsu, who sympathized with lovers who felt they had no choice but to take their own lives in order to be together. Ihara’s stance is understandable as he came from a family of Samurais. But it is less clear why was so hostile to the phenomenon of double suicide.

As discussed above, Japan’s reading culture prospered and the Shogunate began to censor books in the eighteenth century. In 1670, the Tokugawa Shogunate issued a ban on books about sex, or more specifically, “the publication of books that deal with rumors of others” and “the publication of erotic or pornographic books (好色本).” However, Chikamatsu wrote an “erotic” play based on “rumors of others.” The idea of double suicide, which originated in Buddhism, ran counter to the Confucian ethics embraced by the Shogunate, so it is no surprise that the authorities were unhappy with the popularity of *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki*. In 1720, they issued a ban on the publication of erotic novels or novels about double suicides. A year later, they issued the same ban in relation to the work of playwrights. In 1722, the Shogunate even promulgated a law that prohibited double suicide, which stipulated that the bodies of couples who committed a double suicide were not permitted burial. In addition, if there was a person who attempted to take part in a double

suicide but failed in the attempt, he or she was convicted of the murder of their partner and were put to death. If both parties survived, they were displayed in the public square for three days and were demoted to the lowest class, and in this way degraded. After the Shogunate's suppression of double suicides and the death of Chikamatsu, novels and plays on the subject slowly ceased to be published or performed. However, the trend of romanticizing double suicide was prevalent throughout Japanese society, and spread to the Samurai community (Suwa 163).

The fact that the Shogunate had banned certain literary works even before *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* became popular and that the play encouraged a social phenomenon despite tightened regulation suggest that, just as in the case of *The Sorrow of Young Werther*, *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* became widely popular because its theme was contrary to social norms. Ironically, along with the development of printing technology and publishing industry, the Shogunate's regulation of books and literary culture contributed to the spread of reading culture in eighteenth century Japan. For the ordinary people who read for pleasure, the intellectuals' criticism of novels and dramas they loved and the regulations imposed by the ruling class served as catalysts that stimulated their desire. Ryūtei Tanehiko (柳亭種彦), the author of *Nisemurasaki Inakagenji* (偽紫田舎源氏), published in the mid-nineteenth century, was sentenced to jail for committing an offense against public morals, and his novel went out of print. It is said that he died of shock after this happened. Despite the attempt at controlling its circulation, however, *Nisemurasaki Inakagenji* became the most widely purchased book in the Edo period. (Shoji 81) There was even a selection of Nisemurasaki Inakagenji-themed merchandise produced. This came about because the ethical strictures that the ruling class attempted to foist on society in the eighteenth century triggered a public backlash.

Conclusion

In the eighteenth century, Germany and Japan underwent similar experiences in terms of the expansion of their respective literary markets and the increase in the number of readers caused by the printing revolution. But the two countries' reading environments were different, as the German readership was divided into the two groups of ordinary and professional readers, whereas Japanese readers were generally comprised of members of the merchant class who had given up on their aspiration of ascending in social class, and as a result merely sought pleasure in their reading. As Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther* and Chikamatsu's *The Love Suicides at Sonezaki* suggest, however, it is not a coincidence that hugely popular texts in the two countries in the eighteenth century caused extraordinary social re-

actions. In this study, we focus on the external factors that determined the reception of the two texts rather than any inherent factors. Both of them ran counter to the ethical values of the times, and there were many who harshly criticized them. But ultimately, the tension between the desire of ordinary readers and the ethical values of the ruling class helped build impetus behind these texts.

Considering the fact that both Germany and Japan successfully achieved modernization and grew into empires which dominated Europe and Asia respectively, and that they had similar reading cultures and experienced comparable social developments in the eighteenth century, it can be assumed that the print revolution and the rise of reading culture was one of the prerequisites of modernization. If the transformation in reading culture in this period was a driving force behind modernization, the ethical beliefs of the ruling class at the time, which played a critical role in the transformation, should be considered significant. This study examines two iconic texts that arose in Germany and Japan in the eighteenth century, and explores whether there were tensions between the modern transformation of reading culture and contemporary ethical beliefs. In order to deepen the discussion of the reading cultures and ethical codes of Germany and Japan in the eighteenth century, it will be necessary to examine a wide variety of texts and identify their similarities, as well as their distinctive qualities.

Works Cited

- Faulstich, Werner. *Mediengeschichte von 1700 bis ins 3. Jahrtausend*, UTB, Vandenhoeck & Ruperecht, 2006.
- Flaschka, Horst. *Goethes >>Werther<< Werkkontextuelle Deskription und Analyse*, Wilhelm Fink, München, 1987.
- Fuld, Werner, *Das Buch der verbotenen Bücher: Universalgeschichte des Verfolgten und Verfemten von der Antike bis heute*, Galiani-Berlin, 2012.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. *Die Selbstorganisation des Sozialsystems Literatur am 18. Jahrhundert*, Suhrkamp Frankfurt am Main, 1989.
- Schön, Erich, *Geschichte des Lesens*. In: Bodo Franzmann, Klaus Hasemann, Dietrich Löffler, Erich Schön (edited) *Handbuch Lesen*, München, 1-85. 1999.
- 諏訪春雄『愛と死の伝承』角川書店, 1968.
- 床司浅水『日本の書物』美術出版社, 1978.
- 白倉一由『近松の浄瑠璃』近代文芸社, 1989.

文学伦理学批评话语建构：历史、论争与前景

The Discourse Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism: History, Arguments and Prospects

李茂增 (Li Maozeng) 温 华 (Wen Hua)

内容摘要：作为一种具有中国特色的批评理论，文学伦理学批评的建构经历了两个阶段：2004—2010年主要立足国内，进行基本的理论建设；2012年之后，以国际文学伦理学批评研究会的成立为标志，开始逐步走向世界，通过历次国际学术会议，将这一批评话语的影响推向了国际学界。这一批评话语在建构之初曾出现基本概念易混淆、过分强调本土性等问题，随着理论的完善和发展，克服了部分问题。但它在显示出旺盛活力和强大阐释力的同时，基本理论建设仍需进一步加强。

关键词：文学伦理学批评；话语建构；脑文本；道德批评

作者简介：李茂增，广州大学文学思想研究中心教授，主要研究领域为文艺理论与批评；温华，解放军信息工程大学洛阳外国语学院副教授，主要从事比较文学与世界文学研究。

Title: The Discourse Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism: History, Arguments and Prospect

Abstract: As a contemporary literary critical theory with Chinese characteristics, Ethical Literary Criticism goes through two stages. From 2004 to 2010, it mainly exists in domestic context, whose basic concepts and the frameworks were proposed by Nie Zhenzhao and other scholars. After 2012, with the establishment of The International Association for Ethical Literary Criticism, and through successive international academic conferences, this theory has exerted much more international impact. With the improvement of the theory, such deficiencies as the confusion of concepts and the overemphasis on locality have been overcome. While showing strong vitality and explanatory power, the basic theory construction still needs to be further strengthened.

Key words: Ethical Literary Criticism; discourse construction; brain text; moral criticism

Author: Li Maozeng, Professor at Center of Literary Theories, Guangzhou University (Guangzhou 510006, China). His research area is theory and criticism of lit-

erature and art (Email: Lmz69@sina.com). Wen Hua, Associate Professor at Luoyang College of Foreign Languages, the PLA Information Engineering University (Luoyang 471003, China). Her research area is comparative and world literature (Email:wenerxi@sina.com).

自从1996年“失语论”提出以来，建构中国特色的批评话语一直是学界挥之不去的执念。对于如何在古代文论、现代文论和西方文论三重话语传统中建立真正适应当下语境和彰显本土文化特色的批评话语，学界展开了旷日持久的讨论。实际上，从“西学东渐”起，建构本土话语就是中国知识界努力的方向，百余年中不乏有益的尝试和经验。例如王国维兼收中西美学独创“境界说”；宗白华融合古代文论与德国生命哲学提出“散步”美学；毛泽东在创造性吸收马列文论基础上，建构了以《在延安文艺座谈会上的讲话》为代表的，具有强烈政治色彩、民族意识与现实性的阶级分析话语系统；钱中文受巴赫金对话理论启发提出“新理性精神”和文艺学的“现代性”理论……这些尝试虽不一定产生了国际影响，却代表了中国学界立足时代和现实建构本土文学批评话语的努力。

新世纪以来，随着学术积累的不断增长，学界本土意识的不断增强，越来越多的学者不满足于中国学界作为西方理论消费国的角色，尝试建立适应中国语境的理论话语，在国际学界发出独特的声音。不可否认，中国学术在很多方面还落后于西方，我们的学习时代还远未结束，但这并不妨碍我们在学术研究中紧扣本土问题，按照自身需要借鉴、吸收甚至改写西方理论话语，为国际学界提供具有中国文化特色的理论、视角和方法。

在诸多话语建构实践中，文学伦理学批评是唯一产生于外国文学研究界的一种。经过聂珍钊等学者十多年的精心打造，它不仅在国内学界蔚为大观，更打开了与国际学界对话交流的路径。尽管这一话语的理论建设和批评实践还不尽完善，且不可避免地引发了一些争议，但没有人能够否认，文学伦理学批评是目前中国学界最具国际影响力的声音之一。本文试图通过回顾文学伦理学批评的话语建构过程，思考其话语体系的得与失，为建设具有中国特色的文学批评话语提供借鉴。

一、2004—2010年：话语初创期

2004年6月，在《外国文学研究》与江西师范大学共同主办的“中国的英美文学研究：回顾与展望”全国学术研讨会上，聂珍钊作了题为“文学批评方法新探索：文学伦理学批评”的大会发言，揭开了国内学界建构这种新批评话语的序幕。发言构建了文学伦理学批评的基本框架，确立了这种批评方法的理论基础、批评对象、思想与文学渊源，并特别指出伦理学方法一直被有意无意地用于文学批评，但国内外都没有人将其作为文学批评方法明确

提出(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评:文学批评方法新探索》23)。此后,《外国文学研究》于2005年第1期开设“文学伦理学批评”专栏,挪威奥斯陆大学的克努特、国内学者王宁、刘建军等纷纷撰文发表各自看法。2005年10月,《外国文学研究》与东北师范大学等单位共同主办“文学伦理学批评:文学研究方法新探讨”全国学术研讨会,这也是文学伦理学批评提出之后的首次全国性学术会议。此后,文学伦理学批评的建构者以《外国文学研究》为主要阵地,通过每年一到两次的专题学术研讨会,不断呐喊与实践,逐渐让这一话语广为学界所知。

在早期的文章中,主要建构者聂珍钊一直着重强调这种批评方法的原创性、本土性、现实针对性和实践性。聂珍钊认为:“自从有了文学以来,伦理学方法尽管都在广泛地被有意或无意地用来批评文学,但遗憾的是无论国外还是国内,都还没有人明确地把它作为批评文学的方法提出来”(聂珍钊,《文学伦理学批评:文学批评方法新探索》23)。必须承认,这种看法其实值得商榷,“伦理批评”在国外也许确实算不上一种声势浩大的理论流派,但早已有学者肯定了它作为一种文学批评方法的价值,并且进行了系统化的建构。诺思罗普·弗莱在1957年出版的《批评的解剖》中已经指出:伦理批评可以包容历史批评、原型批评、修辞批评三种批评方法,具有整体阐释的效力。九十年代以来,以韦恩·布斯、希利斯·米勒为代表的美国学者分别致力于从新人文主义、解构主义角度建设文学伦理批评,“伦理批评”(ethical criticism)一词频繁出现于美国学界的文学研究专著与论文当中,以至于有人将1990年文学理论的变化命名为“伦理转向”年(Jane Adamson 1-17)。其实,对于西方学界的相关动态,文学伦理学批评的建构者是有相当了解的,比如刘建军等学者都曾提到美国学界的伦理批评。但值得注意的是,聂珍钊在2010年前的所有文章中,几乎完全不曾提及西方学界伦理批评的现状,而是一再突出文学伦理学批评的原创性和本土性。我们无意批评这种忽略,因为很显然,这是一种“有意”的忽略,或者说是一种有意为之的理论姿态,它在很大程度上代表的是当代中国学界试图摆脱西方影响、建设本土理论的焦虑和努力。在解释倡导文学伦理学批评的原因时,聂珍钊一再强调的一个理由,就是中国当代文学批评话语几乎全部来自西方,缺少原创的文学批评方法,文学伦理学批评乃是改变理论方法西化倾向的新尝试(聂珍钊,《序言:文学伦理学批评》1)。聂珍钊强调的第二个理由是,当下的文学研究存在着过分注重理论而忽视文本分析的倾向,而这依然是受西方理论影响的结果。聂珍钊认为:“后现代批评、精神分析以及其他一些从西方新近引入的批评方法和理论,往往都有忽视文学作品伦理价值的倾向”,中国当下的文学批评受其影响,也普遍地忽视文学作品的伦理价值,缺少人文关怀(黄开红 117)。文学伦理学批评正是要匡正这种流弊,重振文学的教诲功能。不难看出,文学伦理学批评的建构动机中倾注着极其强烈的本土话语意识。如

聂珍钊所言：“我们倡导文学伦理学批评，其目的就在于为我们的文学研究方法提供一种新的选择，在西方批评话语中加入一些自己的声音”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评与道德批评》9）。

作为一种意在彰显话语特色的策略，倡导者在初创期对理论本土性和原创性的强调，显然达到了预期效果，文学伦理学批评很快引起了学界的关注。与此同时，对于这一方法的“本土性”，学界也出现了一些不同的声音。有论者以西方学界研究现状为对照，认为“我国的文学伦理批评是西方相关研究的滞后反应”（段俊晖 87）。面对质疑，建构者做出了回应。作为文学伦理学批评的主阵地，《外国文学研究》刊发了介绍美国伦理批评现状的文章（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评与道德批评》9—17）。聂珍钊也在学术演讲中提到韦恩·布斯的伦理批评，但依然认为布斯的伦理批评与中国学界建构的文学伦理学批评不同，是一种道德批判。¹不过，这一判断依然是建立在对布斯伦理批评“误读”的基础上的。在《我们的朋友：小说伦理学》中，布斯详细辨析了自己的伦理批评与传统道德批评的差别，而布斯对道德批评的批判与聂教授对布斯伦理批评的认识非常相似（Wayne C. Booth 7-8）。显然，这一误读还是出于建构者对文学伦理学批评本土性的坚持。换个角度，也许可以说，文学伦理学批评话语的提出和早期建构，的确没有受到西方学界的直接影响，而是学者们紧扣中国的现实问题，吸纳注重教化的文化传统营养，独立思考之所得。但同样毋庸置疑的是，在话语建构过程中，对“本土性”和“原创性”的强调在慢慢淡化。其实聂珍钊教授本人在这一阶段一直与国外学界保持着密切的联系，2006—2007年间赴美国访学期间，还曾就哈姆雷特抉择困境的伦理原因与美国学者有过深入交流，加深了对于文学伦理学批评的理论思考（聂珍钊，《勤学求真，创新求是：漫谈我的治学之路》3）。当然，这一说法是数年之后的“追认”，在理论建构之初，对西方的借鉴非但不可能被纳入到话语策略之中，反倒是要刻意规避的。

客观地说，忽略西方学界相关研究的话语策略固然能够凸显其“本土性”，却不利于更开放、更深入的学术交流。因此，当理论渐趋成熟、建构者试图将这一批评话语推向世界时，便自然而然地放弃了这一话语策略。

二、2010年之后：理论深化与走向世界

2010年，聂珍钊在《外国文学研究》第1期发表文章《文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语》，全面论述了其文学本质观和文学功能论。文章认为，文学并非审美意识形态，而是伦理的艺术，教诲是文学的本质属性，也是第一功能。“文学是审美意识形态”这一判断，本来是中国学界较为认可的一种文学本质论，在高校文学理论教材中被广泛采用。但聂教授认为这种观点并

1 2011年12月22日聂教授在上海大学题为“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与批评实践”的讲座中所言。

非来自于马克思主义，它否认了文学作为文本形式存在的物质属性；审美也并非文学的第一功能，只有与教诲功能结合在一起才有价值。由此出发，文章认为，伦理学批评不仅仅是众多批评方法中的一种，还是文学本质所决定的最有效、最切题的批评方法。这种观点显然是对初期看法的极大发展。最初，聂教授还认为这种批评方法的理论基础在于伦理学与文学关注的问题相近相通，并未将伦理关怀视为文学的本质，因此认为文学伦理学批评只是众多文学研究方法中的一种，而并非文学本质所决定的最基本的研究方法。这种观点的变化表明，建构者提出文学伦理学批评，绝不仅是为众声喧哗的学界提供一种新的批评方法，而是怀着更为宏大的理论诉求，意欲全面系统地建构起一整套相关的文学理论体系和批评话语。第二阶段的理论建构目标，就是将文学伦理学批评从方法论拓展为包括文学本质论、功能论及价值论的系统理论体系。也许有人会不同意其具体观点，但谁都无法否认，这种追求在理论退热、缺少方向的当下学界弥足珍贵。

与第一阶段刻意忽略国外学界的相关话语实践相比，建构者在这一阶段调整了话语策略，变忽略为了解，进而主动展开对话。一大变化就是《外国文学研究》发表了多篇介绍西方学界相关研究的文章，2011年聂珍钊还指导学生完成了博士论文《美国伦理批评研究》，全面梳理探究美国学界的相关研究。第二个值得注意的现象是，建构者与国际学界展开了全方位的互动交流。建构者不再特别强调这一话语的“原创性”，而确认文学伦理学批评是“在借鉴西方伦理批评和中国道德批评的基础上创建的文学批评方法”（聂珍钊，《勤学求真，创新求是：漫谈我的治学之路》6）同时，依然强调这种话语的创新性，强调中国学者作为“文学伦理学批评”这一概念的原创者身份。

2012年12月，“第二届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会”的召开标志着文学伦理学批评话语走向了世界。此次会议，有来自中国、挪威、爱沙尼亚、葡萄牙、美国、韩国、日本、新加坡和马来西亚的170余位专家学者参加。会议宣布成立“国际文学伦理学批评研究会”，中国社科院荣誉学部委员吴元迈任会长，副会长分别由中、韩、挪威及爱沙尼亚学者担任¹。此后，“文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会”每年举办一次，截止目前，已经在中国宁波、上海、韩国首尔、爱沙尼亚塔尔图、英国伦敦成功举办七届。在历次研讨会上，来自世界各地的学者对这一批评话语表现出浓厚的兴趣，积极参与到话语批评实践当中，拓展了文学伦理学批评的理论视野和实践空间。国际学界知名学者玛乔瑞·帕洛夫、查尔斯·伯恩斯坦、安斯加·纽宁纷纷表达对这一批评方法的认可。同时，世界知名学术杂志与期刊《泰晤士文学副刊》、《阿卡

1 据聂珍钊介绍，副会长分别来自美国、俄罗斯、挪威、韩国和爱沙尼亚，参见聂珍钊：《勤学求真，创新求是：漫谈我的治学之路》，《当代外语研究》2014年第11期，另见《“第二届文学伦理学批评国际学术研讨会”综述》，《外国文学研究》2013年第1期。两文略有出入。

狄亚》、《英语语言与文学》都刊发文章甚至开设专栏进行介绍。2015年加州大学欧文分校举办的“批评理论学术年会”，聚集了当代美国最杰出的学者，会议专门开设一个专题讨论中国崛起背景下的批评理论建构。欧文分校教授、欧洲科学院院士邓·阿贝勒指出，“在西语理论过于倚重政治话语的当下，文学伦理学批评对于文学批评向德育和审美功能的回归提供了动力，与西方主流批评话语形成互动与互补的关系。”（夏延华，邓·阿贝勒 172）他认为，文学伦理学批评必将在中西学者的共建中得到进一步的系统化。

综上，在第二阶段，文学伦理学批评的建构重心转向与国际学界接轨并对话，扩大国际影响，同时试图将理论体系化。应该说，文学伦理学批评业已引起了国际学界的注意，但其中的一些具体观点还不乏争议，理论的体系化仍需加强。

三、问题与讨论

在话语建构的第二阶段，建构者对文学伦理学批评的基本理论和术语进行了全方位的拓展，创造了“伦理线”、“伦理结”、“斯芬克斯因子”、“人性因子”、“兽性因子”、“物质文本”、“脑文本”等概念，提出了包括文学表达论、文学文本论、文学物质论、文学教诲论在内的一系列观点和命题，对中国当代文学批评理论建设起到了重要的推动作用（张连桥，161-162）。然而，由于有些观点与学界主流看法多有不同，甚至颇具“颠覆性”，因而不可避免地引发了争议与讨论。

（一）文学不是意识形态

在《文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语》这篇为文学伦理学批评奠基立派的文章中，聂珍钊教授开篇即对“文学是意识形态”这一习见的命题提出了质疑。作为坚定的唯物主义者，聂教授从马克思主义物质第一性原理出发，以文学物质论取代了文学意识形态论。聂教授认为，一切文学均是以文字文本为载体的，“没有文字就没有文本，没有文本则没有文学。”在录音技术和电子技术出现后，又出现了声音文本和电子文本。总之，文学只能是以具体的物质文本形式存在的文学，口头文学实际上是口头表演，属于表演艺术，还不成其为文学。因此，“文学作品不是抽象的，不是精神的，不是观念的，不是语言的，更不是一种意识形态或审美意识形态，而是一种借助文本存在的物质形态。”文学意识形态论恰恰忽视了文学是一种物质存在，因而是错误的。

有批评者提出质疑：如果文本是文学作品的唯一存在形式，而口头文学因此不足以成其为文学，那么众多民族早期的文化遗产如《吉尔伽美什》《荷马史诗》等，在被文本固定下来之前是否也就没有资格成其为文学？为了回应这一诘难，聂珍钊创造性地提出了“脑文本”这一概念，指出口头文学一词并未正确定义口头讲述的故事，真正的文学是以口头形式讲述的脑文本。

所谓脑文本，“指的是存储在人的大脑中的文本。口头文学的脑文本是人类在发明书写符号并以书写方式存储信息之前的文本形式”（聂珍钊，《脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评》29-30）。

在文学伦理学批评一系列概念中，“脑文本”可谓最具原创性与独特性，也是聂教授近年来用力最多的理论。这一理论为口头文学的物质性提供了新颖的解释，有力地回应了批评者的质疑。但置诸于文学伦理学批评的理论体系之中，则仍须追问：所谓“脑文本”能否归诸于物质形式？如果“脑文本”能够算作物质存在的话，那么，同样以“脑文本”形式存在的某种思想、观念，能否算作物质存在？进而言之，从“文学只能以物质形式存在”，是否可以得出“文学不是意识形态”的结论？聂教授的答案是否定的，其根据是：“马克思主义哲学认为，哲学的首要问题是意识还是物质的第一性问题，也就是物质决定意识，还是意识决定物质的问题。……马克思主义的文学观首先应该是文学文本决定意识形态还是意识形态决定文学文本的问题，即文学文本还是意识形态第一性的问题”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语》16）。但在笔者看来，马克思的物质第一性是指，无论自然界的存在与发展，还是人类社会的存在和发展，都不依赖于人的意识，相反，意识却必须受前者的决定和影响。从这个意义上说，包括文学在内的一切观念的东西，都是对广义的物质世界（自然界、人类社会）反映的结果。至于文学作品的文本，只是作为意识形态的文学的载体、媒介。换言之，对于文学作品来说，意识形态是其本质，而文本只是其存在形式。其实，聂教授的表述，也证明了文学的意识形态性（伦理性）是先于其文本形式的：“按照文学伦理学批评的观点，文学的产生源于人类伦理表达的需要，它从人类伦理观念的文本转换而来，其动力来源于人类共享道德经验的渴望。”“人类为了表达自己的伦理意识，逐渐在实践中创造了文字，然后借助文字记载互相帮助和共同协作的事例，阐释人类对这种关系的理解，从而把抽象的和随着记忆消失的生活故事变成了由文字组成的文本，用于人类生活的参考或生活指南。”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语》14）也就是说，文学是对伦理观念的文本转换；是伦理观念（意识形态）在先，文本转换在后。

更重要的是，我们认为，文学伦理学批评所说的“伦理”是一个泛称，它并不限于狭隘的社会伦理，还包括政治、宗教等各种社会关系，以及人与自然的关系。诚如聂教授所说：“在文学伦理学批评的理论体系和术语使用中，伦理的基本涵义同伦理学中伦理的涵义有所不同，它主要指社会体系以及人与社会和人与人之间客观存在的伦理关系和伦理秩序。在现代观念中，伦理还包括了人与自然、人与宇宙之间的伦理关系和道德秩序”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语》17）。从这个意义上说，意识形态批评乃是文学伦理学批评的重要组成部分，如果否认文学是意识形态，文学伦理学批评将难以深入展开。

（二）文学不是审美的艺术

与反对文学是意识形态相一致，文学伦理学批评反对文学是审美的意识形态，也反对文学是审美的艺术。“文学伦理学批评认为，审美不是文学的属性，而是文学的功能，是文学功利实现的媒介。任何文学作品都带有功利性，这种功利性就是教诲”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语》17）。在文学伦理学看来，根本不存在什么无功利的文学，“如果对文学发展的历史细加考察，我们就会发现文学不仅从来都是功利的，而且文学的政治倾向性一直是文学的基本特征。即使在唯美主义作家的创作中，非功利的文学也只是一种乌托邦理想，因为他们的创作从来也没有超越道德，带有明显的道德说教特征”（聂珍钊，《谈文学的伦理价值和教诲功能》13）。聂珍钊认为，“审美的意识形态”本身就是一个自相矛盾的概念，因为“审美”就意味着“无功利”，而意识形态恰恰是功利的。

聂珍钊对文学审美论的批判，牵涉到文学的本质属性这一古老的问题。围绕这一问题，历来有三种看法，一种认为文学是无功利的、审美的，以康德美学为代表；一种认为文学是意识形态的、功利的，儒家的“文以载道”论和柏拉图的理论可为代表；一种是调和论，认为文学是审美的意识形态，“其直接的无功利性、形象性、情感性总是与深层的功利性、理性和认识性等交织在一起。如果从目的、方式和态度三方面来看，文学的审美意识形态属性表现为无功利性与功利性、形象性与理性、情感性与认识性的相互渗透状况”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语》16）。童庆炳是这一理论在当代中国的代表。

本文无意对上述问题进行深入讨论，总体上说，我们赞同聂教授的立场，即认为不存在完全无功利的文学；我们也认同聂教授的看法：文学审美论的大行其道，是造成当代中国文学“伦理缺失”的主要原因。不过，必须指出的是，审美论和调和论在当代中国的出现，是有特定的历史背景的。审美论和调和论之所以在八十年代不遗余力地标举文学的无功利性，是出于长期以来对“文学为政治服务”的强烈排斥和不满；二者之所以强烈反对文学伦理学批评的文学观，是因为曾经吃尽“道德政治化”和“政治道德化”的苦头，特别担心历史会再次重演。对于许多人来说，远离“道德”与远离“政治”是一回事，呼唤文学的道德教诲功能，极有可能会唤回“道德绑架”、“政治绑架”的幽灵。指出两种理论出现的历史背景，并不是为了得出存在即合理的结论，为两种理论辩护，而是为了提醒文学伦理学的倡导者，文学伦理学批评毕竟是一种文学批评，如果不能结合文学自身的特点对自己的理论主张和批评方法做出说明，这种批评就有滑向简单、粗暴的说教式批评的危险。不得不指出的是，或许是为了更清晰地表明自己的理论立场，聂教授常常刻意贬抑文学的审美特性：“我们通过阅读和理解文学作品而得到教诲的过程，就是审美的过程，教诲的实现就是审美的结果，因此，教诲是文学的本质属性，

而审美只是我们阅读文学作品、感受文学作品、理解文学作品而获取教诲的一种方式，一种手段、媒介。”将受教诲直接等同于审美，作为一种论争策略，这种矫枉过正的论断可以理解，但从理论的长远建设来看，则必须要有更为详尽有力的论证。

（三）文学伦理学批评与道德批评

文学伦理学批评很容易让人联想到道德批评。中西方都曾有过强大的道德批评传统，对文学人物评头论足，进行善恶归类；对文学作品的趣味、道德、价值分析考量，做出是非判断，堪称最古老的一种批评方式。在当下的文学批评中，道德批评虽然表面上不如一些时髦理论那么引人注目，但实际仍然是最为基本的一种文学批评方法。作为一种旨在创新的理论，文学伦理学批评与道德批评到底有什么不同？聂珍钊认为，二者的主要区别在于，第一，道德批评往往以今天的道德标准对历史上的文学作品进行好坏判断，文学伦理学批评主张回到历史情境，回到历史的伦理现场，站在当时的伦理立场上解读和阐释文学作品，“文学伦理学批评同道德批评的根本区别就在于它的历史客观性”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语》14）。第二，道德批评关注的是文学作品中人物的行动本身和行动的结果，重在在行动及结果进行善恶评判，文学伦理学批评则以历史主义的立场看待文学作品中表现的伦理关系，重在分析、阐释和理解，“文学伦理学批评主要运用辩证的历史唯物主义的方法研究文学中的道德现象，倾向于在历史的客观环境中去分析、理解和阐释文学中的各种道德现象”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评与道德批评》16）。第三，道德批评的目的是以文学阐释道德，文学伦理学批评则是对文学作品价值的发现。在道德批评中，“批评家个人的道德立场、时代的道德标准就必然影响到对文学的评价，文学往往被用来诠释批评家的道德观念……这种批评在很大程度上不是批评家阐释文学，而成了文学阐释批评家，即文学阐释批评家所代表的一个时代的道德观念。”而文学伦理学批评则强调，“文学伦理学批评目的在于通过对文学文本的阅读与分析，从而获取新的认识与理解。……文学伦理学批评的价值不在于维护已经形成的观点或看法，而在于努力获取新的认识和理解以超越前人，从而把前人的批评向前推动。”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语》22）。

聂教授还通过对哈姆雷特延宕的具体分析，展示了文学伦理学与道德批评的区别。聂教授运用文学伦理学批评方法得出新解：延宕是由于哈姆雷特无法解决的一系列伦理问题引起的。所谓“To be or not to be”，并非如传统理论所认为的那样源于生与死的思考，而是哈姆雷特面临两难伦理选择时关于行动对与错的追问，这个两难选择就是：为亲生父亲复仇是其伦理责任与义务，而一旦复仇则违犯了弑君与弑继父的伦理禁忌。传统的道德批评多批评哈姆雷特性格优柔寡断，责备他对奥菲莉娅薄情，文学伦理学批评则通过细究延宕背后的原因，发现他的毁灭是在崇尚理性的文艺复兴时代，因不能

用理性解决自身遭遇的伦理问题而导致的悲剧。

应当说, 聂教授对文学伦理学批评的正面立论是清晰的、自洽的, 但对道德批评的批判则失之过苛。聂教授认为道德批评的一大缺失, 是以己度人, 即批评者往往以自己或时代的道德标准对历史上的文学作品进行评判, 完全无视作品产生的历史情境, 这诚然是庸俗的、教条的道德批评者的痼疾, 但无庸讳言, 强调以历史的眼光对文学作品进行道德批评的也不乏其例。如孟子“知人论世”说, 就特别强调“颂其诗, 读其书”, 要“知其人, 论其世。”陈寅恪主张研究古代学说, 应具“同情之了解”, 虽是讲治学方法, 但也未尝不可移诸于文学研究。马克思指出, 在对文学作品进行评价时, 既要坚持美学的原则, 也要坚持历史的原则。至于当代文学批评流派中的知识考古学、新历史主义等, 更是特别强调历史化的研究方法。

不仅如此, 以自己或时代的道德标准对历史上的文学作品进行评判, 也并不能一概否定。当聂教授强调文学伦理学批评的目的在于“通过对文学文本的阅读与分析, 从而获取新的认识与理解”时, 其所谓“新的认识与理解”, 其实正有赖于批评者基于自身或当下的道德标准对文学作品的评判。在《文学经典的阅读、阐释和价值发现》一文中, 聂教授认为, 一部文学作品之所以能够成为经典, 主要原因在于它能够不断地为我们提供伦理阐释的可能。比如《老人与海》, 在海明威的时代, 人类奉行征服自然和战胜自然的传统观念, 因此评论家从中概括出一种“硬汉”哲学; 而在生态失衡的今天, 我们又完全可以把圣地亚哥解读为生态破坏者。显然, 对《老人与海》的生态解读, 所依据的正是现时代的道德标准。更不要说, 当我们面对的不是历史上的文学作品, 而是当代文学作品时, 我们当然只能依据当下的道德标准进行判断。

由此可见, 依据上述三条原则, 并不能将文学伦理学批评和道德批评完全区分开来。这说明, 如何进一步明确与相关批评理论在方法论上的区别, 仍然是文学伦理学批评必须要解决的一个问题。

值得注意的是, 有学者已经对相关问题进行过思考。王鸿生认为, 作为两种完全不同的批评方法, 当代伦理批评与传统道德批评的主要区别是: “其一, 批评依据不同。传统道德批评的价值尺度是理性的、绝对的、一元性给定的, 伦理批评的价值尺度则是在经验(先验)与超验悖论式偶在的相关性中自由抉择的; 其二, 批评方式不同。传统道德批评是说教的、权威的、单一外指向的, 故不能出示道德困境, 伦理批评则是对话的、抗拒权力的、自我相关的, 故只能在道德与否的伦理追问中达成道德的自觉, 即使追问得不到终极解答, 但追问本身已显示批评的德性; 其三, 批评视域不同。传统道德批评无意也无力介入文本结构或审美形式, 伦理批评不但要深入话语层面考察其伦理意义, 还要对语构、语式、语象、语调、语气等进行修辞伦理的探讨; 其四, 批评语态及其效果不同。传统道德批评注重‘应该’, 语态往

往是断言式的、谴责的或颂扬的、威胁的和道德归罪的,伦理批评注重‘可能’,所以语态是开放的、质疑的或反省的、分析和道德触动的”(王鸿生 43-50)。张杰、刘增美认为:“文学伦理学批评应该是一种敞开式的对话批评。它不是在对读者进行道德说教,而是不断提出问题,引发读者思考,与读者对话”(张杰,刘增美 137)。诸如此类的思考和建议,值得重视。

四、一种展望

在当下中国学界,还有一种理论话语与文学伦理学批评境况不同但问题相似,那就是文艺理论界童庆炳倡导的“文化诗学”。目前,“文化诗学”已经形成了比较明晰的理论观点和操作方案,实践效果也得到了学界肯定。这一话语的建构也贯穿着非常明确的问题意识,特别体现出中国文化特有的整体性思维方式,尤其是它强烈的本土性和现实性,传达出鲜明的中国特色。但是,“文化诗学”虽志在发出独特的声音,影响仍然局限于中国学界的中国文学研究当中,缺少更大范围的回应,更缺少与国际学界的互动交流,“中国视角”的作用还未能充分发挥出来。与之相比,文学伦理学批评走向世界的脚步显然更为迅速和顺利,已经引起国际学界的高度关注,让更多的国际同行见识了“中国立场”。但是两种话语的建构与传播分别局限于外国文学研究和文艺学研究两个相对固定的学术共同体之内,与共同体之外的学科交流不多,这在很大程度上影响了国内学界对两种话语的认可和接受。

当我们跳出学科壁垒,就会发现文学伦理学批评的建构者不是“一个人在战斗”,还有当代文学界与理论界的诸多学者在为伦理批评摇旗呐喊。¹他们在一些具体问题上的观点不尽相同,但同样怀着对现实的深刻关切,同样对文学批评中的伦理缺位有着痛彻忧虑,同样渴望重振对价值问题的思考。文学伦理学批评在第二阶段的建构中特别注重与国外学界的交流对话,但与国内学界其它学科的沟通似乎显得相对薄弱了一些。实际上,国内学者出于相同的语境和背景,会对文学伦理学批评的“问题意识”抱有更多理解之同情,因此也就更能看到这一话语的价值。换个角度讲,在文学伦理学批评目前形成的学术共同体中,清一色都是研究外国文学的学者,而一种批评话语的建构需要有更为多元丰富的学术力量,也需要接受更多学科的检验。与其在自己的园地里各自为战,不如为了共同的目标联合起来。窃以为,加强与同道者的切磋琢磨、激荡交流,借鉴吸收他们观点中的合理成分,共同打造中国独特的文学批评话语,是文学伦理学批评开拓更大空间的必由之路。

在“全球化”时代,任何批评话语的建构都不可能是全新的创造,而必然是各种话语资源与时代语境相结合的产物。文学伦理学批评建构者怀着深厚的现实关切,强烈的社会责任感打造这一理论话语,筚路蓝缕,试图为中国文学批评开新立派。有理由相信,这一理论将越走越好,发出越来越强的“中

1 除上文提到的王鸿生先生外,还有专注于叙事伦理研究的伍茂国先生等。

国声音”。

Works Cited

段俊晖：“伦理批评的2种范式——列维纳斯的伦理形而上学与哈贝马斯的话语伦理学”，《重庆工学院学报（社会科学版）》，4（2008）：87-90。

[Duan Junhui. “Two Paradigms of Ethical Criticism: On Levinas’ Ethical Metaphysics and Habermas’ Discourse Ethics.” *Journal of Chongqing Institute of Technology (Social Science)* 4 (2008) : 87-90.]

黄开红：“关于文学伦理学批评——访聂珍钊教授”，《学习与探索》5（2006）：53-61。

[Nie Zhenzhao and Huang Kaihong. “On Literary Ethics Criticism—An Interview with Prof. Nie Zhenzhao.” *Study and Exploration* 5 (2006): 53-61.]

Jane Adamson, et al. ed. *Renegotiating Ethics in Literature, Philosophy, and Theory*. Cambridge U P, 1998. 1-17.

聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：文学批评方法新探索”，《外国文学研究》5（2004）：16-24+169。

[Nie Zhenzhao. “Ethical Approach to Literary Studies: A New Perspective.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2004): 16-24+169.]

—：“文学伦理学批评与道德批评”，《外国文学研究》2（2006）：8-17。

[—.“On Ethical Literary Criticism and Moral Criticism.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 2 (2006): 8-17.]

—：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论和术语”，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。

[—.“Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2010): 12-22.]

—：“序言：文学伦理学批评”，《文学伦理学批评：文学研究方法新探讨》，武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2006年，第1页。

[—.“Preface: Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Ethical Literary Criticism: A New Perspective*. Wuhan: Huazhong Normal University Press, 2006:1.]

—：“勤学求真，创新求是：漫谈我的治学之路”，《当代外语研究》11（2014）1-7+80。

[—.“Study for Truth, Innovate for Truth: A Random Talk about My Way of Learning.” *Contemporary Foreign Languages Studies* 11 (2014) 1-7+80.]

—：“谈文学的伦理价值和教诲功能”，《文学评论》2（2014）：13-15。

[—.“On the Ethical Value and Teaching Function of Literature.” *Literary Review* 2 (2014) : 13-15.]

—：“脑文本和脑概念的形成机制与文学伦理学批评”，《外国文学研究》5（2017）：27-34。

[—.“The Forming Mechanism of Brain Text and Brain Concept in Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2017): 27-34.]

王鸿生：“文化批评：政治和伦理”，《当代作家评论》6（2002）：43-50。

[Wang Hongsheng. “Cultural Criticism: Political and Ethical Dimension.” *Contemporary Writers Review* 6 (2002): 43-50.]

Wayne C. Booth, *The Company We Keep: An Ethics of Fiction* (Berkeley and London: U of California P,

1988), P7-8.

夏延华、乔治斯·梵·邓·阿贝勒：“让批评理论与世界进程同步”，《外国文学研究》6 (2015): 170-172。

[Xia Yanhua , Georges Van Den Abbeele .“Synchronize Theory with the Course of the World: A Synopsis of the 1st UCI Critical Theory Conference.”*Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2015): 170-172.]

杨革新：“《艺术与伦理批评》：美国伦理批评的新动向”，《外国文学研究》6 (2011): 32-35。

[Yang Gexin. “Art and Ethical Criticism: A New Direction in American Ethical Criticism.”*Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2011): 32-35.]

张杰、刘增美：“文学伦理学批评的多元主义阐释”，《外国文学研究》5 (2007):137-143。

[Zhang Jie,Liu Zengmei. “Interpretation of the Ethical Literary Criticism from the Perspective of Pluralism.”*Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2007): 137-143.]

张连桥：“范式与话语：文学伦理学批评在中国的兴起与影响”，《文学理论前沿》(第十七辑): 148-169。

[Zhang Lianqiao. “Paradigms and Discourses: The Origination and Development of Ethical Literary Criticism in China.”*Frontiers of Literary Theory* (No.17): 148-169.]

责任编辑：张连桥

“如画”趣味背后的伦理缺场: 从吉尔平的《怀河见闻》谈起

The Taste of Picturesque and its Ethical Absence as Reflected in William Gilpin's *Observations on the River Wye*

何 畅 (He Chang)

内容摘要: 自 18 世纪后期到维多利亚时期, “如画”美学日渐发展成为一种地道的“英式”趣味。对于上述现象, 威廉·吉尔平所著的《怀河见闻》等八部游记功不可没。然而, 以罗斯金为代表的文化批评家却将其定义为“无情”的趣味, 这不免让人困惑。事实上, 如果我们回到“如画”趣味产生的伦理环境, 就会发现其背后的伦理缺场。不可否认, “如画”趣味迎合了英国中产阶级以美学方式摆脱欧洲贵族古典主义传统, 区分其他社会群体的情感需求。上述美学趣味的演变不仅再现了 18 世纪英国社会伦理环境的变迁, 而且折射了中产阶级构建适应自身经济发展的伦理体系的尝试。然而, 它有意拉开观景者与风景或风景中的人的伦理距离, 独独青睐破败不堪的废墟、衰败贫穷的人, 甚至“无人的风景”, 这不免折射出其阶级排他性和观景者的伦理缺场。因此, 从文学伦理学批评的观点来看, 以吉尔平为代表的“如画”趣味不仅缺乏道德情感, 而且其背后的伦理缺场有违“趣味”概念本身的伦理意识。

关键词: 威廉·吉尔平; 《怀河见闻》; 约翰·罗斯金; “如画”趣味; 伦理环境; 伦理缺场

作者简介: 何畅, 文学博士, 浙江工业大学教授, 主要从事英美文学研究。本文为作者主持的 2016 年度国家社会科学基金一般项目的“英国文学中的‘趣味’理论变迁研究”【16BWW011】阶段性研究成果。

Title: The Taste of Picturesque and its Ethical Absence as Reflected in William Gilpin's *Observations on the River Wye*

Abstract: The period from the late 18th century to the Victorian age witnesses the thriving of the Picturesque as an authentic taste of “Englishness”. While William Gilpin justified the Picturesque as a universal way of landscape appreciation in his 8 travel books, particularly in *Observations on the River Wye*, other cultural critics such as John Ruskin perplexingly regarded it as a “heartless” taste. If the ethical environment of the Picturesque is taken into consideration, readers will

surely discover its absence of ethics. On the one hand, with the popularity of the Picturesque, English middle class successfully frees itself from the European aristocratic tradition of classicism, and constructs its own cultural confidence by making itself distinct from other social groups. It is undeniable that the evolution of the taste of Picturesque not only represents the transition of social ethical environment in 18th century England, but also reflects the middle class's attempt to reconstruct a new ethical system to fill in with its economic development. On the other hand, it deliberately increases the ethical distance between viewers and landscape, as well as characters within the landscape. In addition, the Picturesque prefers shattered ruins, decaying figures, even "landscapes without people", which, to some extent, mirrors its function of social distinction and the absence of ethics. From the perspective of the ethical literary criticism, Gilpin's "picturesque" lacks moral sense and goes against the ethical consciousness embedded within the concept of "taste".

Key words: William Gilpin; *Observations on the River Wye*; John Ruskin; the taste of Picturesque; ethical environment; the ethical absence

Author: He Chang, Ph. D., is Professor of the School of Foreign Languages, Zhejiang University of Technology (Hangzhou 310023, China), and her research area is English literature (Email: rabbithc@hotmail.com).

戴维·沃特金 (David Watkin) 曾指出, 从 18 世纪后半期到维多利亚时期, “如画”美学 (the Picturesque) 已经演变为一种普遍的观看模式 (204-216)。更重要的是, 从 1782 年到 1809 年, 威廉·吉尔平 (William Gilpin) 相继出版了 8 本有关如何欣赏“如画”美的游记。可以说, 这一系列以《怀河见闻》为代表的游记¹对普及“如画”趣味起到了关键作用。对此, 安·伯明翰 (Ann Bermingham) 评价道: “‘如画游’迎合了中产阶级的经济能力和道德情感。

1 从 1782 年到 1809 年, 威廉·吉尔平相继出版了 8 本游记, 内容皆为如何以“如画”原则来欣赏英国本土的景色。具体书目如下: *Observations on the River Wye, and several parts of South Wales, etc. relative chiefly to picturesque beauty; made in the summer of the year 1770* (1782); *Observations, relative chiefly to picturesque beauty, made in the year 1772, on several parts of England; particularly the mountains, and lakes of Cumberland, and Westmoreland* (1786); *Observations, relative chiefly to picturesque beauty, made in the year 1776, on several parts of Great Britain; particularly the High-lands of Scotland* (1789); *Remarks on forest scenery, and other woodland views (relative chiefly to picturesque beauty), illustrated by the scenes of New Forest in Hampshire* (1791); *Three essays: on picturesque beauty; on picturesque travel; and on sketching landscape: to which is added a poem, On landscape painting* (1792); *Observations on the Western parts of England, relative chiefly to picturesque beauty; to which are added a few remarks on the picturesque beauties of the Isle of Wight* (1798); *Observations on the coasts of Hampshire, Sussex, and Kent, relative chiefly to picturesque beauty, relative to Picturesque Beauty, made in the Summer of the year 1774* (1804); *Observations on several parts of the counties of Cambridge, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. Also on several parts of North Wales, relative to picturesque beauty in two tours, the former made in 1769, the latter in 1773* (1809)。

作为‘如画游’的游客，他们共享这一情感或风尚，就像人们常说的那样。因为‘如画’原则在美化他们的观景方式的同时，也最终让他们的高雅趣味得以认可”（86）。有意思的是，维多利亚时期的文化批评家约翰·罗斯金（John Ruskin）却将“如画”趣味定义为“无情的”（heartless）趣味。那么，究竟罗斯金为何会做此感慨呢？我们又该如何来理解“如画”趣味呢？

遗憾的是，上述问题并未进入大多数“如画”研究者的视野。究其原因，关于“如画”美学的研究基本以英国旅行者的海外游记为主，聚焦于该美学与帝国话语以及殖民叙事之间的关系，英国内陆的“如画游”反而没有得到应有的重视，遑论其伦理维度。例如，彼得·休姆（Peter Hulme）与蒂姆·扬思（Tim Youngs）主编的《剑桥文学指南：旅行文学》（*The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*）对“如画游”的历史、政治以及文化成因都有简单涉及，却并未探讨其背后的伦理意识。同样，国内学者张德明的学术专著《从岛国到帝国——近现代英国旅行文学研究》是“国内第一部有关近代英国旅行文学研究的学术专著”（刘敏华 179），该书以大量篇幅介绍了旅行主体在不同地理和文化空间中对自我的建构，唯独对主体的伦理建构只字未提。正因为如此，“如画”趣味背后的伦理缺场并未引起学界的足够重视，而罗斯金的质疑也未得到学界的充分回应。事实上，如果我们回到“如画”趣味所产生的伦理环境（ethical environment），则不难理解罗斯金的“无情论”。正如文学伦理学批评所指出的那样，“不同历史时期的文学有其固定的属于特定历史时期的伦理环境与伦理语境，对文学的理解必须让文学回归属于它的伦理环境与伦理语境，这是理解文学的一个前提”（聂珍钊 14）。因此，我们不妨紧随吉尔平的步履，先探寻“如画”美学所产生的历史现场。

一、“如画”趣味产生的伦理环境

众所周知，“如画”美学来自十七世纪英国贵族的海外游历风尚。根据爱德蒙·伯克（Edmund Burke）在《关于优美与壮美概念起源的哲学探索》（*A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, 1759）一书中的分类，海外游历者大致遵循“优美”（the Beautiful）与“崇高”（the Sublime）两种风格来欣赏景色。到18世纪中后期，吉尔平首次提出“如画”一词来调和“优美”和“崇高”之间的二元对立，并指出“如画”并无特殊之处，它指的是特别适合“入画”的事物（Gilpin, *Three Essays* 36），而“粗糙”（roughness）的事物则尤其适宜“入画”（Gilpin, *Three Essays* 6）。笔者认为，在上述“粗糙”论的推动之下，“如画”美学逐渐发展成为有别于欧洲古典贵族美学的英式趣味，并微妙地映射出英国社会伦理环境的变迁。

那么，为什么“粗糙”论意在扬弃欧洲古典贵族趣味呢？我们先来看看吉尔平的解释。在他看来，能够体现出“粗糙”效果的笔触往往是“自由”且“大胆”的。对此，他这样说道：

当笔触不受任何限制时，我们称它为自由的笔触，而“大胆”则指在兼顾整体效果的同时，个体要优于整体。这正是天才的简洁之处。有时候，笔触是自由的，却只表达线条本身的轻率，并无任何“线”外之意。这样的笔触，并不“大胆”，却分外“鲁莽”。(Gilpin, *Three Essays* 17)

值得注意的是，吉尔平在此处强调了“不受束缚”的“自由”的个体，并坦言只有“粗糙”的笔法才能给予个体最自由发挥的空间 (Gilpin, *Three Essays* 17)。其次，他认为，只有再现粗糙质感的事物才能体现审美客体的多样性和独特性。一言以蔽之，无论是审美主体还是审美客体，要实现吉尔平所说的“如画”风格，他(它)们必须“独特”、“大胆”，且有别于古典美学的“平滑”与“整一”。

在《怀河见闻》¹中，吉尔平集中再现了上述观点。在其引导下，我们沿着怀河，时而漫步，时而搭船，又时而驻足观望。走走停停之际，屡次听到其对“多变性”和“不规则性”的强调。例如，在将怀河两岸的风景形容为“连续不断的‘如画’美景”时，他指出这种“美”来自以下两个方面：巍峨高耸的河岸以及迷宫般蜿蜒曲折的河道。尤其是后者的“不规则性”，赋予了景色无穷的变化，令怀河风光别具特色(17-19)。同样，在描述怀河边的教堂时，他不由得感叹自然的鬼斧神工，并讲道：“我们仰慕自然的无穷变化。她的每一处变化造就了凹凸有致地貌，并定义了森罗万象的景色”(34)。有鉴于此，吉尔平建议画家们切莫因循古典美学的条框束缚，而应走向自然，模仿自然，因为只有“千变万化”的自然才会帮助他形成独属于自己的风格(34-35)。上述建议同样出现在其对“如画之眼”(the picturesque eye)的论述中。在形容何为“如画之眼”时，他讲道：“如画之眼”厌恶人工的艺术，青睐自然。因为人工的艺术充斥着“规则”，或者我们称它为“平滑”，而在自然中，却不乏“不规则”，或者说“粗糙”的形象 (Gilpin, *Three Essays* 26-27)。这种对“变化”、“不规则性”的推崇显然有别于以柏拉图和奥古斯丁为代表的古典美学观，后者认为，美应讲究秩序、对称、均匀感、明晰度与整一性。

事实上，从17世纪到18世纪期间，这种对古典美学趣味的修正可以在多位批评家的笔下得以印证。例如，在《伊壁鸠鲁的花园：关于造园艺术》(“Upon the Garden of Epicurus; or of Gardening in the Year of 1685”)一文中，威廉·坦普尔爵士(Sir. William Temple)提到了中国园林中的“无序美”(Sharawadgi)原则，并讲道：

1 本文相关引文均出自 William Gilpin, *Observations on the River Wye, and Several Parts of South Wales, & Relatively Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty; Made in the Summer of the Year 1770*. 2nd ed. (London: printed for R. Blamire, 1792), 以下标出页码，不再一一说明。译文由笔者自译。

就我所谈到的布局最好的花园来看，它们往往是形态规整的。然而，就我所知，可能还存在着形态完全不规整的花园，它们的美远胜我谈到的花园。……对于这类美，尽管我们尚无了解，但中国人却有一个专门词汇来描述它。当他们极目望去，被此种美打动时，他们就说 *Sharawadgi* 很好，很让人喜爱，或者发出诸如此类的赞叹。事实上，任何看到过印度长袍、最精美的屏风或瓷器上的图案的人，都会体会到这种无序之美。（Temple 29-30）

尽管关于“*Sharawadgi*”的词源学考证到目前为止都尚无定论，但可以定论的是该词指代的是一种不规则的，无秩序感的美。随后，艾迪生（Joseph Addison）、蒲伯（Alexander Pope）、沃尔普尔（Horace Walpole）等人分别论及了该词所代表的不规范、不对称之美。此处，我们暂且不论伯克是否受“*Sharawadgi*”一词的启发，但不可否认的是正是他从审美主体的心理体验出发，进一步拓展了上述“无序之美”。对此，博尔顿（James T. Boulton）指出，对“美”的经验主义探索以及对感官“相异性”的重视使得伯克重新思考从中世纪以来的古典美学传统，并将“恐惧”、“无限性”、“巨大”、“含混”、“无序”、“突兀”、“间断”等概念引入到对“美”的探讨之中（ivii）。因此，伯克对古典主义美学的象征性“反抗”使他更像一位“浪漫主义者”（Boulton ivi）。更重要的是，这种浪漫的、与理性大唱反调且诉诸个人情感的“反抗”预示了一种毫无顾忌的、坚定不移的个人主义伦理原则。

有鉴于此，与其说吉尔平与乔舒亚·雷诺兹的“二等趣味”之争是美学之争，不如说它更是一次伦理事件。1791年，吉尔平出版《三篇论文》一书，在《论如画美》的末尾，附有其与雷诺兹的通信。根据吉尔平的说法，由于“如画”原则这一话题是全新的，因此他渴望在出版前得到雷诺兹的肯定。后者在当时为皇家美术学院的创办人及院长，其艺术创作强调古典主义传统。然而，让吉尔平失望的是，雷诺兹并未对“如画”一说予以赞赏，反而表示该词不足以形容荷马和弥尔顿之类恢弘的风格，并将其归为二等绘画趣味（*Gilpin, Three Essays* 37）。针对雷诺兹的评论，吉尔平不无反讽地讲道：

由于所知甚少，我自然无法尽享罗马画派的恢弘之美，但至少我能领会您所说的“色彩的一致性”和“线条的延续性”，以及它们所产生的雄伟效果。事实上，当谈及“多样性”时，我并不想证明您所说的恢弘之美是错误的。（*Gilpin, Three Essays* 37）

难道对于雷诺兹所说的米开朗基罗和拉斐尔等古典画家，吉尔平真的所知甚少吗？答案不言自明。同年，在与威廉·洛克（William Lock）的通

信中，吉尔平再次强调：“让那些古典美的仰慕者追寻自己的道路，我们只希望他们能让我们安静地拥有我们自己的乐趣” (Gilpin, *Three Essays* iii)。可见，吉尔平决心在古典美学之外，建立一个新的美学体系以适应“自由”的，“不受束缚”的美学个体 (Gilpin, *Three Essays* 17)。我们知道，古典主义艺术规范植根于启蒙运动注重理性的伦理大环境中，因此，吉尔平对“自由个体”的反复强调实际上彰显了社会伦理环境从理性至上到注重感知和情感的转变。

从坦普尔爵士到伯克，再到吉尔平，英国社会美学趣味的演变充分说明了一个事实，即“严守理性规则，紧傍古典范例、绝对标准的趣味开始解体。18世纪的文坛领袖们开始连篇累牍地向读者证明：关于美的认知应该是主观性的，个人化的” (安德鲁斯 47)。随后，普莱斯和赖特的“如画”之争，以及前者对布朗式园林的批判¹更是将崇尚个体感受的“如画”趣味推至高潮。更重要的是，上述美学趣味的演变于无形中折射出社会经济伦理环境的变迁。从18世纪中后期到19世纪，随着经济自由主义的甚嚣尘上，英国社会出现了大量吉尔平所说的“不受束缚”的“自由”个体，他们有效推进了英国的工业化和资本化过程，并促进了中产阶级的发展。从这个角度讲，“如画”趣味与英国中产阶级所推崇的道德情感主义伦理原则 (Moral Sentimentalism) 相契合。我们知道，以沙夫茨伯利、亚当·斯密、大卫·休谟等人为代表的道德情感主义认为道德起源于个体的感受与情感，而不是理性，这恰恰满足了该阶层摆脱理性传统，建构新型伦理道德原则以适应资本主义经济发展的需求。正因为如此，安·伯明翰将“如画”趣味贴上了“道德情感”的标签。然而，以情感判断取代理性判断不仅失之于主观化和简单化，而且遮蔽了的伦理行为和伦理选择的复杂性。因此，如果我们将“不受束缚”的“自由”个体以文学伦理学批评的视角来加以审视，就会发现他（它）们不仅是张扬个体情感的美学主体，更是身处社会伦理变迁之中的伦理主体。换言之，他（它）们所采取的观景方式应该体现观景者的道德立场和伦理选择。有鉴于此，罗斯金的“无情论”可谓一语中的，道破了“如画”趣味背后的伦理缺场，并折射出19世纪中后期以来英国社会对道德情感主义伦理原则的反思。

二、道是有情却“无情”的“如画”趣味

事实上，罗斯金对“如画”趣味的批评并非一家之辞。由于吉尔平所推

1 普莱斯对布朗式园林的批判主要在于认为其没有考虑到自然的多样性和地理空间的独特性。因此，他写道：“在一个艺术如此发达的时代和国家，这样一种单一的设计竟然被广泛接纳，就连对独特性的热爱也都没能遏止这种均衡所有差异，使所有地方都一个模样，都变得平淡而枯燥乏味的方法”。详见 W.J.T. 米切尔编著：《风景与权力》，杨丽 万信琼译（南京：译林出版社，2014年），第342页。

崇的“如画”原则具有很强的局限性，它早已被同时代人所诟病¹。但是，罗斯金是第一个从伦理角度予以反思的批评家。在他看来，“如画”美学分为两类，一类为“高贵的如画”，另一类则为“次等的如画”。前者是高境界的艺术形式，它来自于博大的同情心（*Ruskin, Modern Painters Vol.4 9-10*）；后者则聚焦于支离破碎的岩石、铺满茅草的屋顶，以及破败凋零的废墟，因此它倾向于鼓励艺术家和欣赏者以悲伤之物为乐，以追求独特的线条或色彩为目标，反倒忽视了景色中的人，更勿论对景色中的人怀有恻隐之心。对此，罗斯金如此评价道：那些追逐“如画之美”的猎人之所以会变成“无情”的怪物，究其原因，还是因为艺术家思想狭隘或自私，因此“无法对他人（物）产生敏锐的同情心”（*Modern Painters Vol.4 10*）。有见及此，罗斯金不由地感慨：“这种低级的如画理想真是格外的无情啊”（*Modern Painters Vol.4 10*）。上述感叹可谓是伦理之叹，点明了吉尔平式“无人风景”背后的真正原因。

我们不妨再次回到吉尔平的《怀河见闻》。当漫步至 Rure-dean-church 时，作者指出从怀河边远眺该教堂，看到教堂的尖顶从树林中悄然探身而出，独具一种如画美。但是，随着旅人逐渐靠近教堂，一转弯“看见教堂尖顶突然直接矗立在眼前时，那份美反倒瞬间荡然无存”（33）。同样，在形容塞文山谷的景色时，短短四段之内，作者一连用了 5 个“distance”，以此强调审美主体和客体之间必须保持一定的“距离”才能获得“如画”效果。值得注意的是，上述“距离感”固然可以使前者在再现风景时保持客观性与全局观，却同样容易导致两者间难以逾越的伦理距离（*ethical distance*）。更有甚者，在吉尔平描绘的“如画”风景中，我们鲜有看见“人”或者“人的痕迹”。例如，在谈到斯特劳德附近的乡郡时，吉尔平讲道：“以如画美学的角度来看，村民的居住和工业的入驻都让这一带的山谷受害匪浅。树林间偶见的茅草屋、磨坊或者小村庄或许能让乡村风景增色，但遍地的房屋却绝对入不了如画之眼，哪怕它们代表着一种道德情感”（12）。同样的论调也反复出现在《论如画美》和《论如画的旅行》两篇文章中。在吉尔平看来，任何人或者生物都只是作为“如画的物体”（*a picturesque object*）而存在（*Gilpin, Three Essays 45*）。也就是说，他（它）们的存在只是为了增加景色的“如画”效果，我们完全不必考虑其样貌，其蕴含的道德情感，更不用关心其境遇与感受。因此，“如画”的风景往往是“无人的风景”，即使有人，也只是为了增加“如画”效果而安置的吉卜赛人或者穷人，他们要么形象模糊，要么衣着褴褛。

1 威廉·科姆（*William Combe*）在《句法博士的如画旅行》（*Tour of Doctor Syntax in Search of the Picturesque*）中讽刺了吉尔平“如画”原则的僵化与刻板，随文所附的烛刻画由托马斯·娄兰森（*Thomas Rowlandson*）所制，也同样起到了辛辣的讽刺作用。另外，简·奥斯丁（*Jane Austen*）在《理智与情感》、《诺桑觉寺》中也对“如画”美学不无揶揄之意。

对此，布扎德（James Buzard）指出，这种为“如画”而“如画”的倾向，只顾专注于“不规则的，有别于古典主义的景观、废墟，或看上去衰败不堪的人”，却将“视觉的考量完全孤立于历史、政治和道德之外”（46）。

细细揣摩之下，布扎德的话不免有失偏颇。不可否认，以吉尔平为代表的“如画”趣味对风景的伦理价值视而不见，但上述伦理漠视的背后却不乏政治的动因。以华兹华斯的《肯德尔 - 温德米尔铁路计划》一文来看，上述观点不言自明。在《湖区指南》第5版发表时，华兹华斯单独将此文列为一部分，里面涵盖了他写给《晨报》（the Morning Post）主编的两封信。在信中，华兹华斯明确反对通过修建铁路来普及大众旅游，并认为这个所谓“民主化”的提议实际上害“人”不浅。除去保护湖区环境这一因素外，华兹华斯的主要顾虑在于他认为普通劳工阶层根本没有“如画”的“趣味”。因此，他这样讲道：

对浪漫景色的感知并非与生俱来，也并不一定能通过全面的教育获得。……应该说，欣赏自然景色的“趣味”无法一蹴而就。无论是对民族还是对个人而言，上述“趣味”必须逐渐形成。……当然，对没有受过教育的人而言，你显然不可能通过把他们运输到某些特殊的景点而让他们即刻获得上述“趣味”。事实上，只有长期观察和研究景色独特性和相异性的人才能从景色中领会到最大程度的愉悦。（Wordsworth 151-152）

出于上述考虑，他建议那些“手艺人、劳工，以及底阶层的小商小贩们”还不如在邻近的地方短途旅行，以免劳民伤财，却又一无所获（Wordsworth 152）。细察上述引言，这些“长期观察和研究景色独特性和相异性的人”显然不包括贵族和劳工阶层。前者习惯于古典美学所推崇的“修剪整洁的花园和尺寸适宜的美，因此感受不到自然的千变万化和幽深微妙之处”（Wordsworth 151），而后者则对所谓的“如画美”毫无感知。为了印证上述观点，华兹华斯还以农民出生的浪漫主义诗人彭斯（Robert Burns）为例。据说彭斯成名后在风景不逊于苏格兰的各地旅行，但其旅伴阿代尔博士（Dr. Adair）却发现，彭斯对这些景色无动于衷。对此，阿代尔博士不由得感慨道：“我怀疑他是否真的有‘如画’趣味”（Wordsworth 153）。透过阿代尔博士之口，华兹华斯的言外之意不言自明，即对风景的感知与一个特定等级的趣味相关。换句话说，只有掌握中产阶级美学趣味的人才能领略景观的“如画”之美。可见，“如画”趣味看似“有情”，却“无情”地将本阶级以外的“人”区隔在外，无视其他社会群体的际遇与诉求。更重要的是，虽然它体现了英国中产阶级通过“趣味”来实现社会区分，建构本阶级文化身份的情感诉求，但该诉求缺乏理性的道德判断，缺乏对社会的责任与担当，因此它绝非一种道德情感（聂珍钊 14）。正因为如此，罗斯金称它为“不健康的现代风景趣味”

(*Modern Painters* Vol.3 286)。

值得注意的是，罗斯金的判断并非凭空而就，它体现并回应了内在于英国文化批评传统中的伦理焦虑。我们知道，和罗斯金一样，约翰·穆勒、马修·阿诺德、乔治·爱略特等人都曾专题论述过“同情心”这一话题。虽然他们的讨论有不同的语境与所指，但都包含着对阶级融聚和伦理失序问题的担忧与反思。换言之，当过度的自由主义从经济层面上升到伦理层面时，个人与他人之间的冷漠，个人与社会之间的疏离则不可避免，并最终导向社会的伦理失序。正因为如此，评论家科克沙特 (A.O.J. Cockshut) 指出，维多利亚早期的作家尤其强调“情感” (14)。笔者认为，这种情感非道德情感主义者所鼓励的“自由”个体的情感，而是一种真正的道德的情感，即最基本的家庭伦理之情延伸至社会底层的芸芸众生。尤其在中产阶级获得“选举权”，并成为英国社会的“中坚力量”之后，对放任主义（自由竞争）社会的伦理反思更是刻不容缓。对此，罗斯金甚至提出道德经济学 (moral economy) 的概念，希望以此改善当时的社会经济伦理环境，而道德情感则是上述概念中不可忽视的一部分。

结语

马尔科姆·安德鲁斯在评价罗斯金的“无情论”时，曾这样讲道：在如画趣味所受到的挑战中，没有哪个能比罗斯金更为激进——他的挑战特别强调道德标准，这在 19 世纪中期的英国赢得了广泛的认可 (安德鲁斯 312)。事实上，这种广泛的认可本身就体现了维多利亚社会试图改善社会道德风尚、重建伦理秩序的迫切愿望。诚然，以吉尔平为代表的“如画”趣味通过对独特的、不规则的美的强调，凸显了个人化的感官体验，并以此与欧洲古典贵族趣味相区别。上述美学趣味的演变不仅再现了 18 世纪英国社会伦理环境的变迁，而且折射了中产阶级构建适应自身经济发展的伦理体系的尝试。但是，另一方面，“如画”趣味有意拉开观景者与风景或风景中的人的伦理距离，独独青睐破败不堪的废墟、衰败贫穷的人，甚至“无人的风景”，这不免折射出其阶级排他性和观景者的伦理缺失。更重要的是，“如画”趣味以伦理缺席的方式模糊了“趣味”本身的伦理涵义。我们知道，在西方美学发展的初期，“趣味”并不属于美学范畴，而是一个与道德相关的概念，因为人类的堕落似乎始于夏娃的一口苹果。正因为如此，《失乐园》开篇即讲到死亡和灾难来自人类“致命的一口” (Mortal taste) (Milton 3)。可见，夏娃的这口苹果不仅仅是口腹之欲，更是一种伦理选择。同样，人类投向“如画”风景的凝视也应该代表着一种基于伦理选择之上的观看方式。

Works Cited

马尔科姆·安德鲁斯：《寻找如画美：英国的风景美学与旅游，1760—1800》，张箭飞 韦照周译。

南京：译林出版社，2014年。

[Andrews, Malcolm. *The Search for the Picturesque: Landscape Aesthetics and Tourism in Britain, 1760-1800*. Trans. Zhang Jianfei and Wei Zhaozhou. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2014.]

Bermingham, Ann. "The Picturesque and Ready-to-Wear Femininity." *The Politics of the Picturesque*. Eds. Stephen Copley and Peter Garside. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.

Boulton, James T. Editor's Preface. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: U of Notre, Dame P, 1968:i-ix.

Burke, Edmund. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: U of Notre, Dame P, 1968.

Buzard, James. "The Grand Tour and after (1600-1840)." *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Eds. Peter Hulme and Tim Youngs. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Cockshut, A.O.J. "Victorian Thought." *The Victorians*. Ed. Arthur Pollard. London: Sphere, 1970.

Gilpin, William. *Observations on the River Wye, and Several Parts of South Wales, & Relatively Chiefly to Picturesque Beauty; Made in the Summer of the Year 1770*. 2nd ed. London: printed for R. Blamire, 1792.

—. *Three Essays on Picturesque Beauty, on Picturesque Travel and on Sketching Landscape: to which is added a poem, on Landscape Painting*. London: printed for R. Blamire, 1792.

刘敏华：“现代性与主体性：英国旅行文学研究新视角——评张德明教授的《从岛国到帝国——近代英国旅行文学研究》”，《文学跨学科研究》1（2017）：178-182。

[Liu Minhua. "Modernity and Subjectivity: A New Perspective on British Travel Literature: A Review of Prof. Zhang Deming's *From the Island to the Empire: Modern English Travel Literature Research*." *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 2 (2017):178-182.]

Milton, John. *Paradise Lost, edited with an Introduction and notes by John Leonard*. London: Penguin Books, 2000.

W.J.T. 米切尔编著：《风景与权力》，杨丽 万信琼译。南京：译林出版社，2014年。

[Mitchell, W.J.T. *Landscape and Power*. Trans. Yang Li and Wan Xinqiong. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2014.]

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.]

Ruskin, John. *Modern Painters*. Vol 3. London: George Allen, 1888.

—. *Modern Painters*. Vol 4. London: George Allen, 1906.

Temple, William. "Upon the Garden of Epicurus; or of Gardening in the Year of 1685", Five *Miscellaneous Essays by Sir William Temple*, Ed. Samuel Holt Monk. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1963:1-36.

Watkin, David. *The English Version: The Picturesque in Architecture, Landscape, and Garden Design*. New York: Harper and Row, 1982.

Wordsworth, William. *Guide to the Lakes, with an Introduction, Appendices and Notes Textual and Illustration by Ernest De Selincourt*. 5th ed (1835). London: Humphrey Milford, 1926.

责任编辑：张连桥

哈尼夫·库雷西小说《亲密》中的婚恋叙事及其文学伦理学反思

An Ethical Reflection on the Marriage Narrative in Hanif Kureishi's Novella, *Intimacy*

王 进 (Wang Jin)

内容摘要：作为第二代英国南亚裔作家的杰出代表，哈尼夫·库雷西始终关注当代英国南亚移民群体的家庭生活与情感世界。库雷西早期小说《亲密》，围绕男主人公杰伊的婚姻叙事，以中年男性的成长危机作为叙事焦点，聚焦叙述了本人的婚姻焦虑与伦理困惑。现阶段英美学界的库雷西批评将小说叙述者与作者本人的婚姻观念对号入座，造成道德评价谬误及其伦理越界行为。从文学伦理学批评视角来看，中年危机是作为婚恋叙事的伦理结，婚姻焦虑则是作为其伦理线，两者相互交织共同构成作为伦理事件的婚姻危机、作为伦理环境的成长叙事、以及作为伦理悖论的性别政治。

关键词：哈尼夫·库雷西；《亲密》；婚恋叙事；伦理越界；文学伦理学批评

作者简介：王进，文学博士，博士后，暨南大学外国语学院副教授，主要从事欧美文学与西方文论研究。本文为国家社科基金青年项目《米克·巴尔叙事诗学研究》（项目编号：14CWW002），广东省普通高校（人文社科类）特色创新项目（项目编号：2016WTSCX011），中央高校基本科研业务费（暨南启明星计划）项目（项目编号：15JNQM021）的阶段性研究成果。

Title: An Ethical Reflection on the Marriage Narrative in Hanif Kureishi's Novella, *Intimacy*

Abstract: As the most representative one of second generation British-South Asian novelists, Hanif Kureishi has been consistently writing about their family lives and sensational world. His early novella, *Intimacy*, centers on the male protagonist Jay and his marriage narrative, focuses on his middle-age crisis as the narrative perspective, and focalizes his narrative of marriage anxieties and ethical dilemma. Currently, Kureishi criticism in English world relates the narrator Jay's experience of marriage with the author Kureishi, and leads to a fallacy of moral judgment and a transgression of ethical criticism. Examined from the perspective of ethical literary criticism, the middle age crisis in fact serves as the ethical knot of marriage

narrative, while the marriage anxiety as its ethical line, and they interweave with each other to constitute the ethical event of marriage crisis, the ethical environment of Bildung narratives, as well as the ethical paradox of gender politics.

Key Words: Hanif Kureishi; *Intimacy*; narrative of marriage and love; ethical transgression; ethical literary criticism

Author: Wang Jin, PhD., is Associate Professor of English language and literature at the Faculty of Foreign Studies, Jinan University (Guangzhou, China 510632). He is mainly engaged in European and American literature as well as contemporary western literary theories (Email: twangjin88@jnu.edu.cn).

哈尼夫·库雷西是近年来活跃在英国文坛上的巴基斯坦裔小说家，2008年被英国《泰晤士报》评为“1945年以来五十位最伟大的英国作家之一”。库雷西对南亚移民的家庭生活与情感世界充满社会洞察力与文学同情心，评论界普遍视其为第二代英国南亚移民作家的杰出代表。迄今为止，库雷西小说《亲密》（1998年）被公认为是他本人最具阐释张力，也是最负争议的自传体小说。这部小说围绕中年男子杰伊的婚姻危机，聚焦叙述他在权衡抛妻弃儿、决意离家出走之夜的各种心理活动。自小说出版以来，始终备受诟病的不仅是种族主义的性别书写视角，而且是厌女主义的婚姻复仇伦理。不少批评家已经从爱情观念、婚姻关系、家庭责任、男性危机、厌女情节、同性恋问题等多个方面对小说男主人公杰伊的人物形象展开激烈的批判，其中不乏针对作者本人性别倾向的各种对号入座式的人身攻击。¹然而，现阶段的评论成果过度集中在对“厌女问题”的主题分析与性别批判，却没有充分关注到其婚恋叙事作为成长小说的文学伦理学内涵。因此，本文围绕库雷西小说《亲密》中的婚姻观念及其伦理建构，运用文学伦理学批评视角，重新解读男性中年危机的成长叙事，分析并探讨作为伦理事件的婚姻危机、作为伦理环境的成长叙事，以及作为伦理悖论的性别政治，并在此基础上揭示现阶段英美学界库雷西批评的道德评价谬误及其伦理越界行为。

1 库雷西小说《亲密》中的“厌女”主题饱受女性主义批评家的诟病，在当代英美文学界备受争议，理性分析的研究文献并不多见。相关文章主要参阅 Frederick Luis Aldama, “A review of Hanif Kureishi’s *Intimacy*,” *Callaloo*, 1999 (4); Connolly Cressida, “Married with Children,” *Observer*, 1999(May 10); David Sexton, “What do these authors have in common? They all hate women”[Review of *Intimacy*], *Evening Standard*, 1998 (May 14); Laura Cummings, “Charity Begins at Home”[Review of *Intimacy*], *Guardian*, 1998 (May 9); Kenneth C. Kaleta, *Hanif Kureishi: Postcolonial Storyteller*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997; Bradley W Buchanan, *Hanif Kureishi*, London: Palgrave, 2007; 王进：“哈尼夫·库雷西小说《亲密》的婚姻观念与男性叙事”，《天津外国语大学学报》，2013(1)等。

一、作为伦理事件的婚姻危机

对于成年男性而言，成功的婚姻是成长的阶梯，夫妻关系不亚于最亲密的同路人；反之，失败的婚姻则是痛苦的泥潭，两者之间又莫过于最熟悉的陌路人。然而，维系良好的婚姻关系绝非易事，而是始终伴随着自我否定与自我重构的成长过程。婚姻关系如何维系，不仅涉及到夫妻双方认知发展的方方面面，而且呈现出两者成长叙事的不同性别维度。以男主人公杰伊的心理活动为叙事焦点，库雷西小说《亲密》刻画的是一位被困于婚姻围城当中的哈姆莱特形象，叙述的则是其本人纠结于“心动”还是“行动”的成长悖论。在酝酿离家的前夜，杰伊回忆与妻子苏珊、情人妮娜和朋友维克多的段段往事，在权衡的同时反而逐渐失去行动理由和成长动机。作为“思想的巨人”，杰伊满怀内心冲动，充满中年危机的男性焦虑与七年之痒的婚姻倦怠；作为“行动的矮人”，他缺乏行动能力，满怀面对婚姻的戒备心理和面对爱情的踌躇情绪。对婚姻危机及成因，杰伊无所适从，更无法言明，反而将其简单归结于“熟而生厌”的亲密关系，并且认为“伤害一个人，其实正是一种并非出于自愿的亲密表现”（库雷西 2）。从文学伦理学批评来看，杰伊的婚姻关系是作为成长过程的伦理问题，其成长悖论表现为作为伦理事件的婚姻危机。正如聂珍钊先生指出，“在阅读文学作品的过程中，几乎所有伦理问题的产生往往都同伦理身份相关”（“文学伦理学批评” 21）。对杰伊来说，其婚恋叙事呈现三个层面的伦理内容：作为伦理线的中年危机、作为伦理结的婚姻焦虑，以及作为伦理网的身份困惑。

中年危机既是杰伊婚恋叙事的伦理线，也是其成长悖论的心理动因。正如芮渝萍指出，作为成长叙事的重要内涵，“认知发展细分为社会认知、自我认知、道德认知、情感认知、智慧认知和环境认知六个方面”（芮渝萍 34）。作为自由散漫、碌碌无为的中年业余作家，杰伊的认知发展主要纠结于社会认知的事业危机、自我认知的心理困惑，以及情感认知的角色迷惘。从事业危机来看，理应事业有成的杰伊却基本处于（半）失业状态，不得不依靠妻子苏珊作为出版商的丰厚收入维系家庭生活开支，甚至是其本人租用工作室的费用；从心理困惑来看，他也曾竭力的幻想在工作与家庭的不同空间当中发挥自己的绝对影响与主导作用，但是却不得不面对丰满理想遭遇骨感现实的尴尬境遇；从角色迷惘来看，他也曾积极担当作为丈夫和父亲的社会责任和家庭义务，但是无法回避自己日渐沦为弱势男性的中年危机，也就无法承受身份认同的心理危机。围绕认知发展的叙事视角，小说在家庭层面呈现的是“七年之痒”的婚姻现象，在社会层面反映出的是男性群体的中年危机，在叙事层面体现出的则是弱势男性的成长悖论（王进 76）。杰伊的中年危机同样造成在认知与行动这两种范式之间的成长悖论。在认知发展方面，杰伊反思觉醒成长的徒劳，自我检讨“十年里我没有获得知识上的长进，也

没有从我对答案的渴求中挣脱出来”；在行动抉择方面，他备受心理焦虑的煎熬，自我诘问“我就像一直关在笼里的老鼠。我该怎么摆脱这一切？”（库雷西 49）中年危机的伦理主线始终贯穿杰伊的婚恋叙事，认知发展的成长悖论继续延伸到他本人的婚姻焦虑。

婚姻焦虑既是杰伊婚恋叙事的伦理结，也是其成长悖论的聚焦点。杰伊与妻子苏珊相识十年、厮守六年，却愈发感受到婚姻的围城效应与自我的成长困惑。杰伊与苏珊呈现出完全不同的成长模式：前者转向内心挣扎，消极的应对工作的失意和家庭的失势，后者则转向外部奋斗，积极的追求事业的成功与家庭的圆满；在此基础上，两者表现出二元对立的婚姻关系：在弱勢的杰伊看来，苏珊成天颐指气使，只知发号施令；在强势的苏珊看来，杰伊终日无所事事，只会惟命是从。其结果，面对同样的中年危机问题，杰伊焦虑的是自己的男性属性与家庭地位，苏珊关注的则是自己的同事关系与事业发展。正如卢万尼指出，“库雷西关注的是在迷茫一代的男性和比他们更能干和更务实的女性同伴之间的各种关系”，在传统性别角色的反转关系当中“苏珊的各种能力反而变成对她进行妖魔化的原因”（Ruvani 111）。苏珊的精明能干不仅突显杰伊的中年危机问题，而且加剧双方的婚内紧张关系，并且造成后者对家庭生活的男性焦虑心理。按照杰伊的描述，他的婚姻焦虑具有三个层次的具体形式。一是失语问题：“每回面对她，我心里早就变得结结巴巴了”；二是失态感受：“我觉得我的身子在她的注视下开始萎缩”；三是失魂心理：“我从来就不知道该做什么好，很快我就会感觉自己好像被她推挤到墙上，身上像是挨了一阵乱棍”（库雷西 7）。即使是在决意离家的当天，杰伊仍然充满对苏珊的畏惧，以及对婚姻关系的焦虑，以至于“整个下午，这一整天，都在发抖”（库雷西 2）。以中年危机为伦理线，杰伊的婚姻焦虑辐射影响到伦理身份的认同困惑。

身份困惑既是杰伊婚恋叙事的伦理网，也是其成长悖论的问题域。婚姻危机不仅是作为家庭破裂的情感事件，而且也是作为身份重构的伦理事件。正如杰伊本人坦言，“我都在考虑离家出走这件事，全方位地考虑”（库雷西 3）。他的离家行为不仅涉及背弃家庭亲情的伦理成本，而且包括拥抱未知生活的道德风险。一方面，让杰伊犹豫不决的是要解除与妻子苏珊的“亲密”关系，让他惧怕不已的则是“我们将因为共同拥有一段历史而成为危险的熟人”（库雷西 2）；另一方面，让杰伊迷惑不止的是重构多种可能的“亲密”关系，他可以选择与情人妮娜的异性恋关系，或者是与维克多的同性恋关系，但是仍然让他苦恼不已的则是“该怎么和他们保持适当的距离呢？”（库雷西 93）杰伊的婚姻危机在本质上源自他对身份角色的认同困惑，并且直接影响到其对亲密关系的伦理判断。这种身份重构的伦理选择呈现出的乃是“由人性和兽性因子组合而成的斯芬克斯因子通过理性意志、自由意志和非理性意志之间的伦理冲突”（聂珍钊《文学伦理学批评导论》49）。具体而言，

理性意志压制杰伊对离家行为的心理冲动，自由意志释放他对身份重构的非分之想，非理性意志则纵容他对伦理禁忌的不良欲望。在伦理选择的具体过程，直接面临的是人性与兽性因子的伦理冲突，在伦理冲突的解决过程，重新应对的则是理性与自由意志的伦理选择。凡此种种，最终均指向作为伦理环境的成长叙事。

二、作为伦理环境的成长叙事

对于理性的夫妻关系而言，婚姻生活主要遵循的是存在主义的适度原则，因此并不存在任何绝对化的敌对关系，或是孰是孰非的道德问题，而是表现为一种相对化的磨合关系，以及家庭矛盾的伦理问题。聚焦作为伦理事件的婚姻危机，库雷西小说《亲密》大致呈现出杰伊婚恋叙事从中年危机、婚姻焦虑到身份困惑等三方面的伦理内容。因此，合理评价杰伊弃家而逃的伦理悖论，并不能简单地停留在家庭责任和义务的道德批判，而是应该延伸考察作为伦理现场的成长过程。针对伦理问题的评价方法，文学伦理学批评强调的是“进入文学的伦理环境或伦理语境中，站在当时的伦理立场上解读和阐释文学作品，寻找文学产生的客观伦理原因并解释其何以成立，分析作品中导致社会事件和影响人物命运的伦理因素，用伦理的观点对事件、人物、文学问题等给以解释，并从历史的角度作出道德评价”（“文学伦理学批评”¹⁴）。婚姻危机的伦理问题，起源于作为中年危机的成长悖论，却又回溯到作为伦理环境的成长叙事。正如杰伊本人感悟：“失败的婚姻可不是一个能被密封起来的小隔间，它会渗透到生活的方方面面，就像个漏了眼的油罐头”（库雷西 129）。从自我塑型的成长视角来看，“自我教育的社会环境大致包括职业与娱乐、人际关系（婚姻、父母、友谊）、社会责任与义务”（孙胜忠 85）。杰伊的婚姻危机既是自我教育的伦理事件，也是作为成长悖论的伦理现场。具体而言，作为伦理环境的成长叙事则大致包括家庭生活、社会关系与自我意识等三个层面。

在家庭生活层面，杰伊成长叙事的伦理环境直接表现为他与其他家庭成员的亲密与疏离问题。就父母关系而言，童年的杰伊已经过早的理解父母之间仅存忠诚义务、毫无亲密关系的婚姻危机，并且悟到：“婚姻中几乎没有快乐，它只包含着无尽的忍耐，就像做一个你所痛恨的工作”（库雷西 57）。就夫妻关系来看，杰伊与苏珊的不同成长经历造就“女强男弱”的“家庭伦理剧”：苏珊出身伦敦上流社会，工作生活有条不紊，为人处世深思熟虑；与此相反，杰伊来自伦敦郊区的中下阶层家庭，据说是长期浸淫“贫穷与虚妄的自负奇异地交织在一起”的社会环境，并且已经习惯性的精于矫饰与掩藏之能事，让他始终有能力自我安慰“我似乎已经习惯了被她推搡、受她奴役的日子，这是因为我没有搞清楚自己到底要什么，因为我习惯了逆来顺受”（库雷西 30）。从父子关系来看，杰伊作为父亲的成长叙事也是充满着自我

与他者的伦理冲突：孩子们的健康成长是夫妻关系的共同话题和家庭生活的感情基础，杰伊的父爱作为婚姻危机的自我救赎，让他总是寄托“这个世界因为他们的吵闹而重新变得生机勃勃”；与此同时，他将自己在夫妻关系中的弱者情感延伸到同样是处于弱势地位的孩子身上，其父爱始终作为与母爱相对的他者视角，以至于他狡辩“我和我的儿子需要的是同一种东西：更多的人生”（库雷西 11，15）。回到家庭关系的伦理现场，杰伊的自我教育更多的是呈现出男性权力的危机意识与焦虑问题。

在社会关系层面，杰伊作为不太成功的业余作家，其社交范围相对局限，因此他的成长叙事当中相对集中的出现了三种不同的引路人角色。其一、作为中立者形象的异性恋人妮娜。与妻子苏姗给他造成的焦虑心态相比，妮娜在杰伊眼中“是一个在城市里四处游荡的自由自在的姑娘”，更加难能可贵的是她始终保持适度的自由与适当的距离，给他带来的是“可望而不可即”的亲密欲望（库雷西 71，82）；其二、作为正人君子形象的大学同学阿西夫。与妻子苏姗给他造成的压抑情绪相似，阿西夫在杰伊眼中是“正直的、讲原则的人”，并且“拒绝一切玩世不恭的事”，更加难以忍受的是其始终对自己的信仰自鸣得意、对别人的活法指责排斥，因此给他带来的是与家里一样的“混杂着沮丧与消沉的氛围”（库雷西 39-40）；其三、作为负面人物形象的同病相怜者，其中包括离婚独居的同性恋朋友维克多、离异又复婚的肥胖中年会计、恐婚的同性恋朋友伊安。从弗洛伊德的性格结构理论来看，此三者似乎构成杰伊人格的不同境界：作为本我的伊安代表着他任性追求伦敦单身汉生活的内心世界及其快乐伦理；作为超我的会计朋友体现为他决意压抑自我、安于现状的道德世界及其至善伦理；作为超我的维克多意味着他逃避家庭责任、短暂恢复自由的权宜作派及其现实伦理。回溯社会关系的伦理现场，杰伊的自我教育展现出的是在不同引路人、同路人、以及异路人形象之间的价值观念与交流过程。

在自我意识层面上，杰伊的成长叙事则又具体表现为在心动与行动之间的伦理选择，在觉醒与顿悟之间的伦理困境，以及在成长与反成长之间的伦理冲突。就伦理选择而言，杰伊始终纠结的是自己离家出走的道德风险，以及在自由与义务之间的伦理考量。他强调倾听内心对单身自由的呼唤，虚妄放言“摧毁这一切，这样才能突围，才能逃出去”，旋即却又提出对家庭责任的重视，自我反省“你可以拿自己的人生做实验；不过，也许你不应该拿别人的人生来当实验品”（库雷西 49）；就伦理困境来说，杰伊始终困扰的是在“离开”与“留下”之间的伦理两难。是选择离开，直面这遥遥无期的煎熬，还是选择留下，默默忍受这暴桀的命运，这不仅关乎杰伊对家庭地位的顿悟，而且涉及他对男人权力的觉醒。然而，颇具荒诞意味的是：为了证明自己的男性气概、恢复应有的家庭地位，他只能考虑选择以离家出走这种最没有男子气概可言的弱者行为，即使是他本人也非常清楚“一个拥有意志、

勇气和责任心男人完全应该有不同表现”(库雷西 44)。就伦理冲突来看,杰伊同时呈现的是成长与反成长的悖论问题。他对现在的婚姻生活倍感煎熬,渴望突破现状、自由成长,认为“家庭似乎不过是一台让自由的个体饱受压抑和扭曲的机器”(库雷西 72);但是,杰伊对将来的成长道路却又迷茫无助,他始终未能跳出伦理冲突的两难困境,不但失去了心动的方向,而且失去了行动的理由,借用他的原话来说,“我必须做点什么。可是该做什么呢?最关键的是,为什么要做呢?”(库雷西 48)因此,作为伦理环境的成长叙事,实际上也是作为杰伊成长悖论的伦理现场。

三、作为伦理越界的性别政治

从文学伦理学批评视角来看,杰伊的婚姻危机是作为成长叙事的伦理困境,呈现出其本人认知发展的成长悖论,他的成长叙事则是作为婚姻危机的道德环境,表现为其本人情感发展的伦理悖论。应该说,主体认知的成长悖论作为伦理主线贯穿杰伊的婚恋叙事,道德情感的伦理悖论作为叙事主线延伸到对“亲密关系”的阅读与接受问题。围绕“亲密关系”的男性叙事空间,阿密特瓦·库玛认为“库雷西对于性和欲望的描述不是怀旧主义的,而是应对充满政治意味的当下问题”,即在后现代文化语境的爱情与婚姻观念“不再是在放荡和忠诚之间的简单选择,而是我们的选择总是受到其对立面的威胁,甚至于被牵引到相反的境地”(Amitava 159)。作为当下问题的婚恋叙事,显然已经超越了善恶二元对立的道德判断,更多的是指向多元立场共存的伦理评价。藉于此,卢万尼发现“库雷西总是刻意地制造距离感,使得对于《亲密》的阅读愈加模棱两可”:一方面,杰伊是作为“传统恶棍形象(自私、残酷和不成熟)”,充分展现“男性自私、自由欲望和逃避责任的‘传统’形式”;另一方面,他又重新包装成为“后现代文化英雄(勇敢的离家出走,无视资产阶级道德观念)”,浑身洋溢着“一种‘青春躁动’和‘新型’男性气质”(Ruvani 110,112)。阿密特瓦从当下文化语境重新界定作为道德问题的“亲密关系”,卢万尼则从当下阅读立场重新揭示作为道德现象的杰伊形象。两位评论家聚焦讨论杰伊婚姻危机的道德动因,在为其男性叙事做无罪辩护的同时反而错将其视为库雷西本人的道德立场,因此并没有关注到这种道德评判本身的不同性别立场。

针对“亲密关系”的女性叙事空间,女性主义批评家们转向到评价苏珊作为妻子的强悍形象,以及杰伊对苏珊的弱者地位。苏珊及其存在消解的是传统女性所扮演的贤妻良母刻板形象,杰伊的困境则彻底改写了传统男性在家庭生活中的男权和父权强势文化,在两者之间的反转关系挑战的则是读者群体对传统婚姻与夫妻关系的各种权力预期与道德预判。然而,从女性主义视角对杰伊的道德审判,同样延伸到对于库雷西本人的不同道德评价:一方面,吉尔伯特·穆勒等人赞许库雷西的性别书写,认为“《亲密》可以在

某种程度上被视为“后女权主义”的案列，明显不同于以往批判女权主义的批评家及作品，因为它并没有将女性运动的成功及其效果归结到当代男性”（Moore-Gilbert 179）；另一方面，塞克斯顿、阿达玛等人则又猛烈批判库雷西的性别立场，强调“亲密关系真实记录的是世纪末他者的政治无意识”，认为杰伊及其创造者库雷西本人“在本质上都是憎恨女性的”（Aldama 1097-1100）。在对杰伊夫妻关系的阅读与阐释过程，他的婚姻危机往往被直接归结为男性权力对新女性形象的道德立场，他的成长悖论被简单的解读成在善性与恶意之间的道德行为，其伦理困境则被过度的阐释为库雷西本人的写作意图。因此，在女性形象的再现问题上，现阶段的库雷西批评主要聚焦“强女弱男”的性别形象及其道德解读，始终纠结于“赞女”与“厌女”的不同阐释立场，由此而生的这种道德悖论逐渐演变成为对于作家本人道德问题的猜想与质疑。

小说《亲密》充满各种可能的开放型结尾，则又突出呈现“亲密关系”的可然叙事空间。杰伊经过全面的利弊权衡和伦理考量，但是对自己的伦理选择却仍然是语焉不详，并将其成长叙事的伦理悖论继续推向道德批判的性别政治及其叙事迷宫。正如他本人在小说结尾透露：在解决婚姻危机的成长悖论之后，“我们在一起漫步，沉浸在自己的思想里。我忘记了我们身在何处，也忘记了这是几时”；在消除道德情感的伦理困境的同时，“突然之间我感觉万事万物都如此妥帖，快乐与满足无以复加”（库雷西 153）。然而，杰伊始终没有对自己话语中“我们”作出任何形式的身份界定，由此产生出的则是多种可能性的伦理立场与阐释空间。具体而言，如果共同散步的人是苏姗，那就意味着与结发妻子破镜重圆的伦理选择；如果是妮娜，那就是与婚外异性情人不伦之实的道德问题；如果是维克多，那么就是与同性恋人觉醒意识的性取向问题；如果是他自己，那么极有可能就是其本人沦为自恋狂的人格分裂症状。针对“亲密关系”的各种猜想，虽然缘起于小说文本的可然叙事，却总是指向作家主体的叙事意图。实际上，库雷西对这种削足适履的意图阐释是极度排斥，对任何对号入座的道德批判也是不厌其烦：一方面，他从文学的阐释立场提倡理性分析，认为“某些评论家已经陷入到对《亲密》的狂怒喧闹”；另一方面，他从文学的叙事视角强调文本解读，挑明“这本书是一个文本，而不是我的生活，我不是文本”（Yousaf 25）。然而，让库雷西始料不及的是：原本理应属于小说《亲密》的阐释争议，已经衍变成为针对其本人的道德批判乃至人身攻击。

针对这种道德评价谬误的库雷西现象，苏西·托马斯强调“关于《亲密》的大部分批评阐释是政治性的，并且/或者是传记式的，而并非美学意义上的”（Susie 144）。对于杰伊形象的道德批判，以及对于库雷西的人身攻击，似乎也已经陷入到了一种伦理两难的尴尬现状，不但没有从文学叙事重新建构文学人物的道德关系与伦理环境，反而愈加衍变成为不同身份立场的性别政

治与阐释话语。究其原因，从文学人物到作者主体的错位阐释，实际上是对不同伦理语境的越界行为，“将现实的伦理评价带入了虚构的文本中，脱离了小说文本中所体现的伦理语境”（杜明业 65）。应该说，在文学的虚构世界产生的一系列道德问题，其阐释争议理应回归到其文本世界的叙事空间，而不应该超越虚构与现实的阐释边界进而延伸并介入到作者的生活世界。就小说《亲密》引发的阐释争议而言，我们不应该只是简单的对作者本人作出具体的道德评价，而是必须从文学伦理学批评视角重新建构小说人物的道德关系与小说世界的伦理秩序。因此，小说人物杰伊婚恋叙事中的多重“亲密关系”，实际上是作为小说世界伦理秩序的焦点问题，其文学伦理学批评必须回溯作为伦理环境的成长叙事，进而考察作为伦理事件的婚姻危机，在此基础上理性的分析作为小说人物成长悖论的反 / 伦理问题，合理的评价作为小说世界伦理悖论的反 / 成长问题。惟其如此，才能摆脱长期以来困扰库雷西本人及其研究者的道德批判和阐释争议，正视并纠正文学批评与阐释的伦理越界行为及其道德评价谬误，从文学世界的伦理秩序分析文学人物的道德问题，为现实世界的伦理秩序提供文学叙事的道德戒喻。

Works Cited

- Aldama, Frederick Luis. "A review of Hanif Kureishi's *Intimacy*." *Callaloo* 4 (1999):1097-1100.
- Amitava, Kumar. *Bombay London New York*. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Cressida, Connolly. "Married with Children." *Observer* (May 1999): 18.
- Cummings, Laura. "Charity Begins at Home" [Review of *Intimacy*]. *Guardian* (May 9, 1998): 9.
- 杜明业：“《别让我走》的文学伦理学解读”，《外国文学研究》3 (2014): 60-67。
- [Du, Mingye. "An Ethical Literary Analysis of *Never Let Me Go*." *Foreign Literature Studies* 3 (2014):60-67.]
- 哈尼夫·库雷西：《亲密》，王莹莹译，上海：上海文艺出版社，2007年。
- [Hanif Kureishi. *Intimacy*. Trans.Wang Yingying. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing, 2008]
- 聂珍钊：“文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语”，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。
- [Nie, Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundamentals and Terms." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2010):12-22.]
- ：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014年。
- [—, *An Introduction to Literary Ethical Criticism*. Beijing: Beijing U P, 2014.]
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart. Hanif Kureishi. Manchester: Manchester U P, 2001.
- Proctor, Minna. "Buddha Leaves Suburbia." *The Nation* (April 19, 1999):38.
- Ranasinha, Ruvani. *Writers and Their Works: Hanif Kureishi*. Plymouth: Northcote House, 2002.
- 芮渝萍、范谊：“认知发展：成长小说的叙事动力”，《外国文学研究》6 (2007): 29-36。
- [Rui,Yuping, FanYi. "Cognitive Development as Narrative Impetus in Initiation Stories." *Foreign Lit-*

erature Studies 6 (2007): 29-36.]

Sexton, David. "What do these authors have in common? They all hate women"[Review of *Intimacy*].

Evening Standard, 1998 (May 14):1.

孙胜忠：“论成长小说中的‘Bildung’”，《外国语》4 (2010): 81-87.

[Sun, Shengzhong. "On 'Bildung' in Bildungsroman." *Journal of Foreign Languages* 4(2010):81-87.]

Susie, Thomas, eds. *Hanif Kureishi*. Hampshire: Palgrave, 2005.

Yousaf, Nahem. *Hanif Kureishi's The Buddha of Suburbia*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

王进：哈尼夫·库雷西小说《亲密》的婚姻观念与男性叙事，《天津外国语大学学报》，2013(1)：76-80。

[Wang, Jin. "The Conception of Marriage and Male Narratives in Hanif Kureishi's Novel *Intimacy*."

Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University 1(2013): 76-80.]

责任编辑：杨革新

文学伦理学批评视角下儿童文学中“反抗”元素的比较研究

A Comparative Study on the Element of Revolt in Children's Literature from the Perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism

徐德荣 (Xu Derong) 赵一凡 (Zhao Yifan)

内容摘要: 中西方儿童文学创作对于“反抗”元素的表现有着较为明显的差异。本文以文学伦理学批评为视角, 试从“反抗”元素出现的频率、反抗深度及反抗结果等方面分析比较中西儿童文学作品中“反抗”元素不同的表现, 从中西方具有区别性的伦理环境、伦理价值观以及儿童观等方面探析形成这诸多不同表现的具体动因, 最终揭示“反抗”这一元素之于儿童文学的伦理构建意义与其具有批判性的道德教诲作用, 并提出中国儿童文学实现“反抗”的理念与创作突破的建议。

关键词: 文学伦理学批评; 儿童文学; “反抗”元素; 比较研究

作者简介: 徐德荣, 博士在读, 中国海洋大学副教授, 主要研究方向为儿童文学及其翻译。赵一凡, 中国海洋大学硕士研究生在读, 主要研究方向为儿童文学。本文系国家社科基金项目“儿童文学翻译的文体学研究”(14BY018)和教育部人文社科项目“外国儿童文学汉译史重大问题研究”(17YJC740031)的阶段性成果。

Title: A Comparative Study on the Element of Revolt in Children's Literature from the Perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism

Abstract: Obvious differences can be observed when it comes to the element of revolt between Chinese and western children's literature. From the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism, this paper compares these differences in revolt frequency, revolt level and revolt result, with an analysis of the reasons from ethical environment, ethical value orientation and view on children in order to work out the significance of revolt to children's literature's ethical construction, its critical education function and how breakthroughs in terms of revolt in Chinese children's literature could be made.

Key words: Ethical Literary Criticism; children's literature; the element of revolt;

comparative study

Authors: Xu Derong, PhD candidate, is Associate Professor of English at the College of Foreign Languages, Ocean University of China (Qingdao 266100, China). His main research area is children's literature and its translation. (Email:77david@163.com) **Zhao Yifan** is a Master candidate of Ocean University of China. Her research focuses on children's literature (Email:zyf_7006@qq.com).

“反抗”元素是儿童文学的应有之义。“从现实来看，在以成人作为主宰的社会精神环境中，儿童经常处于软弱无力的苦恼之中”（朱自强，《儿童文学的本质》202）。儿童在成长过程中感受到其中对于自身的不合理之处，对真善美的本能追求会使他们自然而然地渴望变革，由此而引发的反抗便成为儿童文学创作中不可或缺的元素。儿童文学中的“反抗”由于作者对“度”的把握不一，往往有离经叛道之嫌，那么既然儿童文学作为儿童成长的“教科书”，“发挥着引导儿童道德完善的作用”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》269），儿童文学又是怎样通过对儿童“反抗”的刻画帮助儿童实现道德成长的呢？文学伦理学批评认为，“人同兽相比最为本质的特征是具有伦理意识，只有当人的伦理意识出现之后，才能成为真正的人”，“伦理意识的最重要的特征就是分辨善恶的能力”（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评及其它》21）。儿童文学作者正是通过“反抗”的呈现帮助儿童读者获得“分辨善恶的能力”，从而树立“伦理意识”，成为有道德的人。可见，儿童文学中的“反抗”具有极为重要的道德教诲和伦理建构意义，而现在学界对儿童文学中“反抗”的研究极为缺乏，中西方对比的研究更暂付阙如，相关研究已是儿童文学批评研究的当务之急。

对比发现，就“反抗”元素，中西方儿童文学创作差异显著。首先，“反抗”元素在儿童文学作品中出现的频率差异明显：西方儿童文学“反抗”元素出现的频率远高于中国儿童文学。其次，作品中儿童反抗的深度不同，具体表现在反抗形式、程度、层次中，西方儿童文学中儿童的反抗诉求、反抗触及的层面比中国儿童文学体现地更加广泛、深入。此外，儿童反抗的最终结果也有明显区别：中国儿童文学更趋向于重归于好、皆大欢喜的大团圆结局，而在西方儿童文学中，儿童反抗的胜利往往更加彻底、不留余地。本文便从“反抗”元素出现的频率、反抗深度及反抗结果这三个方面分析比较中西儿童文学作品中“反抗”元素不同的表现，并借助文学伦理学批评，从伦理环境、伦理价值观以及儿童观等角度探析形成这诸多不同表现的具体动因，最终提炼、总结出“反抗”这一元素之于儿童文学的伦理构建意义、具有批判性的道德教诲作用以及中国儿童文学中的“反抗”可以怎样借鉴西方经验，以实现理念和创作的突破。

一、“反抗”的表现

1. 频率

中西方儿童文学中“反抗”元素的差异,最直观的体现便是出现频率不同,或者说作品数量的不同。

“反抗”元素鲜见于中国儿童文学作家的创作之中。有学者曾在文章中根据中国儿童文学发展的历史脉络总结出中国儿童文学作家的代际划分:第一代以叶圣陶、冰心为代表,第二代以张天翼、陈伯吹、严文井等为代表,第三代则以孙幼军、葛翠琳为代表,1950年后出生的作家如曹文轩、沈石溪、秦文君、陈丹燕、班马等为第四代作家,而在1990年后迅速崛起的第五代作家以杨红樱等为代表(汤素兰 15)。这些作家可视为中国儿童文学创作届的缩影,他们的作品一定程度上反映了中国儿童文学创作的整体取向。通过阅读上述作家的作品,不难发现他们中大部分从未创作过与“反抗”相关的作品。在众多作家作品中,勉强可以算作带有“反抗”因素的屈指可数,如班马的《六年级大逃亡》,陈丹燕的《上锁的抽屉》、《我的妈妈是精灵》等。中国作家似乎并不将儿童天然具有的反抗心理作为关注点,使得中国儿童文学从整体上缺乏对“反抗”元素的呈现。

相比之下,西方儿童文学对于儿童的反抗心理更为关注。英国儿童文学作家杰奎琳·威尔逊与杨红樱同样是擅长描写青少年儿童成长历程、成长心理的作家,但与杨红樱不同的是,她在儿童文学创作中常常对儿童反抗精神有着生动的刻画,作品中不乏对反抗精神的赞扬。如《1+1=0》中叛逆的双胞胎姐姐红宝石,这位青春期小姑娘的“反抗”在其笔下率真、自尊,比乖乖女更显可爱。童话作家罗尔德·达尔一以贯之的创作元素便是儿童的反抗精神,“反抗”元素甚至可以作为达尔童话的代表性标签。整体而言,在西方儿童文学创作史上,“反抗”这一元素从未间断出现。从马克·吐温的《汤姆·索亚历险记》到茨威格的《守不住的秘密》再到林格伦的《长袜子皮皮》,无不展现着儿童的反抗精神,这些作品将儿童这一特殊心理生动地摆在读者面前,往往让成人也深感理解。

中西方在“反抗”这一创作元素上的选择差异是由诸多原因造成的,与中西伦理环境、伦理价值观以及不同的儿童观等各方因素息息相关,本文第三部分将就此展开详细论述。

2. 深度

就中国儿童文学少量的带有“反抗”因素的小说而言,其中所表现的反抗深度也与西方儿童文学有较大差异,具体可以细分为反抗形式、反抗程度、反抗层次、反抗诉求以及诉求触及的深度等方面。

首先,从反抗形式来看,中国儿童文学作品中儿童的反抗多表现得较为缓和,与其说是“反抗”,倒不如用“淘气”来形容更贴切。作品中描绘的

情形常常是学生与学校、孩子与家长之间的表层矛盾，情节多体现了孩子的不成熟性。其反抗行为也多为中国儿童文学作家想象中儿童所“力所能及”的事情，如顶嘴、逃学、不写作业等。这类带有“反抗”因素的作品常有的模式便是通过这一系列冲突的解决，儿童与成人最终握手言和，孩子实现了“成长”，变得懂事、听话，理解学校的好意、家长的苦心。典型的例子便是班马的《六年级大逃亡》。作者在描绘逃学生李小乔顽劣的同时，笔墨较多地表现出其对学校生活的想念，还借李小乔之口为看起来可恶的老师平反，表示她们就像自己的“妈妈”（班马 201），自己“好像成了她们的儿子”（203）。相较之下，西方儿童文学作品中的反抗形式更为多样，并不局限在学校或学习生活之中，有些反抗方式甚至“大逆不道”。如在达尔的幻想小说《小乔治的神奇魔药》中，小乔治为了对付可怕的姥姥，竟然生出把姥姥炸掉的念头，而他也将自己的想法付诸实践，苦心研制给姥姥一“爆炸性打击”的魔药。西方儿童文学作品中没有中国儿童文学作品中颇有教训意味的“虚假”反抗，其描写的反抗常显夸张甚至荒诞。

其次，在反抗程度方面，中国儿童文学中儿童的反抗可概括为“撒娇式反抗”，其种种反抗常常表现为老师及家长监控之下的小打小闹。儿童文学作家在创作时，也将儿童的反抗行为严格控制在社会道德的禁锢以内。陈丹燕所著《我的妈妈是精灵》中，“我”为了阻止爸爸妈妈离婚而“学坏”，使出浑身解数来改变爸爸妈妈的想法。而无论是穿奇装异服、抽烟、说脏话，都改变不了其“向善”的本质：“我”是为了不让爸爸妈妈离婚而这么做的。小说中明确定义某些行为是“坏”的，言外之意似乎是叫小读者不要模仿。如此反抗似乎并未触及儿童内心深层的反抗动因，主人公的行为带有反面教材性质，往往难以真正引起儿童的共鸣。与中国儿童文学中的“撒娇式反抗”相对照，西方儿童文学中的反抗可总结为“造反式反抗”。这种反抗更加激烈、大胆，儿童与成人两方的斗争是势不两立的彻底敌对状态。依然以上述《小乔治的神奇魔药》为例，全书着重描写了小乔治与姥姥“斗法”的过程，最终结局是姥姥服下小乔治配制的神奇魔药，整个身体缩小直至消失在这个世界上。这种程度的反抗若是放在中国是骇人听闻的，无论如何中国作家们也不会创作出外孙谋杀姥姥的情节。然而在中国，达尔的此类作品非常受欢迎，读者并不觉得有唐突之处。由此可以推断，人类的反抗精神不分国度、生而有之，在某些情境下，反抗并非忤逆，而常常是争取个人伦理意识觉醒的斗争。

就反抗层次而言，中国儿童文学作品中的“反抗”元素触及深度较西方更浅，常常有意将儿童的叛逆行为刻画成逗乐的滑稽剧，《淘气包马小跳》系列便属此类。这类作品内容轻松、热闹，搏读者一笑后尚不能引起其对于儿童反抗行为的反思，仿佛儿童天生并不懂反抗，只是淘气而已。而西方儿童文学则关照到儿童之所以有反抗行为的内在动因，通过情节设置让读者感同身受地体会到主人公之所以会如此举措的原因，从而再极端的反抗手段也

变得顺理成章、妙趣横生。

此外，中西儿童文学创作中的差异还体现在儿童反抗的不同诉求中。中国儿童的诉求通常为呼唤父母的爱，寻求亲情的庇护，从而将自己的身心回归家庭。而西方儿童文学作品中刻画的叛逆儿童，其诉求更多的是个人独立与尊严。这可以说是创作观的不同，但归根结底是儿童观的不同。不同的儿童观是导致中西儿童文学作家创作动因的直接原因之一，加之伦理环境以及伦理价值观这两方面，三者共同造成了中西儿童对于“反抗”元素取舍的不同选择。

3. 结果

如上文所谈，中国儿童文学作品的结局大都为大团圆收尾。儿童与成人达成和解，皆大欢喜。在《上锁的抽屉》中，主人公“我”进入青春期，随着身体以及心理的逐渐成熟，渴望摆脱成人的管理与监控，建立自己的内心世界。于是她有了属于自己的小秘密，并为自己的抽屉上了锁，这便引发了父母的不安，矛盾冲突由此产生。而故事的结局自然是“我”与父母握手言和；在人生的关键时刻，“我”得到了父母的信任和保护，最终变得快乐、自信，放弃了与父母的对抗。与中国这种和谐结局形成鲜明对比的是英国童话作家达尔的作品。其小说中，儿童与成人对抗定有一方（儿童方）将另一方（成人方）彻底击垮，实现对抗的彻底胜利。在《詹姆斯与大仙桃》中，自私、残暴的海绵团姨妈与大头钉姨妈被滚动的大仙桃“扑哧一声”碾成了平平薄薄的纸片人，再也不能大吼大叫、为非作歹了；在《玛蒂尔达》中，邪恶的校长最终被吓跑，贪婪的爸爸因为罪行败露而逃之夭夭，无论是在学校还是在家里，玛蒂尔达都过上了舒心的生活。

在中国儿童文学作品中，故事的结尾通常伴随着“反抗”元素的消失。“反抗”元素只是作为情节演进的一个临时性过渡，最终的落脚点是爱与家庭。而西方儿童文学中，基于儿童反抗的胜利，反抗精神得以保留，一定程度上作为一种争取个人尊严的有效途径而传承下来。可以说在西方价值中，反抗是恒久存在的实现自我独立、完成伦理选择的必经之路。

刘绪源在谈及儿童内心“渴望冲破束缚张扬自由的天性”（刘绪源，《儿童文学的三大母题》152）的同时，也明确提出其“渴望母爱与家庭温暖”的需求，显然，中国儿童文学作家在创作中更加侧重于后一种渴望，西方儿童文学作家则更关注前者。下文将针对这两种不同倾向的产生动因展开具体分析。

二、“反抗”元素形成的动因

1. 不同的伦理环境

讨论中西儿童文学作家对于“反抗”元素的表现差异，绕不开中西迥然不同的伦理环境。所谓伦理环境，即“文学作品存在的历史空间”（聂珍钊，《文

学伦理学批评导论》256)。中西儿童文学诞生于不同的历史、文化背景之中，其差异化的伦理环境直接影响了“反抗”元素的不同。

中国两千年多年的封建文明对于中华民族性格的塑造是深刻入骨的，构成了中国文学创作独特的伦理环境。中国能够成为唯一留存的四大古文明之国，除了汉字这一表意文字的作用，还要归功于统治阶层士阶层的延续。底层人民想要改变命运上升为“士”，唯一的途径便是通过科举考试。由此，重文轻武的观念在中国人民心中根深蒂固。士阶层绝大多数是文士，观念保守，奉“君君臣臣、父父子子”为圭臬，缺乏反抗精神。中国稳固的中央集权封建专制统治延续上千年，在西方列强将其日渐衰朽的大门轰开之时，中国士阶层开始觉醒，但这种觉醒仅仅是试探性的。无论是治标不治本的洋务运动，亦或是仅维持了百日的戊戌变法，无不体现出士阶层怯懦、软弱的本性。这样的改良尝试，是生死存亡之时不得不变的无奈举措，这样温和的改良与中华民族在两千年的封建统治高压下养成的民族性格密切相关。因此，哪怕是辛亥革命最终也依然以失败而告终。士阶层并未伴随新中国的诞生而消失。新中国的领导阶层大多自小接受旧式教育，直到而立之年以后才得以接触新文化，他们的心中依然保有中国传统士阶层“修身、齐家、治国、平天下”的志向与胸怀。中华文明因士阶层的延续而得以代代相传，但同时一代代士之信仰与精神的传递也将其中庸、温和、不善反抗的性格保留至今，成为中华民族标志性的性格内核。余英时在提及中国士阶层之弊端时，谈到：“大多数的中国知识分子经不起政治权威的巨大压力”（余英时 157）。并且进一步解释道，在长期的专制统治压迫下（历代文人因言获罪的例子并不罕见，清朝的文字狱更是将其发展到登峰造极），士阶层不仅渐渐丧失了自信与自尊，而且还滋生了一种“自疑和自罪的潜意识”（158）。这种“知识分子的原罪意识”（158）便是士阶层产生怯于反抗的性格的重要原因之一。这从一定程度上解释了中国儿童文学作品中“反抗”元素的缺乏。叶圣陶的短篇童话《稻草人》便可看作是对于中国知识分子“有心无力”的一个生动暗喻。故事中的稻草人站在田野里看尽了农民遭受的种种不幸，却因自己的手脚也被紧紧捆住而无法改变什么，最终它非但没有拯救别人，自己也痛苦而又无奈地倒下了。叶圣陶本人也曾解析过稻草人象征着中国知识分子的这层意义，他形容自己笔下的稻草人是一个空有满腔同情却没有足够力量改变现状的人，它代表着中国有良心的知识分子，自己则是不自觉地写出了他们的苦恼（王泉根 92）。

相较于中国的文士，西方的统治阶层骑士阶层则大多是勇猛善战的武士。许倬云曾评价作为西方文明源头之一的希腊文明为“武勇的文化”、“侵略和扩张的文化”（许倬云 39）。希腊这种扩张好斗的精神贯穿整个西方文明的历史。从欧洲扩张时代的开始，到美洲新大陆的发现，再到近代资本主义的扩张战争，无不体现了这一点。西方文明的另一个源头两河文明也对其反抗

精神产生了深远影响。两河流域的地理位置和地貌特征显著，这一地区沙漠与海洋并存，高山与平原相望，这样对立的地理特征在一定意义上促使这一地区发展出一种“二元相悖乎互斥的思维方式”（许倬云 58）。这样一刀切的思维方式使得一方很难与相对一方融合，冲突便成为必然。“在对抗中求得胜利”（许倬云 68）的心态便成为西方文明发展进步的动因之一。纵观西方政治、思想发展的历史，从文艺复兴到新科技革命再到启蒙运动，从英国资产阶级革命到法国大革命再到美国革命，整个过程是充满斗争、反抗，是武力争取个人尊严与独立的历史。如此的反抗精神也深深注入了其文学作品中。在成人主宰的世界里，儿童常常处在弱势的一方，因此儿童文学作品中体现儿童反抗成人的情节便屡见不鲜，这与其千百年来的历史传统文化传统即伦理环境密切相关。

2. 不同的伦理价值观

基于上述的伦理环境背景，中西方各自养成了不同的民族性格。而不同的民族性格，进一步使他们形成截然相反的伦理价值取向，儿童文学创作观也因此产生分异。

中华民族的精神内核是形成于春秋时期的儒家文化。儒家文化是在历史中不断融合其他思想的文化，因此包容性便成为其典型特征之一，中华文明亦如此。早在汉代，儒家就已经开始了吸纳、融合的进程，最典型的体现便是其时“外儒内法”的治国理念，在外以儒家为门面，在内以法家为工具。在随后的朝代中，儒家思想不断地更新、吸收，佛教、道教的思想也渐渐与儒家文化的某些部分融合。中国人作为一个务实的民族，便也坦然接受了儒、佛、道三家思想的并立。对于至圣先师孔子的崇拜并不影响一个人去寺庙里烧香拜佛，也不影响其算卦、看风水。许倬云将这种包容的性格总结为“中华文化的精神所在”（许倬云 58）。因此，与西方“二元相悖乎互斥的思维方式”不同，中国人养成的是一种“二元互补、二元演化的思维方式”（许倬云 60）。中国人更倾向于包容、和谐，而非西方的斗争、反抗。由此，中国儿童文学作品中有着更多的妥协因素便也不足为奇。

除了对于包容的推崇，儒家思想对于“秩序”、“规矩”严苛的要求，也深深植入了中国人的伦理意识。儒家典籍中有专门的《孝经》，“孝”字在《论语》中见于十四章之多，儒家文化对于“孝”的推崇便可见一斑。儒家所倡导的“父为子纲”、“长者至尊”直至今天依然是中华文化的主流。中国人在大多数情况下，对于“叛逆”避之不及。在网络搜索引擎中输入“叛逆、孩子”这一词条，赫然出现“孩子叛逆怎么办？”、“十大妙招搞定叛逆孩子”等热门话题。在儿童文学产业中，“反抗”因素的市场需求几乎为零，这自然导致了儿童文学创作中反抗精神的缺失。

而在西方，反抗精神在一定程度上是其国家进步的旗帜。基督教文化作为西方精神的重要源头，其对于西方文化中的反抗精神影响深远。思想家恩

斯特·布洛赫认为：“一个读了《圣经》而不做革命之梦的人是误读《圣经》的人”（金寿铁 112；Bloch 345）。圣经中耶稣的降临，象征着希望，但这种希望不是要人们坐享其成地站在原地等待救赎，而是警醒人们勇敢地斗争，唯有如此人们才能获得自由。在新约《马太福音》第10章第34节里，耶稣说：“不要以为我来是要把和平带到人间的，我带来的不是和平，而是利剑。”在某种程度上，耶稣是一位引导人们为自己而战的英雄。《圣经》中的道德教诲对于不乏此类“反抗”因素，耶稣还曾训诫他的信众“要警醒”，这种反对既有体制的解放意识潜移默化地影响了一代代西方人的伦理价值取向。

影响西方伦理价值观的另一重要文献便是反映美国立国精神的《独立宣言》。《独立宣言》是美国人民对于殖民压迫一次铿锵有力的反抗，其内容及精神深深植入了美国人的价值观。这种反抗精神直接或间接地导致了其后的一系列平权运动，包括黑人运动、女权运动等。背靠此种精神传统，其儿童文学中难免会有更多“英雄式”的叛逆少年形象，汤姆·索亚、哈克贝利·芬便是其中的典型代表。西方当然不仅仅包括美国，但稍加观察我们会发现，所谓“西方”列国的立国纲领，其精神内核常有惊人的巧合，美国有《独立宣言》，英国有《权利法案》，法国有《人权宣言》——国虽不同，但其精神传统殊途同归。而这也恰恰使得笔者得以将中国与整个“西方”儿童文学创作做比较之研究。

3. 不同的儿童观

如同政治经济发展的历程不同，中西方发现儿童的历史及秉持的儿童观亦有所差异，而这种差异正是导致两方儿童文学创作中“反抗”元素表现不同的另一原因。

“中国儿童文学的真正发现与发展，是从‘五四’新文学运动开始的”（王泉根，《现代中国儿童文学主潮》12）。在这一时期，以周作为代表的思想家们逐渐意识到了儿童与大人的不同，他在《绍兴县教育会月刊》第三号中提出：“盖儿童者，大人之胚体，而非大人之缩影”（刘绪源，《周作人论儿童文学》38），并进而总结出儿童在人格上与成人平等，而在生理心理上又有自己的独特性等“儿童本位”观点。然而新文化运动之后，对于儿童的发现经历过一定程度的倒退，教育工具主义的儿童观曾大行其道，时至今日，功利主义的儿童观依然根深蒂固。“专为将来设想，不顾现在儿童生活的需要”，（朱自强，《经典这样告诉我们》54）这种功利主义视儿童为“成人的预备”，基于此观点创作的儿童文学是“包着薄薄糖衣的药丸”（55），让孩子“以为是在游戏，实际上却从早到晚都在学习”（55）。这种观点在中国长时期地占据市场同中国人注重实用的价值取向密不可分。在这种背景下，对于儿童的发现和认识有着明显的局限性，这种局限性自然体现在儿童文学的创作中。就“反抗”元素而言，未有对其本身蕴含的文学伦理价值进行审慎、深刻的思考和探讨，在创作中缺乏深度和广度也就成了必然。我们看到，

我国的儿童文学作品中，当出现儿童遭遇来自成人世界的侵犯或者伤害时，聚焦点主要在于儿童对于自我（体表特征和心理）认知的变化，在这一过程中出现的“反抗”言行往往具有原发性，即儿童在特定成长阶段（第一反抗期、青春期）自然而然表现出的反成人意识，而具体的反抗策略以及反抗结局并非重点。

西方儿童文学的发展也并非一帆风顺，但却是一个螺旋上升的过程。专为儿童阅读的书籍最早在十七世纪出现，遗憾的是，这些作品仅仅是实现宗教教育的工具，说教意味浓厚。启蒙运动时期，以约翰·洛克、卢梭为代表的学者摒弃了清教徒儿童文学中的宗教原罪观念，洛克认为儿童是“珍贵的人的资源”，卢梭则更进一步阐明“儿童不是作为仅仅是实现目的的手段才重要，而是本来就是重要的”（34-36）。虽然他们的主张比前人离“儿童本位”的儿童观更接近了一些，但仍改变不了他们实际行为中履行着教训主义态度的本质。时间继续向后推进，十九世纪末二十世纪初，浪漫主义儿童文学兴起，英国作家巴里所著《彼得·潘》以及米尔恩所著《小熊温尼·菩》便是其中的典型代表，这些作品反映出成年人对于幼年时代的乡愁，赞美童心，渐渐脱离了儿童文学中的说教意味。进入二十世纪，在“拯救儿童”运动的推动下，西方儿童文学迈出了具有区别意义的一步：“从成年观念中的儿童，走向现实生活中的儿童”（41），发展形成了“儿童本位的儿童观”。在此引用朱自强教授的观点，对于“儿童本位”的儿童观加以阐明：

既不是把儿童看做未完成品，然后按照成人自己的人生预设与教训儿童（如历史上的教训主义儿童观），也不是从成人的精神需要出发去利用儿童（如历史上童心主义的儿童观），而是从儿童自身的原始生命欲求出发去解放和发展儿童，并且在这解放和发展儿童的过程中，将自身融入其间，以保持和丰富人性中的可贵品质。（朱自强，《儿童文学概论》25）

相较于中国历史上对于儿童存在的漠视以及儿童观思考的不足，西方儿童文学历经教训主义、经验主义、浪漫主义，如今秉持儿童本位的儿童观，体现出从教育性到娱乐性、从教训性到解放性的总体发展轨迹。正是在上述发展轨迹的影响下，儿童文学创作拥有较大的自由度和宽容度，更有条件实现读者乃至全社会对于儿童文学作品提出的伦理问题进行理性讨论和思考，并以某种形式形成社会共识。

三、“反抗”的意义

儿童需要形成分辨善恶的能力，获得伦理意识，才能成为真正的人，这正是儿童文学中“反抗”的意义和使命所在。毋庸置疑，儿童文学担负着引

领儿童道德成长、伦理建构的使命，而当今时代的伦理道德意识绝非旨在使儿童能够成为被动接受的“顺民”，而是有着明确的善恶观念、独立思考能力和批判意识的人。儿童文学中的“反抗”能够引发儿童以及成人读者对是非善恶进行思考，从而形成伦理意识，获得道德教诲。儿童文学中的“反抗”元素的意义之一便在于此。此外，儿童在与生活的搏斗之中所自然流露出的反抗精神，正是儿童本位儿童观所强调的“儿童自身的原初生命欲求”。儿童文学作家需要做的便是与儿童“同谋”，成为儿童反抗成人的“同案犯”（朱自强，《经典这样告诉我们》83），将自己融入儿童独特的生命世界，从而引导儿童实现更广阔的生命发展。

儿童文学对于反抗精神的直面能够帮助儿童实现现实伦理构建。如《激进的儿童文学》（*Radical Children's Literature*）中所言：

简短文本里的文字、意象往往能够传递有关经验、情感、审视自我、审视世界所必需的心理建设及思想工具，将这些填满一代代小读者的头脑。

（It is the words and images of often physically small texts that turn out to be capable of filling the minds of generations of young readers with experiences, emotions, and the mental furniture and tools necessary for thinking about themselves and the world they inhabit.）（Reynolds 1）

读者伴随着儿童文学作品中主人公的成熟，“亦能潜移默化地向成人的知识与经验迈进一步”（and by implication, readers too will have moved a step closer to adult knowledge and experience）（2）。这过程即为儿童由“兽”向“人”的转变，儿童在搏斗中逐渐树立稳定的伦理意识，产生真正的善恶观念，从而逐步完成理性的伦理选择。

同时，儿童文学中的反抗精神已能够唤起成人自己内心雪藏已久的“叛逆”。儿童文学中儿童纯真的反抗可以引起或许已经变得麻木的成人反思，重新拾起自己的潜在的童心。尽管长期以来，儿童文学常常不被视为正统文学，游离在主流文学之外，但恰恰这种不受重视反倒给了儿童文学自由发展的机会。Kimberley Reynolds 曾将儿童文学的这种自由与其它文化传播途径进行比较：

加之于电视节目、电影、动漫、杂志、电脑游戏叙事的规范、审查相较加之于儿童文学叙事的规范、审查，有着显而易见的差异。”

（There is a clear distinction between the amount of regulation and scrutiny applied to narrative forms such as televisions, films, comics, magazines and computer games, and that given to children's literature.）

(15)

因此,许多时候,儿童文学无心插柳成为了“激发与滋养创新(stimulating and nurturing innovation)”(16)的佳径。这其中,反抗精神无疑是一大促进力。通过“促成成人对于自身做法的道德反思以及教育方法的改良”(徐德荣 姜珊 21),加强对于儿童伦理观念养成的认识,提高社会对于儿童伦理观念的保护。

对比研究中西儿童文学对于“反抗”元素的不同态度及形成动因,可以帮助我们发现中国儿童文学创作中有待发展的部分。首先,中国儿童文学作家们应将儿童的“反抗”心理行之有效地用于创作中,帮助儿童形成善恶分辨能力,实现儿童的伦理启蒙;以“反抗”引发而儿童读者和成人读者的思考,促进伦理体系的更新和发展。此外,还应增强儿童本位的创作意识,关照儿童内心的真实诉求,深入到儿童的生命空间,与儿童携手走在人生的路上。同时,中国儿童文学创作应该探索儿童文学所蕴含的变革力量,探索包括“反抗”在内的为中国儿童文学创作所较为忽视的元素,探索这类元素对于道德教诲、解放思想的重要意义,为中国儿童文学创作带来新的创作空间和视界。归根结底,“反抗”元素之所以在西方盛行,是西方儿童本位思想发展至今的结果,是认识到伦理构建自然过程的结果,“反抗”元素的表现方式和内涵有着广阔的空间和重要的伦理价值,值得中国儿童文学创作进行深入探索和体验。除了启示儿童文学创作,对比研究中西“反抗”元素也能够为中国儿童文学研究开辟方向,关注“反抗”这一特殊儿童心理或能够帮助儿童文学研究实现新的理论突破。当然,“反抗”元素的呈现需要把握“度”,要避免为了反抗而反抗的盲目创作,忽视“反抗”元素的真正价值所在。

结语

人类是在真理与谎言中义无反顾地选择哪怕会带来痛苦的真理,才得以不断发展进步。追求真相、追寻平等对话,需要反抗精神。顺着柏拉图洞穴理论的思路,激烈的争辩大约永远好过无声的和谐。儿童对成人世界不合理之处的争辩正是书写在一部部儿童本位的儿童文学作品上。儿童文学创作者应直面儿童的反抗精神,正视儿童伦理构建过程中遇到的问题,帮助儿童实现自身的伦理构建。当现有的伦理无法解决儿童内心当下面临的问题,通过“反抗”、打破旧的伦理秩序,儿童可实现新的适应现状的伦理构建。从伦理混沌到理性选择的过程并不是一蹴而就,在一次次推倒重来中,儿童文学中的“反抗”因素能够帮助儿童不断更新、迭代伦理建设,最终实现内心的伦理平衡,使得理性的伦理选择在符合真、善、美的基础上也符合内心原初的生命欲求。同时,儿童文学中体现在儿童与家庭、儿童与学校、个人与工作、人与自然等诸多情景中的“反抗”元素还通过对于成人读者的启发从各方面

影响整个社会的伦理观念。

本文通过比较中西儿童文学创作在“反抗”元素出现频率、反抗深度及反抗结果上的差异，分析其中的内在动因，旨在发现中国儿童文学创作中尚需补长之处以及如何补长之法。比较发现，“反抗”元素对于中国儿童文学创作而言，是一个亟待开采的巨大矿藏。中国儿童文学创作者应大胆尝试，发掘这一元素更多富有价值的可能性。

Works Cited

- 班马：《六年级大逃亡》。南昌：二十一世纪出版社，2013。
 [Ban Ma. *The Great Escape of a Boy in Grade Six*. Nanchang: 21st Century Publishing, 2013.]
- 金寿铁：“反抗与叛逆的基督教——恩斯特·布洛赫的圣经观”，《世界宗教研究》2（2016）：111-127。转引自恩斯特·布洛赫：《基督教中的无神论》。法兰克福：苏尔坎普出版社，1968。
 [Jin Shoutie. “The Revolt and Rebellion of Christianity: Ernst Bloch’s View of the Bible.” *Studies in World Religions* 2 (2016): 111-127. Qtd. Ernst Bloch: *Atheismus im Christentum. Zui Religion des Exodus und des Reichs*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1968.]
- 刘绪源：《儿童文学的三大母题》。上海：华东师范大学出版社，2009。
 [Liu Xuyuan. *The Three Motifs in Children Literature*. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press, 2009.]
- ：《周作人论儿童文学》。北京：海豚出版社，2012。
 [—, *Zhou Zuoren’s Reviews on Children’s Literature*. Beijing: Dolphin Books, 2012.]
- 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014。
 [Nie Zhenzhao. *An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking University Press, 2014.]
- ：《文学伦理学批评及其它》。武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2012。
 [—, *Ethical Literary Criticism and Others*. Wuhan: Huazhong Normal University Press, 2012.]
- Reynolds, Kimberley. *Radical Children’s Literature: Future Visions and Aesthetic Transformations in Juvenile Fiction*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2007.
- 汤素兰：“中国儿童文学的变化发展趋势”，《创作与评论》177（2013）：14-18。
 [Tang Sulan. “The Change and Developmental Trend of Chinese Children’s Literature.” *Creation and Criticism* 177 (2013): 14-18.]
- 王泉根：《现代中国儿童文学主潮》。重庆：重庆出版社，2000。
 [Wang Quangen. *The Mainstream of Modern Chinese Children’s Literature*. Chongqing: Chongqing Publishing, 2000.]
- ：“现实主义：百年中国儿童文学的发展主潮”，《河南社会科学》6（2016）：90-99。
 [—, “Realism: Main Development Tide of One Hundred Years Chinese Children’s Literature.” *Henan Social Sciences* 6 (2016): 90-99.]
- 徐德荣 姜珊：“罗尔德·达尔幻想儿童文学中的‘反抗’主题”，《南京师范大学文学院学报》

4 (2017) : 17-21。

[Xu Derong, Jiang Shan. "The Theme of 'Revolt' in Roald Dahl's Fantasy Children's Literature."

Journal of School of Chinese Language and Culture Nanjing Normal University 4 (2017):17-21.]

许倬云：《中西文明的对照》。杭州：浙江人民出版社，2016。

[Xu Zhuoyun. *Chinese and Western Civilization Contrasted*. Hangzhou: Zhejiang People's Publishing House, 2016.]

余英时：《余英时文集（第四卷）中国知识人之史的考察》。桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2004。

[Yu Yingshu. *Collections of Yu Yingshi's Essays (Vol 4) Observation on the History of Chinese Intellectuals*. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press, 2004.]

朱自强：《儿童文学概论》。北京：高等教育出版社，2009。

[Zhu Ziqiang. *An Introduction to Children's Literature*. Beijing: Higher Education Press, 2009.]

—：《儿童文学的本质》。上海：少年儿童出版社，1997。

[—. *The Nature of Children's Literature*. Shanghai: Juvenile and Children's Publishing House, 1997.]

—：《经典这样告诉我们》。济南：明天出版社，2010。

[—. *So the Classics Tell Us*. Jinan: Tomorrow Publishing House, 2010.]

责任编辑：王晓兰

非自然叙事的人文主义思考：《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗？》中的伦理诉求与主体救赎

Humanism in the Unnatural Narrative: The Ethical Appeal and the Salvation of the Subject in *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*

郭 雯 (Guo Wen)

内容摘要：《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗？》以核战之后的后人类世界为书写对象，小说充斥着大规模复制和生物技术，解构了仿生人、电子宠物、电视、默瑟等虚拟现实的仿象与原生物之间的二元对立。在叙事形式上，作品借助科幻小说在物理、逻辑、和人力上的非自然叙事，营造了“不可能的世界”。在内容上，尽管小说充满虚实转换、记忆碎片、真假身份等“不确定性”元素，但始终将身份焦虑、情感困境、精神危机、主体救赎等现实问题与伦理诉求融入后人类语境中。小说将现实主义主题与非自然叙事形式交织互补，挑战了读者的认知，在人类与仿象的新型伦理关系中窥探了技术对社会、人性、伦理道德等方面的影响，体现着浓烈的人文主义关怀。

关键词：《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗？》；非自然叙事；后人类；伦理；人文主义

作者简介：郭雯，文学博士，苏州科技大学外国语学院讲师，主要研究领域为英美文学、科幻小说和文学伦理学批评研究。本文为国家社科基金青年项目“美国后人类科幻小说人文思想研究”【项目批号：17CWW017】的阶段性成果。

Title: Humanism in the Unnatural Narrative: The Ethical Appeal and the Salvation of the Subject in *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*

Abstract: *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?* depicts a posthuman world after nuclear war. Filled with mass reproduction and biological technology, the fiction eliminates the opposition between the original and the copy with the images of androids, electric animals, television and Mercer. As to the narrative style, by the physically, logically and humanly unnatural narration of science fiction, the novel creates “impossible worlds”. Though full of the uncertain elements like the shift between real and visual worlds, memory fragments and real or fake identity, the story

still focuses on the realistic problems and ethical appeal such as identity anxiety, emotional dilemma, spiritual crisis and the salvation of the subject under the post-human context. The fiction is interwoven with realistic themes and unnatural narrative, challenging readers' cognition; however, in its new ethical relation between humans and simulations, the fiction explores the technological impact on society, humanity, ethics and morality, evoking a profound thinking of humanism.

Key words: *Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*; unnatural narrative; posthuman; ethics; humanism

Author: Guo Wen, Ph.D., is Lecturer at the School of Foreign Languages and Literature, Suzhou University of Science and Technology (Suzhou 215009, China). Her research interests include British and American literature, science fiction and ethical literary criticism (Email: ainna520@163.com).

引言

科幻小说《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗?》(*Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?*, 1968) 是菲利普·迪克¹ (Philip K. Dick, 1928-1982) 的经典代表作, 电影《银翼杀手》(*Blade Runner*, 1982) 就由此改编。美国著名科幻作家厄休拉·勒奎恩 (Ursula Le Guin) 认为迪克小说充满后现代色彩, “向我们展示了现实与疯狂, 时间与死亡, 罪恶与救赎”(33)。杰森·维斯特 (Jason Vest) 概括道: “迪克勇于在破碎分裂的后现代悲观主义中重构个体主体性、政治自由、个体身份, 这些看似乌托邦的价值观成为迪克作品重要的人文主义”(xi)。诚然, 《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗?》可谓是“赛博朋克”小说 (cyberpunk)² 的前身, 主题聚焦于身份诉求、性别政治、主体焦虑、情感与道德的丧失、传统信仰与高科技时代宗教的矛盾等关于“人”的现实问题, 但是, 很少有学者从小说的叙事特点来探讨作家如何表达人文思想。扬·阿尔贝 (Jan Alber) 认为“科

1 作为 20 世纪美国最著名而多产的科幻作家之一, 迪克一生创作了 44 部长篇小说和 121 部短篇小说, 至少有 10 部被翻拍成好莱坞科幻电影, 而以他姓名命名的科幻三大奖项之一“菲利普·迪克奖”(另两项为“雨果奖”和“星云奖”)也足以证明他的伟大。

2 “赛博朋克”(cyberpunk) 包含虚拟现实、记忆移植、平行宇宙、错列历史等元素, 尽管威廉·吉布森 (William Gibson) 被认为是“赛博朋克”科幻小说鼻祖, 但迪克作品特点可以说是“赛博朋克”的前身。其概念源自美国作家布鲁斯·贝斯克 (Bruce Bethke) 短篇小说《赛博朋克》(*Cyberpunk*, 1983), 在《前言》部分, 他提出创造该词的初衷是因为上世纪 80 年代出现了青少年黑客 (teenage hacker), 他想“将数字、技术和一群迷途的青年相结合, 直到出现这个听上去不错的单词”。参见 <http://www.infinityplus.co.uk/stories/cpunk.htm>。

科幻小说都呈现出非自然叙事特征” (43)¹，小说中自然人与仿生人的博弈、饲养电子羊、用于移情及与他者融合的“共鸣箱”、代表政府意志的“老友巴斯特”、宣扬宗教道德的“默瑟主义”等脱离理性现实世界的人物和事件，都是非自然叙事，它们与多重现实主义主题穿插交织，在充满各种冲突与危机的人类—后人类进化图景中，浸淫着科技异化的焦虑感。虽然非自然叙事使“物理上、逻辑上或人力上不可能的情境与事件挑战了我们真实世界的认知”(Alber 3)，但笔者认为，探讨小说的非自然叙事超越了对其主题的研究，应当借由真实世界的认知模式产生对话性，不仅是文本中人类与后人类、男性与女性、自我与他者的对话，更是科技与人文的对话，这才是探索科幻小说非自然叙事的意义所在。小说通过无限科学幻想，拓展了人类的认知限度，最终让人类在“非自然”的情境与空间中完成了身份诉求与主体救赎，维护了伦理秩序，唤起人们重构人性、捍卫生命的伦理需求。因此，解读非自然元素如何融入现实主义文本结构，以及非自然与自然叙事如何互动，直接关系到读者对后现代社会的理解，也能发掘作家深刻的人文主义关怀。

一、后人类人文景观与伦理变迁

《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗?》将故事设定在核战后的末日世界，放射尘使地球上的动物濒临灭绝，地球已不再适合人类居住。“为了殖民，人们改装了一种叫‘合成自由战士’的战争机器……这些人形机器——严格说来，是有机仿生人——成为殖民计划中任劳任怨、辛勤劳作的引擎”(11)²。政府承诺只要移民到外星球，就可以为每个人配备一个仿生人帮其生活。但是，有些仿生人不满足被人类奴役的现状，想方设法从火星逃回地球。主人公里克·德卡德便是一名专门追捕逃亡仿生人的赏金猎人，整个故事发生在二十四小时内，他追杀了六个最高级的枢纽6型仿生人。小说中科技与人性的关系成为学界关注的焦点，“迪克一直在探讨人与机器的差异性”(Vest 180-181)，还有学者认为里克在追杀仿生人的过程中“失去人性：变成杀人机器”(Booker 225)。另外，学者们也注意到了乌托邦式叙事与现实的关联，指出“叙事模式解构了二十世纪欧美人性的确定性……主人公过着不确定的生活，但并没有给他们创造人性乌托邦或舒适的空间”(Vest 42-43)。这种技术悲观主义色彩浸透在迪克作品中，“揭示了人类对技术控制论的恐惧”(刘

1 非自然叙事是自21世纪以来叙事学研究热点，本文所有关于非自然叙事概念及特征的引文均来自阿尔贝的《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)。其他重要论著包括阿尔贝、尼尔森和理查森等人的《非自然叙事诗学》(A Poetics of Unnatural Narrative, 2013)，理查森的《非自然叙事：理论、历史与实践》(Unnatural Narrative: Theory, History, and Practice, 2015)。

2 本文所有小说引文均出自许东华译：《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗?》(南京：译林出版社，2013年)。下文只标注页码，不再一一说明。

晓华 117)。尽管学者们意识到了科幻小说对世界的变形和改造,但并未发掘小说“非自然叙事”中这些不自然的人或事对探讨作品主题的作用。

叙事本质上的虚构与布莱希特的“间离效果”和科幻的“认知疏离”(cognitive estrangement)作用相似,即“作品中的人际关系和社会必须由读者去发现与人类有何相似或不同,才能产生意义”(Suvin 41),这就要求我们重回历史现场,即伦理环境对文本进行解读¹。战后 60 年代的美国社会充斥着越战、美苏冷战等政治危机,核武器的发展令人恐惧,自然生态遭到破坏,各种社会运动此起彼伏;黑人民权运动、女权主义运动、反文化运动等形成了多元文化的新局面。迪克通过“卡夫卡式”的变形,构建了“不可能的世界”(impossible worlds),仿生人属于人类生物属性上的不可能,自然人追杀仿生人也在不可能的情境中发生,而自然与非自然的叙事互动直接关系到读者对美国社会转型后的政治焦虑、科技异化、身份危机、大众文化等理解。流水线上批量生产出来的仿生人智商超群,并计划杀死人类主人,这就引发人类追杀仿生人的结果。为何要追杀仿生人?人类意识到长期占统治的同一性主体地位面临着威胁,“造物主”开始处于机器人决策圈上方,而非圈内,机器人可以绕过人类拥有自主决策权,即拥有主体地位。在面对突如其来的科技产物所营造的伦理恐慌与困境时,迪克通过非自然叙事,激发人们从现实与未来两个维度对主体性变化进行思考。

仿生人受奴役的境遇与美国早期黑奴制度和种族歧视形成类比,不少生物题材“主要用做社会政治本体 (tenor) 的喻体 (vehicle),从而引发文本中人物之间关系的各种可能性的类比”(苏恩文 416)。文本不仅暗喻美国历史,而且预见由仿生人替代黑奴的未来新型殖民文化。另外,作者没有脱离对女性的身体书写,或者对父权社会的影射,女性仿生人仍被描写为性感的、充满诱惑力的:“有的女性仿生人很漂亮,他曾发现自己被其中几个吸引过。那是一种奇特的感受”(73)。仿生人技术催生了一种新文化和伦理关系,女性的传统角色被消解,不再拥有母亲、妻子、伴侣的伦理身份²。事实上,

1 本文关于伦理的论述主要受到聂珍钊教授文学伦理学批评的启发。伦理环境也叫伦理语境,它是文学作品存在的历史空间。聂珍钊教授认为:“文学只是人类历史的一部分,它不能超越历史,不能脱离历史,而只能构成历史。不同历史时期的文学有其固定的属于特定历史的伦理环境和伦理语境,对文学的理解必须让文学回归属于它的伦理环境或伦理语境中去,这是理解文学的一个前提”(《文学伦理学批评导论》256)。

2 关于伦理身份的分析,主要参考聂珍钊教授的“文学伦理学批评”,聂教授指出,“身份从来源上说可以分为两种,一种是与生俱来的!如血缘所决定的血亲的身份。一种是后天获取的,如丈夫和妻子的身份。从起源上说,人的身份是进行自我选择的结果。自然选择是从形式上解决人的身份问题,即从形式上把人同兽区别开来,从而获取人的身份。伦理选择是从伦理上解决人的身份问题,不仅要本质上把人同兽区别开来,而且还需要从责任、义务和道德等价值方面对人的身份进行确认”(《文学伦理学批评导论》263)。

日美等科技发达的国家已经出现并使用性爱机器人，这些“女性”机器人惟妙惟肖，使一些男士不再需要妻子和家庭。可见，无论是仿生人奴隶制还是女性仿生人的描写仍反映出自启蒙运动以来的自由人文主义主体与他者的关系。

“人与非人”的互动还预示着一个时代的政治与伦理的变化。堂娜·哈拉维 (Donna Haraway) 认为“科幻小说主要围绕不确定的自我与意想不到的他者之间的相互渗透，以及跨国界的科技语境之下可能出现的世界” (“The Promise of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others” 70)。作为“意想不到的他者”，仿生人与自然人共存的非自然叙事带领我们进入新型人文景观，即“后人类时代”。随着上世纪 60 年代生物基因、计算机、互联网等信息技术的发展，后人类主义 (posthumanism) 也以“赛博格” (cyborg) 即人机混合体的概念而发展起来。哈拉维将“赛博格”定义为“一个有机机器的生物，是机器与有机体的混合物，是社会现实的生物，也是虚拟小说中的造物” (“A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s” 7)。后人类主义专家海尔斯 (Katherine Hayles) 则认为“后人类不重视物质性的实体存在，而重视信息模式，生物基底只是历史的偶然而非生命的必然” (*How We Became Posthuman* 2)。小说中的仿生人不具有人类的生物属性，而是在行为与思想上完美模仿人类的信息合成的赛博格，与自然人的差异性几乎为零，属于非自然叙事中的“反现实人物”。阿尔贝认为“科幻小说中不可能的人物是与将来可能发生的推测相关……即物理上、逻辑上或人力上不可能的人物和形象” (104)。科技的发展消解了人机本质差异，使后人类社会充斥着仿象，仿象是没有原版的东西的摹本，原版也可以成为仿象¹。对应当代人工智能的大数据时代，人脑似乎已不占优势，机器可以表现得更像人，由此可见，技术正在重塑人性、深刻地颠覆了我们对“人”的观念。

虽然迪克陌生化了我们熟悉的世界，也预见到了几十年后的今天，但从功能上来看，他却无意解构文本的虚构性或艺术性，而是扩展了对人的身份及可能出现的社会伦理结构的认知。迪克关于“人与非人”的探讨并不在于具体形象的同一性，而在于由理性、情感等构成的人性化判断。仿生人与人

1 “仿象”亦翻译为“类象”，鲍德里亚曾提出了类像的三个序列，第三序列时期即仿真 (simulation)，这是后工业消费社会的特点，类像成为没有原版的东西的摹本，虚拟与现实混淆不清。参见 Jean Baudrillard, “Simulacra and Science Fiction.” *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. S.F.Glaser. Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1994: 81-84. 第一个序列时期类似于亚里士多德的“模仿说”，追求对自然的反映，基于对美好事物的理想的、理念的、自然的完美模仿；第二序列时期是生产 (production)，现代工业化与科技发展为科学幻想开拓了想象空间，普罗米修斯式的目标在于不断全球化、不断壮大，可以说与之相对应的便是科学幻想。

类唯一区别就是在“社会、情感和道德反应”(79)几乎为零,必须通过移情测试或骨髓测试才能确定身份,可见,“移情”作为人类特有的交互手段和最重要的特点,在伦理与情感关系中体现着人性。自然人与仿生人之间的博弈在后人类语境下延展了人与他者的认知维度,形成了有趣的互动,打破了“人与非人”之间的伦理空白,从而对高科技时代“何为人”的问题进行探索。

二、人类身份困境与情感诉求

以往科幻小说会重点描写“非人”如何在人类社会进行人类身份诉求,但是这部小说却将自然人里克的伦理身份困惑与情感困境作为重点。迪克通过自然人与仿生人、电子羊、电视等仿象之间的交互,使非自然叙事与现实主义题材融会贯通,具有现实与未来的双重意义。里克的焦虑首先来自追杀混入华约的波洛科夫过程中。波洛科夫不仅能顺利混进人类社会,而且得知被追杀时,还能镇定自若地假扮苏联警察一起协助里克。里克曾鄙视处于弱势地位的仿生人,称其为“唾弃的对象,是我们都发誓要毁灭的糟粕”(97),但此次,仿生人差点杀死里克。面对真假难辨的仿生人,里克产生“似人非人”的认同感,既熟悉又陌生。在追杀歌唱家鲁芭·勒夫特时,里克同样对自己的身份产生困惑。勒夫特是主体意识强大、智商超群的仿生人,得知里克也做过移情测验后,她便循循善诱:“也许那是假记忆。仿生人不是有时会被植入假记忆吗?”(78)里克“呆若木鸡”(78),开始质疑自己是仿生人;而仿生人却露出战胜人类的胜利微笑,她知道记忆可以证明人类身份。一个人的记忆是他“有根可寻”的依据,有记忆则意味着拥有人类的反应和感受,而里克与仿生人都知道真实的记忆往往是混乱的,因此里克“有生以来第一次,开始怀疑自己”(110),他成为“他者”眼中的“他者”。

一方面,虚实难辨意味着自我认同与他者认同之间本身就难以分清的相互关系,这种身份的不确定性尤其成为后现代多元文化中人们无根的漂泊感的隐喻。小说的非自然叙事与世界主义(cosmopolitanism)形成对话,殖民地主体身份的杂交实则动摇了传统人类主体的自主性,“我和他者”的界限不再清晰,正如后殖民理论家霍米·巴巴(Homi Bhabha)所言:“四海为家的方式就是生活在域外之家或家之域外”(587),每个具有自由意志的主体都是他者。另一方面,里克和勒夫特关于“记忆之根”的对话表明科技历史的变迁,也预示着科技将人类“历史之根”彻底切断的可能性。小说创作背景正是人类第三次科技革命之时,作为科技大国,美国开始涌现计算机信息技术革命、新能源、新材料等生物技术,自然法则与生命本体论被改写,人的肉身不再重要,人类“万物之灵”的地位被动摇,这也意味着人的意义被解构。

迪克曾经写道:“要界定什么是真实,就是要界定什么是人类”(Dick 171),但在他的笔下,真实与虚幻从来都没有明显地界限,他又将人类描写

得如同没有移情能力的仿生人，麻木不堪，在他看来，世界本质就是混乱而不可预知。人类处处充满情感危机，里克爱上女仿生人蕾切尔，而不爱现实生活中真正的人类，即他的妻子，这种非自然情感模糊了真实与虚幻的世界。一方面，在现实世界，里克的理性告诉自己蕾切尔是个假人，另一方面，他将激情、爱情和欲望转移到假人身上，宁愿与蕾切尔发生关系，映射出他的心理与情感状态，这是对现代人生活状态的寓言、精神世界的讽刺。里克的妻子终日靠“情绪调节器”游走于自责抑郁或喜悦的情绪之间，只会抱怨，“我太累了，生活没有一丝希望。我们的婚姻也让人绝望”（72）。她对缺乏交流和关爱的婚姻感到死一般的绝望，这不仅是后现代生活的写照，也可能是迪克本人多次婚姻失败的影射¹。

除了情感危机以外，里克在工作中也逐渐迷失自我。他对自己的杀戮行为产生抑郁，抱怨自己的“冷漠是因为感觉自己失去了价值”（155），这也反映了现代人在职场中寻找生存意义却逐渐丧失自我价值认同感。里克逐渐渴望与仿生人建立共存的伦理关系，但在道德困境面前，他必须恪守伦理身份，做出相应的伦理选择。“赏金猎人”的身份使他必须卖命地为政府追杀仿生人。迪克以“非自然时间”和“反摹仿空间”描写了里克一天之内完成追杀任务。“非自然时间”是指逻辑上不可能的时间进程，“反摹仿空间”是指物理上或逻辑上不可能的空间情境。里克可以乘坐飞车极速往来于各个城市之间，杀死六名仿生人，这一非自然叙事体现了现代工作时间的非人道特征以及科技对人类生活的异化。人们为了生计争分夺秒地工作，成为赚钱的机器，他们宁可赚足赏金购买昂贵真实的动物，也不愿陪伴家人。

小说中的自然人内心孤寂，丧失了爱的能力，而仿生人情感丰富、意志坚定，混乱了人机边界。蕾切尔与里克之间有着无法梳理的爱恨情仇，为了让里克停止追杀同类，便布局勾引里克发生了一夜情。迪克似乎热衷于对“黑发女孩”的描写，女仿生人蕾切尔便是其中之一。海尔斯根据迪克生平推断出他对聪颖而冷酷的母亲“有乱伦的情感”（How We Became Posthuman 165），并将这种焦虑通过夭折的孪生妹妹简凸显出来，幻化为精神分裂的“黑发女孩”（How We Became Posthuman 165），因此蕾切尔兼具机器人的冷漠和人类的同情心。蕾切尔宣布“她战胜了他”（156），也标志着对男性主体性的阉割。当里克杀死最后三个仿生人后，蕾切尔便杀死了里克的羊作为报复。里克感叹道：“什么都是真的”（177），人与非人、真实与虚幻的界限再次被打破，蕾切尔以操纵者形象解构了男性，现实本身动摇了里克对她的欲望。这个非自然叙事不仅是迪克本人对强势女性和男性地位的戏仿，同时也为读者打开了另一层思考的空间：仿生人“比主人还要像人”（21），这就从根本上消除了人与物的二元对立，反倒使小说变成一首哀悼人性的挽歌。人类

1 迪克一生有过五次婚姻，关于其生平简介参见 https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Philip_K._Dick。

千百年来,的进化似乎未从生物学上发生翻天覆地的变化,却在社会文化、精神思想、行为方面发生了巨变,技术改写了人类与世界的本质,传统人文面临着全新的难题。

在迪克编织的后人类多层网络之中,人与动物的伦理关系与模式也在被重构。电子羊吃人工草的非自然场景首先反映了战争对生态的破坏,其次,人类通过饲养电子宠物排解抑郁,获取心灵慰藉。与电子宠物这一新型他者融合的移情能力使人类伦理得以延续,虽然电子羊的诞生超越了自然法则,但是电子动物伙伴建立了跨人类的情感血缘关系,是后人类伦理关系表征,以情感和有机的方式穿越物种之间的分界,成为自然与文化的复合体。人类在电子宠物身上体现的最为自然的情感流露,实际上完成了现实中人们疏于沟通的情感表达。仿生人与电子羊作为最重要的两个仿真意象出现在小说标题的问句中,实现了人的不在场,本身就具有非自然叙事特征。里克曾问道“仿生人会不会做梦”(142),他的答案是肯定的。仿生人如果能做梦,说明具有意识,或者像海尔斯新书《非思考》(*Unthought*, 2017)中所言的“非意识认知”(nonconscious cognition),即“认知超越了生物学上的生命体,而存在于其他生命形态和复杂的技术系统中”(Unthought 9),仿生人对信息的高效处理能力击垮了以意识为傲的人类,换言之,去具身化的“后人类”也能具有移情能力,从而彰显人性。

移情本是人类特有的能力,是情感交流和认知的一种形式,但移情的主客体在虚拟现实的仿真产物中不断交替。另一个帮助人类完成移情功能的“反现实人物”就是“老友巴斯特”,它是出现在电视上为人类排除寂寞、消磨时光的虚拟产物。实际上,巴斯特是政府和利益集团的代表,它向大众鼓吹政策,不停地宣传仿生人。六十年代美国涌现的大众文化催生了文化产品和媒介的标准化与规模化,电视是大众文化的代表,它的出现隔绝了人类真实的人际交流,人们宁愿倾心于那喋喋不休的“老友”。“电子媒介是中枢神经系统的延伸,其余一切媒介(尤其是机械媒介)是人体个别器官的延伸”(麦克卢汉 17)。电视的效果便是人类中枢神经系统最新近、最壮观的电力延伸,它作为大众传媒最具影响力的媒介之一,不仅向美国,而且向世界各国进行文化输出和霸权。电视建立了新的伦理关系,展望了未来人机交流、寄托情感、建立信任关系的可能性,也反映了现实中的人际危机和技术控制论。

三、自我救赎与人性回归

小说的非自然叙事似乎在陈述一个事实:现实本身就充斥着真假,在虚拟与现实交织的后人类社会,仿象有时比现实更真实,正如“特障人”伊西多尔坚称“老友巴斯特”是真实存在的朋友;抑或蕾切尔杀死真正的山羊后,里克的感悟:“任何人想象过的任何东西都是真的”(155)。在人类与仿象建立的各种伦理关系中,人类如此脆弱和压抑,但是,迪克坚持认为在充满

政治阴谋与技术控制论的资本主义世界，人还有救赎的希望。正如巴德明顿所言：“‘人’中介的末世论叙述……忽视了人类救赎的能力，很明显，也忽略了‘重演’的能力”(Badmington 11)。迪克通过自然人在“共鸣箱”中与“默瑟”融合的非自然叙事，描写了人类如何在新型的后人类秩序中进行自救，重新探索了生命的意义与人的价值。

默瑟是“反现实人物”，是个体需要与他人融合时抓住“共鸣箱”手柄出现的宗教形象。人只要抓住手柄，阴极射线管就会闪亮，出现模拟电视图像：“默瑟正在艰难地向前跋涉”(15)。默瑟仿佛上帝或是一名苦行僧，他艰难地攀岩，直到死去，再到复生，生命循环，其历程充满艰辛与痛苦。虽然默瑟最后被“老友巴斯特”揭穿是个仿象，是一个被雇佣表演痛苦和赎罪的人造情景，但是，默瑟主义又是真正的体验，就像默瑟扮演者最后亲自向里克和伊西多尔承认的那样：他既是虚伪的人物，又是真实的存在。默瑟主义的非自然叙事并无意离读者的情感激发理性，而是在自然叙事与非自然叙事的融合中，拓展了伦理建构的可能性，呈现出矛盾而复杂的现实世界和真实情感：主体与他者融合，接受他者、相互承认的过程正是人类相互认同的本能欲望和重构社会秩序的愿望。“非自然叙事是反柏拉图摹仿说，因为它不是模仿或再生产我们所知的世界……但它却是亚里士多德模仿说，因为不可能的事可以在虚构世界得以再现”(Alber 28)，可以说，人类在面对自我迷茫与恐慌无助时，“共鸣箱”这一时间与空间上双重“不可能的”物体，提供了与其他一切生物发生移情、建立伦理关系的情境和媒介。有学者认为共鸣箱“目的不是为了社会团结，而是分裂”(Galvan 416)，但“共鸣箱”这一封闭的空间恰恰拓展了物理空间和伦理空间，使主体将个人幻想和体验融入到社会共享的宗教、政治等意识形态中。

尽管默瑟主义是悖论式的存在，但它将自我意识与陌生人的意识融合，使个体不再是完全孤立或与世隔绝的。“特障人”伊西多尔便沉溺于幻觉与现实的边缘。他是被社会抛弃的边缘人，是弱势群体代表，他选择与默瑟融合虽然无法解决他艰难的生活困境，但却意味着他渴望重构伦理身份、获得他人身份认同的可能性。正如布莱希特所言：“人类具有一种能力，在虚构的现实面前能够产生和在现实面前同样的感情”(60)。伊西多尔握紧手柄，“他感到身外的客厅渐渐淡出，周围的废旧家具如潮水般退去，他再也感觉不到它们的存在。他感觉自己，就像从前一样，进入了这个场景，这苍凉的山冈，这苍凉的天空”(15)。在这苍凉的虚境中，伊西多尔渴求的是在真正孤独的现实中所缺失的情感与人际关系。

在虚拟与现实的融合中，多重混淆不断的上演。如果在共鸣箱中被石头砸中，回到现实会发现胳膊流血，“未来与过去混在了一起。他以前的体验，与终将得到的体验，都混在一起，除了眼前当下，再无其他”(16)。在融合的过程中，人类会站在时间停滞的坟墓世界无望地等待再次前进，徘徊于

内部与外部世界的矛盾之中，“所有人都在一起攀登。当循环结束时，所有人又一起坠回坟墓世界的深谷”（22）。坟墓世界往往是荒凉而恐怖的，是人类生命终结的象征，在一堆死尸面前，人们等待着周围生命复苏，才有机会爬出坟墓，获得重生。坟墓亦是对精神危机的虚构，是人物内心死亡意识的外部投射，但是它同时又是一种心灵净化的必需品。坟墓体现着文本一向呈现的内外、虚实界限的混乱，这种时空的穿越将自我与他者的肉体、意识、精神融为一体，从而完成个人体验。而这些都是仿生人无法体验的，他们可以循环复制，不具备人类生命意义和个体价值。尽管共鸣箱的融合场景阴森恐怖，但坟墓和死亡也意味着生命即将轮回。因此，在压抑而黑暗的色彩中透露着一丝曙光，面对科技对人类、人文、人性挑战时，小说回归了对“人”的终极思考。

与默瑟融合表达了寻求自我归属和身份认同的欲望，也是对人类基本伦理秩序的维护。伊西多尔认为“不跟默瑟融合，不去感恩，是很不道德的”（133），即使基皮（垃圾）不断生长，“打乱所有的秩序”（164），人还是要靠信仰努力攀爬。可见，亦真亦幻的默瑟主义从认知角度拓展了伦理建构的可能性，对重构人类传统伦理价值体系至关重要，它宣扬了至善至美的道德观，成为高科技时代人类的宗教信仰。“科幻小说中的宗教与灵性是个人、国家乃至星球的心理必需品。宗教并不能因为它是理解宇宙的非理性方式而被否定”（Vest 111）。在默瑟主义洗礼中，伊西多尔不仅在共鸣箱的虚境中诉求自我，而且还一直渴望将主义付诸于行动中，挽救仿生人，因为追杀仿生人“违反了现代默瑟主义伦理。所有生命都是一体的”（113），最后他还救起一只濒临死亡的仿生蜘蛛。

默瑟主义的非自然叙事不仅暗示着人类的伦理意识和道德观念，而且寄托着迪克本人的人文主义情怀，即对生命的尊重和他者边界的质疑。伊西多尔与仿生人共住一楼、帮助仿生人逃跑、救赎动物等伦理选择，是在物理上、逻辑上不可能的情境中完成的，解救他者意味着确立对他者的责任，同时也重新定义了自己的伦理身份。“伦理身份是一个人在社会中存在的标识，人需要承担身份所赋予的责任与义务”（聂珍钊 263），这种责任与义务不仅体现在努力与他者融合建立伦理关系，而且体现在对他者的认同与责任感，这便是人类伦理身份的意义。尽管默瑟主义最后被揭穿是骗局，对后现代社会宗教信仰危机形成一定的讽刺性，然而，真假并不重要。作者无意批判人类的虚伪性，而是在虚拟与现实的融合中探讨高科技时代人类何去何从。在苦痛、黑暗、压抑的科技悲观主义色彩中，主体性受创的里克与伊西多尔在默瑟的引领下仍进行着自我救赎。在布满仿象的后现代社会中，只要有真实的信仰、信念与精神支柱，人性就能彰显光辉。

通过非自然叙事，迪克探索了传统伦理体系中诸如自我与他者、爱与责任、苦难与救赎等价值观念。而在这个认知过程中，里克与伊西多尔重新经

历个人情感与伦理道德的体验，最终选择“坠回坟墓世界的深谷”，完成了伦理身份的诉求。小说的结尾部分是开放式的，作者并未交代里克今后的工作和生活，他可能仍要面对六型或七型更高级的仿生人、依旧要面对妻子和调节器、依旧要在高科技中感到失望或焦虑。但是，里克似乎回归了家庭，正如开篇提到许多地球人拒绝移民，“也许是因为地球虽然已经毁得不成样子，但仍然是个熟悉的家，是个让人眷恋的地方”（11）。这个“似家非家”的家不仅是个人的小家庭，更是人类的家园，是精神的归属。在这个“家”，人类受到科技的影响，曾被科技摧残又被科技拯救，进行着主体重建和人性维护，这也是作者对后人类时代的一种乌托邦思想实验。

结语

2017年10月上映的电影《银翼杀手：2049》延续了原著黑暗压抑的氛围，整部电影在冰冷的高科技背景和阴沉刺耳的音乐中，与小说非自然叙事所反映的多重主题呼应。电影中里克与蕾切尔有了女儿，彻底打破了“人与非人”的界限，而具有人性的仿生人被残忍地猎杀，再次将科技理性异化与人性问题推至风口浪尖，人们不禁思考技术是否存在伦理底线。《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗？》并没有通过追杀仿生人来凸显对人类中心主义的维护或批判，而是通过后人类社会的非自然叙事让读者思考人性与技术之间错综复杂的关系。在作家看来，技术存在巨大风险，也具有救赎能力。小说的叙事形式突破了读者的认知领域，从人物、时间、空间等多重不可能的维度呈现出多种类比、隐喻和象征，使小说文本如同玄妙的科幻世界一样，充满不确定性。而从叙事内容来看，人物命运、虚实转换、记忆碎片、真假身份以及开放式的结局本身就是对人类未来种种不确定性的描写，在后现代漂泊无根的焦虑感中，人物诉求伦理身份、重建伦理关系。同时，这部经典小说在人工智能的大数据时代更被赋予一种全新的意义，并指明了一个可以确定的历史：人类不再是进化的终点，因而必须接受新的思维方式，在面对各种可能性时，我们应当并且只能维护“人之所以为人”的方面。

Works Cited

- Alber, John. *Unnatural Narrative: Impossible Worlds in Fiction and Drama*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2016.
- Badmington, Neil. "Theorizing Posthumanism." *Cultural Critique*. (53) 2003:10-27.
- Bhabha, Homi. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Public Culture* 12.3 (2000): 577-589.
- Booker, M. Keith. *Monsters, Mushroom Clouds, and the Cold War: American Science Fiction and the Roots of Postmodernism, 1946-1964*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2001.
- Dick, Philip K. "The Evolution of a Vital Love." *The Dark-Haired Girl*. Willimantic, Conn.: Mark V. Ziesing, 1988.

- Galvan, Jill. "Entering the Posthuman Collective in Philip K. Dick's Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?" *Science Fiction Studies* 24 (3): 413-429.
- Haraway, Donna. "A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s." *The Haraway Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2004. 7-45.
- . "The Promise of Monsters: A Regenerative Politics for Inappropriate/d Others." *The Haraway Reader*. New York: Routledge, 2004. 63-124.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. *How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- . *Unthought: The Power of the Cognitive Nonconscious*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2017.
- Le Guin, Ursula K. "Science Fiction as Prophecy." *New Republic*. 30 October (1976): 33-34.
- Suvin, Darko. *Defined by A Hollow: Essays on Utopia, Science Fiction and Political Epistemology*. Bern: Peter Lang AG, 2010.
- Vest, Jason P. *The Postmodern Humanism of Philip K. Dick*. Lanham, Maryland: The Scarecrow Press, 2009.
- 贝尔托·布莱希特:《布莱希特论戏剧》,丁扬忠等译。北京:中国戏剧出版社,1990年。
[Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht's Reflections on Drama*. Trans. Ding Yangzhong, etc. Beijing: China Theatre Press, 1990.]
- 达科·苏恩文:《科学小说面面观》,郝琳、李庆涛、程佳译。合肥:安徽文艺出版社,2011年。
[Suvin, Darko. *Positions and Presuppositions in Science Fiction*. Trans. Hao Lin, Li Qingtao and Cheng Jia. Hefei: Anhui Literature and Art Publishing House, 2011.]
- 刘晓华:“技术控制论的梦魇——解读科幻小说《仿生人会梦见电子羊吗?》”,《国外文学》3(2015):117-122。
[Liu, Xiaohua. "The Nightmare of Technophobia: On the Science Novel Do Androids Dream of Electric Sheep?" *Foreign Literatures* 3(2015):117-122.]
- 马歇尔·麦克卢汉:《理解媒介:论人的延伸》,何道宽译。南京:译林出版社,2011年。
[McLuhan, M. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Trans. He Daokuan. Nanjing: Yilin 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. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]

责任编辑:杨革新

德性论视域下包法利夫人悲剧的再思考

Further Reflection on the Tragedy of Madame Bovary from the Perspective of Virtue Theory

隋红升 (Sui Hongsheng)

内容摘要：世界文学经典《包法利夫人》中女主人公爱玛的人生悲剧一直牵系着广大读者和批评家的心，已有的研究主要从她的爱情观、社会环境、父权思想及其情爱对象的人格缺陷等几个方面探究其悲剧根源。本文认为爱玛自身德性缺陷在其人生悲剧中扮演着重要角色。道德自觉的缺失让她背离了自己应当担负的家庭责任，并且让生命失去了承载，变得更加空虚无聊；道德情感的淡漠让她丧失了基本的羞恶之心，无法对自己和他人的行为作出正确评判，以至于在肉欲的放纵中走向堕落；道德意志的薄弱让她无法及时有效地控制她的消费欲望，让她最终在物欲的奢靡中走向毁灭。

关键词：包法利夫人；福楼拜；德性；道德自觉；道德情感；道德意志

作者简介：隋红升，浙江大学外语学院英文系副教授，主要从事美国文学、性别诗学 and 美德伦理学研究。

Title: Further Reflection on the Tragedy of Madame Bovary from the Perspective of Virtue Theory

Abstract: The life tragedy of Emma in the world literature classic Madame Bovary has always been the focus of common readers and critics. The existing research mainly explores the root of her life tragedy from the perspectives of her view of love, social environment, patriarchal ideology, and the defects of her lovers' personality. This paper considers that Emma's own virtual deficiency plays a crucial role in her tragedy. Emma's lack of moral consciousness makes her deviate from family responsibilities, which in turn makes her life more weightless, empty, and boring. The apathy in Emma's moral emotion makes her lose the basic sense of shame, and unable to make correct judgment on her own and other people's behaviors, thus becoming degenerating in carnal indulgence. The weakness in Emma's moral will makes her unable to control her consuming desire, which makes her go to her final ruin in the extravagance of material consumption.

Key words: Madame Bovary; Flaubert; virtue; moral consciousness; moral emotion; moral will

Author: Sui Hongsheng, Ph.D., is Associate Professor at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University(Hangzhou 310058, China). His research focuses on American literature, Gender Poetics, and Virtue Ethics (Email: suihongsheng1972@163.com).

世界文学经典著作《包法利夫人》(*Madame Bovary*, 1856)中女主人公爱玛的人生悲剧一直牵系着广大读者和批评家的心。就已有的研究文献来看,关于爱玛人生悲剧的根源主要有以下几种观点。第一种观点认为爱玛悲剧的主要根源在于其不切实际的情爱观,认为爱玛的人生悲剧是其“追求偏激、虚荣的浪漫爱情生活”所致(侯小珍 25)。第二种观点认为爱玛的人生悲剧主要来源于其所生存的社会环境,认为“艾玛人生悲剧是特定时期、特定环境下的一种生存悲剧、一种女性悲剧”(陈立乾 200)。第三种观点认为爱玛对男权思想的认同是其人生悲剧的一大根源,认为蕴含着男权思想的浪漫主义小说是爱玛人生悲剧的罪魁祸首,“本文的‘极度诱惑’与女性的‘语言拜物教’”构成了爱玛悲剧的根源(张凌江 59)。第四种观点认为爱玛悲剧的根源在于其情爱对象的人格与道德缺陷,认为“以艾玛丈夫查理为典型的平庸男人形象是造成艾玛爱情幻想破灭”的主要原因(朱茜 85)。以上几种代表性的观点都直接或间接地触及到爱玛人生悲剧的根源,为我们深入研究提供了宝贵借鉴。然而,对于爱玛在德性方面的缺陷在其人生悲剧中扮演的重要角色,学界还缺乏正面、深入的探讨。

实际上,对道德的关注一直是福楼拜的一个文学创作重心,正如其本人所说的那样,“在可能范围以内,我尽量放入风格和道德”(李健吾 70)。《包法利夫人》出版后,面对接踵而来的诘责和法律控诉,福楼拜反驳道:“至于我,我觉得自己非常道德。孟地影(Mentyon)的奖金应该给我才对,因为这本小说,含有一种明显的教训,如果母亲不允许她的女儿读,我想丈夫拿给他们的夫人读,总该不坏吧”(李健吾 69)。从《包法利夫人》整部著作的叙事重心来看,该作可谓是一部道德寓言,对道德问题的深刻反思让该作拥有了跨越时空的意义。彭俞霞认为“这部作品的伟大魅力之一来自包法利夫人的世界性。每个人或多或少地在其身上认出了自己,可怜同情或批评警醒”(彭俞霞 12)。这种“世界性”的核心应当是该作具有的普遍道德教诲意义,而“道德教诲即文学的基本功能”(聂珍钊 248)。缺少了这一点,该作与很多情色小说也就没有太大区别,“世界性”也就无从谈起。

与一般道德训诫小说有所不同的是,这部作品的道德内涵没有停留在宏观的道德规范层面,而是又往前推进一步,在道德实践层面——即德性或美德层面——考量道德问题。根据德性论的观点,“德性主要由道德自觉、道德意志和道德情感所构成”(李佑新)。简单来讲,德性由知、情、意三个主要因素构成,三者之间相互影响,相互促进,共同构成社会个体的道德人

格。我们在谈到德性时，“可能指某一种德性，也可能指一个人的德性。因此，德性这个词可以指单一的德性，也可以指整体的德性”（江畅 35）。当我们评价说一个人有德性时，是在整体意义上谈德性，指的是这个人已经有了品德或道德人格。道德人格在个体的道德认知和实践中扮演着重要角色，是个体实现人生价值、获得幸福的重要条件和保障，因而应当是每个人力求达到的人生境界。但个体道德认知和实践过程中出现的某些具体问题又与道德自觉、道德情感和道德意志等德性的组成要素的有无或强弱有着密切的关联。因此，以德性或道德人格为观照，在道德自觉、道德情感和道德意志等三个德性构成要素中审视个体道德实践中存在的问题，才更为具体和准确，才能抓住问题的根结。对于爱玛而言，道德自觉或道德意识的缺失让她变得自私和自恋，背离了自己应当担负的家庭责任，并且让她的生命失去了承载，变得更加空虚、无聊和烦躁；道德情感的淡漠导致她丧失了良知和基本的羞恶之心，丧失了对自己 and 他人行为的道德评价力，以至于在肉欲的放纵中走向堕落；道德意志的薄弱让她无法合理控制欲望，让她最终在物欲的奢靡中走向毁灭。

一、道德自觉的缺失

根据德性论观点，“道德自觉是个体在正确认识和把握道德地位、作用和发展规律的基础上，对一定社会道德原则、道德规范的认同与遵守，以及对时代所赋予的伦理使命和道德责任的主动担当”（白臣 79）。在道德人格的“知”、“情”、“意”三要素中，道德自觉主要借助道德原则、道德理性和规范为个体的思想和行为提供导向。对于爱玛而言，可以说其人格体系中道德自觉的缺失是其人生悲剧的总根源，主要体现在其幸福观中的认识与追求过程中对德性、尤其责任的忽略。

不可否认，爱玛对幸福的追求也是正当的，因为毕竟幸福是每个人生命的终极目标，追求幸福也是每个人的权利。就此而言，尚玉峰所言不无道理：“爱玛的许多要求是合理的，她身上的一些所谓‘特质’实际是女性所共有的，体现着女性意识的觉醒”（尚玉峰 61）。然而爱玛没有意识到，缺乏了德性的支撑，幸福是没有保障的。她也没有意识到，幸福还要以责任为内容，“幸福是对高贵心灵的抚慰和奖赏，是对责任担负的一种回报。一个幸福的人不可能没有责任，一个没有责任的人根本就无法获得真正长久的幸福”（谢军 5）。总体来看，爱玛的幸福观是一种索取型的幸福观，过多地看重自己的权利和欲望的满足而忽略了自身德性的提高。正如文中所说的那样，爱玛“虽说充满热情，却是一个很实际的人，她爱教堂只因为里面有花朵，爱音乐只是为了它的歌词，爱文学也只是为了获得感情上的刺激”¹。显然，爱玛的幸

1 福楼拜：《包法利夫人》，张道真译（上海：上海文艺出版社，2007年）32。以下凡出自该书的引文只标注出处页码，不再另行加注。

福观是单向度的，一切以满足自己的欲求为要，缺乏提升自身的德性、完善自我的诉求。尤其需要强调的是，她读文学不是为了提升自身的智识和修养，不是为了从文学中得到应有的道德教诲，而是为让自己获得情感上的刺激和愉悦，这也是从根本上违背阅读伦理的，因为“美德决不能依据愉快或有用来界定或辨识”（麦金太尔 203）。

责任意识的缺失让爱玛没有很好地担当起一个母亲和妻子的责任，给女儿和丈夫带来巨大的伤害。作为妻子，她对丈夫缺乏足够的体贴、关心和帮助。在他的事业遭受挫折、情绪低落之际，她不但没有给他安慰和鼓励，反而对他充满愤怒和鄙视。在小说中，包法利在众人的揶揄之下给伊波里特的畸形脚做手术，结果失败，导致腿部腐烂，不得不把腿锯掉。这次挫败让包法利非常沮丧和绝望：“他看到自己信誉扫地，身败名裂！他的心，在种种假想的进攻下，忐忑不安，就像仍在海里的空木桶，随波起伏着”（146）。而此时的爱玛不但没有给予丈夫任何安慰，反而感到自己受到了羞辱：“爱玛在他对面坐着瞧他。她不是在分担他的羞辱，她是在想自己受到的羞辱：她竟然会异想天开，以为这样一个人会有出息，就仿佛她没有一再看透他是一个废物似的！”（146）更为严重的是，她辜负了丈夫对她的信任，在外面寻欢作乐，违背了一个妻子的伦理身份和道德操守。在该作中，婚前对丈夫有着很大期待的爱玛，婚后不久就开始对简朴的生活心怀不满，但她没有在现有的条件下与丈夫同心同德、齐心协力地经营婚姻生活，而是一味怪罪丈夫的无能，认为他缺乏雄心壮志，太没出息。另外，道德自觉的缺失也让爱玛没有很好地履行一个母亲的责任，在孩子需要母爱的时候，她对孩子表现出更多的是冷漠和不耐烦，从而给女儿幼小的心灵带来难以弥补的创伤。在孩子出生之际，当她知道是个女孩的时候，“她转过头，晕了过去”（69）。在她被情人鲁道尔夫抛弃、身体状况极度糟糕之际，当孩子向她表示亲近之时，她却表现出极度的粗暴和不耐烦。可见她的母爱已经匮乏到了何种地步。在临死之际她才感受到了这种久违的母爱，然而为时已晚。当她想亲吻一下孩子的手时，孩子表现出极度惊恐和拒斥。孩子对她的惊恐与拒斥宣告了她作为一个母亲的失败。

二、道德情感的淡漠

在“知”、“情”、“意”三要素中，道德情感处于中间环节，它来源于道德意识或道德自觉，“直接形成于个人道德认识，因而没有个人道德认识，绝不会有个人道德感情”（王海明 1546）。根据文学伦理学批评的界定，“道德情感即受到道德约束的情感”（聂珍钊 249），“伦理选择中的情感在特定环境或语境中受到理性的约束，使之符合道德准则与规范。这种以理性意志形式表现出来的情感是一种道德情感，如母爱和亲情”（聂珍钊 250）。道德情感对道德自觉和道德意志也有很大的促动作用。一方面，道德情感是

一种强大的超越性心理能量，对健康道德人格的形构以及道德行为的实施有着正向推动力。另一方面，荣誉感、羞恶感、良心等道德情感对个体非理性的欲望具有反向的遏制力。一个人的情感世界中如果缺乏高洁的情操，缺乏道德情感，那么以情欲和物欲主导的自然情感就会占据主导地位，自私的、自恋的、低俗的情感就会主宰着人的心灵。诸多细节表明，爱玛在道德情感方面同样处于极度贫乏的状态，既对无私的、高尚的、善良的情操缺乏“喜好”和向往之情，也对自私的、低俗的、卑劣的品性缺乏羞耻和“厌恶”之感。

首先，道德情感的淡漠让她在爱情的认识方面存在严重误区，缺乏精神高度和灵魂深度，没有多少超越性可言。可以说，爱情是爱玛生命中的一切。但颇具反讽意味的是，爱玛的爱情追求不但没有如其所愿地给她带来真正的快乐和满足，反而让她更加失落和幻灭。其原因在于爱玛所追求的爱情缺乏精神和道德维度，不是一种真正的爱情。真正的爱情不仅有自然情感属性，而且还有道德情感属性，而且接受后者净化和监督。然而这种精神和道德含量在爱玛的情爱观中却少得可怜，正如小说中所说的那样，她与第一个情人鲁道尔夫“之间似乎不是一种爱慕的关系，而是一种长期的诱惑”（136）。她与第二个情人莱昂之间的“爱情”同样不尽人意。经历过短暂的欢愉和激情之后，他们的情爱关系陷入了平淡、乏味和厌倦。对此，爱玛也每每感到困惑，不断思考自己不快乐的理由。爱玛没意识到她不快乐的根源在于她所认同的这种爱情观及其实现方式本身存着严重问题，没意识到一种缺乏道德内涵和美德诉求的情感是空洞的，很快就会“审美疲劳的”，不会给人带来深层次的满足和恒久的快乐。

其次，道德情感的淡漠也让爱玛与鲁道尔夫等浪荡子弟之间的情爱关系更多地表现为一种肉体关系，并在肉欲的放纵中走向堕落。面对情场老手鲁道尔夫的勾引，起初爱玛还是有一定的道德意识。然而其爱情观中道德意识的淡漠让她在强大的情欲面前丧失了评判力和免疫力。在与鲁道尔夫之间的这种缺乏道德情操的情爱关系中，爱玛逐渐走向堕落。同样，肉欲的狂欢也成了维系爱玛与莱昂情爱关系的纽带，而且让她更加放荡不羁，在情欲的放纵中已经丧失了基本的羞耻感。另外，爱玛在这种赤裸裸的情欲放纵中并没有获得预期的快乐和满足。她没有意识到，与单纯放纵情欲相比，情欲的节制以及拥有高洁的情操同样会给人带来满足感：“尽管方式不同，但节制之人却能凭借开心因素而让自己获得同放纵之人一样多的快乐”（赫斯特豪斯 239）。

再次，荣誉感和良心等道德情感的缺乏让爱玛无法事后对自己道德失范行为做出正确的道德评价，无法对自己种种不当行为及时检视和自省，从而错失了迷途知返、改过自新的机会。根据德性论观点，道德情感表现为多种形式：“行为主体对不符合道德规范的行为动机反省之后的自责和自谴；对自己行为的不良后果的内疚和悔恨；对实践高尚道德行为的某种愉悦和崇高

感；对他人的善行或恶性的认同感或排斥感（反感）”（李佑新 154）。可见，道德情感有助于个体对自己和他人的品性和行为进行正确评价，有利于个体及时纠正认知偏差，调整行为方向。在该作中，爱玛也有过几次昙花一现式的良心的发现，对自己的道德失范行为表现出一定的“自责”和“自谴”，并且也采取了一定的行动对之进行弥补。但由于道德自觉的缺失和道德情感的淡漠，其“良好表现”也并非出自真心，在周围邻里称赞她好善乐施、勤俭节约之时，“她的内心却充满欲念、愤怒和怨恨”（84）。而且事后因丈夫一次行医的失败反而感到自己的这种改过自新多余和不值，甚至认为自己太过贤惠。显然，道德情感的缺乏，让爱玛良心泯灭，无法对自己道德失范行为进行彻底反省，因而迟迟不能回归生命的正途。

三、道德意志的薄弱

根据学界的定义，“道德意志是人们在道德实践中为了达到某种目的而自觉克服困难的毅力和精神，是道德认知向道德行为转化的关键”（罗石、郭敬和 17）。如果道德自觉的作用机制是导向和规范，道德情感倚重的一种高尚的道德情操的观照和匡正，那么道德意志的运行机制则是一种约束和控制。因此，自律性和自控性是道德意志的主要特性。就此而言，爱玛在道德意志方面显然是非常薄弱的。对于这一点，爱玛自己也有所认识，认为“她的意志就像她那用一根细绳子扣在帽上的面纱，碰到一点风都会摆动”（69）。但她更多地把它归咎为自己的女性身份，没有意识到其实道德意志与性别没什么大关系，与道德情感一样，道德意志是可以培养和形构的，正如刘喜珍所说的那样，“顽强的道德意志以坚定、执着的道德信念为基石，通过恒久的道德实践磨炼而成”（刘喜珍 32）。在很大程度上讲，爱玛种种道德失范行为恰恰就是她道德意志薄弱或缺乏的表现。道德意志薄弱让她后来的非理性消费彻底失控，最终让她在物欲的放纵中走向毁灭。

首先，道德意志的薄弱让爱玛无法果断中止与浮浪子弟的交往，及时从肉欲的深渊中走出，这是她最终走向毁灭的间接原因。正如前文提到的那样，爱玛与莱昂交往不久就感受到了他们爱情的平淡和乏味，而且也很快就意识到了莱昂在人格与德性方面的种种问题：“他孱弱、平庸，做不出惊人之举，比女人还优柔，此外，还贪婪、怯懦”（226）。她与后者的每次约会都让他感到失望和幻灭：“没有东西值得追求，一切都是虚幻！每一个笑容后面都掩藏着厌倦，每一回高兴里都潜伏着不祥的预兆，一切欢乐都会变成厌倦，最甜美的吻也只是在唇上留下一个向往更大快乐却又无法实现的欲望”（227）。可见，此时她对他们情爱关系的性质已经有一定的“知”，但“从‘知’到‘行’，有一个‘意’的重要环节。此所谓‘意’，并非一般的意念或意见，而是道德意志”（李佑新 152）。也就是说，从知善到行善，还需要道德意志的参与。正是由于道德意志的薄弱，爱玛缺乏与莱昂断绝来往的决心和勇

气，无法遏制“她那因通奸而更加旺盛的欲火”（232），以至于在肉欲的深渊中不能自拔。

其次，道德意志的薄弱让爱玛没有及时遏制自己非理性的消费欲望，这也构成了她最终走向毁灭的直接原因。小说一开始就告诉读者，爱玛的爱情世界并不纯净，爱玛是个有物欲倾向的人，而且她的情欲从一开始就和物欲纠缠在一起，把奢华的物质享受看作其体验浪漫爱情的必备条件：“所有肉体的激动和情意的缠绵，都离不开终日悠闲的大庄园的阳台，离不开有绸子窗帘、厚实地毯、葱郁的盆景和讲究的牙床的绣楼，离不开晶莹闪光的宝石和军服肩上的丝穗”（47）。这也为她后来的穷奢极欲埋下伏笔。与莱昂的肉欲狂欢终究无法拯救日渐枯萎的爱情，而爱玛在给莱昂的信中所谈的“花儿、诗、月亮和星星”已经无法激发爱的激情，已经变成了“拙劣的点缀物”（226）。鉴于“爱情在衰退时总求助于一切外力来使自己恢复”（226），奢华的物质就成了维护其爱情幻像、装扮和美化这种空洞的情爱关系的主要方式。由于道德意志的缺乏，不仅与莱昂的偷情过程中极尽奢华之能事，而且在日常生活中也控制不住其逐渐膨胀的消费欲望，以至于在物欲的深渊中越陷越深。为了弄到钱，她可谓无所不用其极：“她开始卖旧帽子、旧手套和旧铁器”，“她向费丽丝黛、勒佛兰索太太和红十字客店的老老板娘借钱，不管在什么地方，不管是谁，她是有钱就借”（231）。最终她欠下了难以偿还的债务，甚至收到要在24小时内还清八千法郎的法院执行判决书，这不仅把自己逼上了不归路，也给可怜无辜的丈夫和女儿带来致命的伤害。

结语

爱玛因为读了浪漫传奇的小说陷入对爱情不切实际的幻想和追逐，而我们读了《包法利夫人》却不会成为爱玛，原因在于这是一部有着深厚道德关怀和道德教诲价值的作品。通过对爱玛人生悲剧的详尽叙述，该作强调了德性在个体健康成长和获得幸福的过程中扮演的重要角色。这是一部道德寓言，更确切地说是一部书写德性或美德的著作。包法利夫人是一个符号，一个人性的能指，所指就是我们每个人。本文援用德性论的相关观念来探究爱玛人生悲剧的根源，其目的就是为从学理上挖掘和展示该作蕴含的深刻道德意蕴，审视道德自觉、道德情感和道德意志三个德性构成要素在处理这些矛盾冲突、形塑道德人格、获得幸福人生过程中的重要作用。在爱玛身上我们领略了每个人对爱情和幸福的渴望与向往，感受到了人性中的欲望和激情，同时也意识到平衡幸福与责任、激情与理智、欲望与道德之间关系的重要性。通过爱玛这个人物形象的塑造，该作提出了关乎每个社会个体幸与不幸的重大命题。在该作出版160多年的今天，对于在消费时代各种欲望极度膨胀的现代人而言，该作提出的这些重大命题不但没有过时，反而更具当下意义。

Works Cited

- 白臣：“论道德自觉的人性基础”，《河北师范大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）5（2013）：79-83。
[Bai Chen. “On the Human Nature-Oriented Moral Consciousness.” *Journal of Hebei Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)* 5 (2013): 79-83.]
- 陈立乾：“男权体制下的牺牲品：《包法利夫人》中艾玛人生悲剧解读”，《前沿》24（2011）：200-202。[Chen Liqian. “Victim under Patriarchy: On Emma’s Life Tragedy in Madame Bovary.” *Forward Position* 24 (2011): 200-202.]
- 福楼拜：《包法利夫人》，张道真译。上海：上海文艺出版社，2007年。
[Flaubert. *Madame Bovary*. Trans, Zhang Daozhen. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing House, 2007.]
- 罗莎琳德·赫斯特豪斯：《美德伦理学》，李义天译。南京：译林出版社，2016年。
[Hursthouse, Rosalind. *On Virtue Ethics*. Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2016.]
- 侯小珍：“性格决定命运：探析包法利夫人的悲剧根源”，《甘肃高师学报》8（2017）：25-27。
[Hou Xiaozhen. “Character Determines One’s Fate: An Analysis of the Tragedy of Madame Bovary.” *Journal of Gansu Normal Colleges* 8 (2017): 25-27.]
- 江畅：《德性论》。北京：人民出版社，2011年。
[Jiang Chang. *Virtue Theory*. Beijing: People’s Publishing House, 2011.]
- 李健吾：《福楼拜评传》。长沙：湖南人民出版社，1980年。
[Li Jianwu. *Critical Biography of Flaubert*. Changsha: Human People’s Publishing House, 1980.]
- 李佑新：《走出现代性道德困境》。北京：人民出版社，2006年。
[Li Youxin. *Getting out of the Moral Dilemma of Modernity*. Beijing: People’s Publishing House, 2006.]
- 刘喜珍：“西方道德意志观念及其现代价值研究”，《北方工业大学学报》2（2002）：32-37。
[Liu Xizhen. “Western Moral Will Concept and Its Modern Values.” *Journal of North China University of Technology* 2 (2002): 32-37.]
- 罗石、郭敬和：“试析道德情感主导下的道德行为”，《伦理学研究》1（2012）：14-19。
[Luo Shi and Guo Jinghe. “On the Moral Behavior Motivated by Moral Emotion.” *Studies in Ethics* 6 (2010): 14-19.]
- 阿拉斯戴尔·麦金泰尔：《追寻美德：道德理论研究》，宋继杰译。南京：译林出版社，2011年。
[MacIntyre, Alasdair. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. Nanjing: Yilin 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. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]
- 彭俞霞：“谁是包法利夫人：福楼拜小说人物文本内外形象综述”，《法国研究》3（2008）：9-14。
[Peng Yuxia. “Who Is Madame Bovary: An Overview of Character Images in and out of Flaubert’s Fictions.” *Etudes Francaises* 3 (2008): 9-14.]
- 尚玉峰：“《包法利夫人》的女性主义解读”，《中华女子学院山东分院学报》5（2008）：61-

65。

[Shang Yufeng. "The Feminist Deciphement on Madame Bovary." *Journal of Shandong Women's University* 5 (2008): 61-65]

王海明：《新伦理学》，北京：商务印书馆，2008年。

[Wang Haiming. *New Ethics*. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2008.]

谢军：《责任论》。上海：上海人民出版社，2007年。

[Xie Jun. *Responsibility Theory*. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2007.]

张凌江：“被文本吞噬的爱玛：对《包法利夫人》的女性主义解读”，《铁道师院学报》5（1999）：59-62。

[Zhang Lingjiang. "A Text-Swallowed Emma: A Feminist Interpretation of Madame Bovary." *Journal of Suzhou Railway Teachers College* 5 (1999): 59-62.]

朱茜：“论《包法利夫人》悲剧的必然性”，《北方文学》6（2017）：85-85。

[Zhu Qian. "On the Inevitability of the Tragedy in Madame Bovary." *Northern Literature* 6 (2017): 85-85.]

责任编辑：杨革新

石黑一雄《小夜曲：音乐与黄昏五故事集》 中的音乐与“暗恐”

Music and “Uncanny” in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*

高 奋 (Gao Fen) 郑洁儒 (Zheng Jieru)

内容摘要：在《小夜曲：音乐与黄昏五故事集》中，石黑一雄用音乐表现现代人在“无家可归”感与“在家”感之间挣扎时所产生的负面情绪，独具匠心地以平淡自然的风格展现被弗洛伊德界定为“压抑的复现”的“暗恐”心理，揭示了现代人的心理问题、现代社会的文化危机和理想的精神家园。在心理表现上，作品用音乐触发往日美好记忆与当下破碎现实的瞬间交织，再现现代人压抑的情感被音乐唤醒时那种无以名状的无家可归感；在文化剖析上，作品以音乐人的经历为典型题材，揭示现代人“暗恐”的根源在于追逐名利的文化价值观；在理想精神重构上，作品强调了音乐兼具手段和目的双重作用的重要性和音乐的专业性与心灵性共存的重要性，为走出现代人负面生存状态，回归生命愉悦之本真提供了途径。

关键词：石黑一雄；《小夜曲：音乐与黄昏五故事集》；暗恐；音乐

作者简介：高奋，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院教授、博导，主要从事英美文学研究；郑洁儒，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院博士研究生，主要从事英国文学研究。本文获得“中央高校基本科研业务费专项资金资助”。

Title: Music and “Uncanny” in Kazuo Ishiguro’s *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*

Abstract: In *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*, Kazuo Ishiguro expresses the unpleasant feelings confronted with the conflict between a sense of homelessness and a sense of being at home, presenting creatively and naturally Freud’s theory of “uncanny” defined as “something repressed which recurs”, in order to disclose psychological problems of modern individuals, cultural crisis of modern society and an ideal spiritual state. In terms of psychological description, it arouses through music a momentary impact between the past pleasant memory and the present broken reality, foregrounding an unspeakable sense of homelessness haunting modern individuals since their natural desires have long been repressed. In

terms of cultural examination, the root of “uncanny” feelings is revealed, through focusing on the existential state of musicians, to be fame-and-wealth-oriented cultural value. In terms of ideal spirit reconstruction, it emphasizes the significance of music as both means and end, and music as both professional and spiritual, which is an effective way to transcend negative feelings and return to the real of life.

Key words: Kazuo Ishiguro; *Nocturnes*; uncanny; music

Author: Gao Fen is Professor of English at the School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research interest is British and American literature (Email: gfd2002@163.com). Zheng Jieru is a doctoral candidate at the School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research interest is British literature (Email: xiaoyangkiki@163.com).

诺贝尔文学奖 2017 年得主石黑一雄 (Kazuo Ishiguro) 挚爱音乐, 曾在《远山淡影》(*A Pale View of Hills*)、《无可慰藉》(*The Unconsoled*)、《别让我走》(*Never Let Me Go*) 等多部作品中运用音乐元素。短篇小说集《小夜曲: 音乐与黄昏五故事集》(*Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*) (以下简称《小夜曲》) 最集中地体现了石黑一雄创作的音乐性, 他独具匠心地以音乐为媒介、题材和主题, 串联五个故事, 多侧面地表现并揭示现代人的生存状态及本质。

石黑一雄的音乐性不仅如欧美和中国批评界所揭示的那样, 表现了音乐与人物之间的内在关联性 (萧碧莉 23-34)、音乐对现实的拟像 (梅丽 73-81)、小说与“小夜曲”这一同名乐曲之间的关联性 (Fusco 186-193) 等, 更重要的是, 他用音乐表达了现代人在“无家可归”感 (a sense of homelessness) 与“在家”感 (being at home) 之间的挣扎 (Barry Lewis 3), 刻画了一群在家的温暖记忆与家的破碎现实的夹缝中无所适从的现代人。石黑一雄所表现的无以名状的心理与弗洛伊德 (Sigmund Freud) 1919 年阐述的“暗恐”心理相近。关于这一点, 批评界尚无人作深入研究, 仅有富斯科 (Fusco) 曾提及“小夜曲”音乐旋律与石黑一雄作品中常见的“思家/怀旧 (nostalgia)”主题之间的关系: “小夜曲是指一种以抒情和旋律为特征的乐曲, 能够传达梦幻般的气氛, 及忧郁与思家/怀旧共存的矛盾情绪” (186)。

本论文将集中探讨《小夜曲》中音乐与“暗恐”之间的关系, 以揭示石黑一雄作品的“深层含义” (deeper things) (qtd. in Cheng 123)。所探讨的主要问题包括: 作品如何用音乐复现“暗恐”心理? 其音乐题材揭示出“暗恐”心理怎样的文化根源? 音乐又如何消解现代“暗恐”?

1919 年, 弗洛伊德曾发表题为《暗恐》的论文, 用“暗恐” (英文

uncanny) (德文 *das unheimlich*) 指称美学中与“美丽、魅力、崇高”(514)等积极情感相对的另一面,即“害怕和恐惧”(514)等负面情感。他在分析“暗恐”的德文词义后,阐明“暗恐指本该隐藏的东西却曝光了”(517);又在分析德国作家霍夫曼的《沙魔》等文学作品后,指出暗恐本质上就是“压抑的复现”：“首先,精神分析理论认为任何情感……受到压抑时,都会变成焦虑……焦虑表现为压抑的复现。这类病态的焦虑就是暗恐……其次,如果它的确是暗恐的隐密本质,我们会明白为什么在语言使用中 *heimlich* 会被延伸到它的反义词 *unheimlich*, 因为暗恐本质上并非新的和陌生的东西,而是某种熟悉的和旧的东西,它早就存在于头脑中,只是因为受到压抑而变得陌生了”(526)。弗洛伊德将心理分析和现代美学有机结合,不仅系统论述“暗恐”作为现代人负面情感的表征,它的成因(情感的压抑)、本质(压抑的复现)和表现形式(焦虑惊恐),而且提醒学界重视长期遭忽视的负面情感的美学价值。

现当代诸多用负面情感表现社会问题和文化危机的文学作品与弗洛伊德的“暗恐”理论琴瑟共鸣。大部分作品以创伤性和恐怖性的方式表现种族歧视、殖民暴力、黑奴制等黑暗记忆带来的焦虑和恐惧,普遍采用浓墨厚描的叙事形式,比如:怪异行为、扭曲心灵、阴森鬼魂等,其形式相似于弗洛伊德在《暗恐》中所剖析的作品《沙魔》——一个孩提时的恐怖传说在主人公的生命中一次次“复现”,最后直接导致主人公死亡的恐怖故事。

石黑一雄的《小夜曲》同样透过现代人的负面情绪折射社会问题和文化危机,但是他突破了种族歧视、殖民暴力这类特定的历史创伤主题,直面普通人的负面情感,因而能更深入地触及现代人的普遍生存困境。他分五则短篇,用平淡的笔触分别表现现代人在婚姻破裂、求职无望、职业受挫、碌碌无为等艰难处境时的负面情感,以音乐为媒介,让压抑的情感在挫败的现实中“复现”,赋予作品深长的意味,不失为对现代人“暗恐”心理的独创性表现。

一、音乐复现“暗恐”

在《小夜曲》中,音乐是进入石黑一雄的“深层含义”的独特媒介。借助熟悉的旋律,他在小说中营造了一片独特的声音空间:长久压抑的感受被音乐唤醒,记忆和现实瞬间碰撞,令人百感交集。石黑一雄在这一过程中表现的正是弗洛伊德“暗恐”概念中的“压抑复现”,如朱莉娅·克里斯蒂娃(Julia Kristeva)所言:“暗恐在想象与现实的边界模糊时出现”(188)。

在第一则故事《情歌手》(“Crooner”)中,音乐同时“复现”三个人物回忆与现实交织时的压抑感。过气歌手托尼·加德纳决意重返歌坛,他决定与相伴27年的妻子琳迪离婚,另娶一位姑娘,以全新面貌出现在公众面前。琳迪“理解”并坦然接受了这一决定。乍看之下,生活似乎波澜不惊。石黑一雄的妙处在于,用音乐旋律凸显平静表象下的不安与焦虑。

分手前托尼刻意为琳迪演唱离别歌曲，他邀请吉他手扬为他伴奏，在威尼斯河道的小船上为临窗而坐的妻子演唱她最喜爱的歌曲。托尼演唱前一直心事重重地沉浸在回忆中，向吉他手扬讲述他和妻子的婚姻故事。他演唱时“温柔、近乎沙哑，但是倾注了全身的力量”（27）¹，唱完后他“看起来并不高兴”、“疲倦”，似乎带着“羞愧”感（28）。面对即将到来的离婚，他安静地告诉扬：“我们仍深爱着对方”（29）。一位深爱着妻子，却决意为歌唱事业与妻子分手的男人的复杂内心就在他的歌声中展开，对27年婚姻的不舍、对妻子的爱恋和内疚、重返乐坛的雄心和冲劲、家的温暖和未来的不确定，所有复杂的情感聚合成歌声在威尼斯黝黑寒冷的河道上空飘荡；三首充满漂泊、思念和离别意蕴的歌曲似乎就是对他的人生的最好诠释。

心烦意乱的妻子琳迪听完前两首歌后，“毫无反应”，四周一片“宁静和黑暗”（27）；第三首歌唱完后，足足过了一分钟，才传来她的“啜泣”（28）。“宁静和黑暗”伴随着似无若有的“啜泣”，映照出琳迪压抑的情绪，它正是被歌声激发的“暗恐”心理席卷而来的标志。托尼刻意挑选了记载两人甜蜜生活的歌曲，用歌声重现往昔的美好，而这个感官混杂的声音空间（audiosphere），正是衔接回忆与现实的利器（Fusco 191）。对琳迪来说，熟悉的旋律回响在陌生的场景中，歌声犹在，歌者却决意弃她而去。歌声同时传递出“熟悉”与“陌生”交集的生命体验，爱恋、伤痛、恐惧、无奈、希望，五味杂陈，无以言说的情绪随着泪水喷涌而出。

吉他手扬从加德纳的歌声中似乎看见了自己离异的母亲孤独听歌的画面。母亲一生最爱倾听加德纳的歌曲，将自己全部的伤痛都托付给了歌声。此时此刻，在现场聆听加德纳充满忧伤的歌声，扬比任何时候都更深切地体会到母亲一生的悲苦。他竭力劝说加德纳“两个人还彼此相爱，就应该永远在一起”（31），并为托尼和琳迪三个月后最终离婚而黯然伤神。是爱的遗弃还是歌唱事业的重生，石黑一雄不作定论，一切都在歌声中复现，在歌声中交集，在歌声中伸展。

在《不论下雨或晴天》（“Come Rain or Come Shine”）中，音乐同样发挥“暗恐”复现的作用。查理和艾米莉是大学同学，已结婚多年，功成名就时却遭遇情感危机。他们邀请碌碌无为的大学同学雷蒙德来调和他们的感情。雷蒙德到达后，郁闷的查理外出开会，通过电话诉说他们的婚姻危机；烦躁的艾米莉忙于工作；独自在家的雷蒙德因偷看艾米莉的记事本而惶恐不安。故事在艾米莉回家打开音响后进入高潮。倾听着萨拉·沃恩的《爱人》这首他们大学期间最喜爱的歌曲，雷蒙德突然感到“一阵轻松和宽慰。和着缓缓的拍子，他闭上眼睛，想起许多年以前，在艾米莉的宿舍里”，他俩兴致勃勃地谈论音乐（81）。伴随着歌声，他告诉艾米莉，查理很爱她。而艾米莉随着音乐

1 本文相关引文均出自 Kazuo Ishiguro, *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009)。以下标出页码，不再一一说明。

旋律回忆起大学的快乐时光，意识到夫妻感情危机的症结在于他们“从来不能满足”，因为生活充满了诱惑，“这些人让你不得安宁。他们不停地冲着你叫喊、挥手，做各种蠢事吸引你的注意”（84）。埃米莉的反思与查理电话中的抱怨相互呼应：查理认为二人婚姻危机的祸根在于埃米莉难以满足的欲求，这是一切矛盾的“核心”（50），而他最需要的是“一个能把我心中的自我释放出来的人”（74）。但是淡泊名利、随时释放自我的雷蒙德却一直遭到他们的鄙视和攻击。最后，埃米莉盘伴着音乐，轻声说“查理是个好人。我们会好起来的”，雷蒙德却觉得只有在音乐播放的几分钟内他才“安全”（86）。在功名心的驱动下，现代人疯狂地追求物质、地位、权力、声望，却将人的天性、情感、欲求封锁起来，压抑下去，鄙视并弃绝，导致心灵家园的干枯和荒芜，乃至实体家庭的破裂和崩溃。在这则短篇中，音乐唤醒的正是被功名心长久压抑的情感需求和精神愉悦。

石黑一雄的创作功力在于：在平淡的叙述中插入音乐旋律，让过去与现在、心灵与现实碰撞，使散落一地的人物情绪瞬间聚合，现代人负面情绪的内在机理清晰显现。

二、音乐题材与“暗恐”根源

除了巧用音乐“复现”技巧外，石黑一雄还探索了音乐题材。他描写歌手、吉他手、萨克斯手、大提琴手等音乐人的经历，以乐坛为实例，披露追逐名利的社会价值观的弊端，揭示现代人“暗恐”的文化根源。

他借叙述人之口，这样描述乐坛的病症：“在这里，就是在最根部，有一种就算不是完全腐烂，也至少是极肤浅、极虚伪的东西在蔓延；这种现象直达最上层，反映了整个音乐界的状况。”（91）。他所指的“肤浅”（shallow）、“虚伪”（inauthentic）、“腐烂”（utterly rotten）就是指人们追名逐利过程中滋生的潜规则。作品描写了最常见的几种：

炮制“名气”。过气歌手托尼·加德纳执意与结婚27年的妻子琳迪离婚。他如此陈述自己的动机：“看看那些成功重返歌坛的人，看看那些仍活跃在歌坛的我这一辈人。他们每一个都再婚了。两次，甚至三次。他们每人都挽着年轻的妻子。我和琳迪会成为笑话”（30）。也就是说，不论是以头条新闻还是绯闻的形式，要“成名”就要不断借助媒体传播新闻，提升关注度，哪怕以婚姻为代价也在所不惜。

交易“名气”。托尼·加德纳成名的代价是婚姻，同名短篇《小夜曲》（“Nocturne”）中的萨克斯手史蒂夫则被迫以身体为代价换取成功机会。史蒂夫由于面相平庸，甚至带着“失败者的丑陋”（129），他的音乐才华始终得不到社会的认可。他的妻子离他而去，与他人同居，出资赞助他整容；经纪人减少他的工作机会，强迫他整容。他最终默认乐坛潜规则，去做整容手术，以便像妻子想象的那样，在乐坛“飞黄腾达”（132）。但是，他从心底

痛恨这些潜规则：“如果有那么一个人所代表的是世界上肤浅和恶心的东西，那么那个人非琳迪·加德纳莫属：一个毫无才能的人……她已经显示自己不会演戏，也不假装有什么音乐才能——可是她照样走红……这是怎么做到的？当然是老一套。适时的绯闻，适时的结婚，适时的离婚”（137）。

“暗恐”心理就在不择手段的追名逐利中悄然袭来。

琳迪自少女时代起便决意以美丽容貌为筹码换取婚姻和名利。托尼这样回忆他和琳迪初识经历：“我对琳迪一见钟情。可是她也爱我吗？我想她根本没考虑过这个问题。我是个明星，她只关心这一点”（29）。正是在人与人之间以利益为连结的社会中，心灵的真实欲求被压抑，变陌生，“暗恐”随之袭来。当托尼决定重返乐坛时，夫妻二人朝夕相处的爱情被视为成功路上的拦路虎：“琳迪早在我之前就明白这其中的道理。我们商量过了。她明白我们是时候各走各的了”（30-31）。然而“暗恐”来袭，琳迪在惊恐中察觉名利包装下的虚情假意：自己追逐的名利能够替代内心的真情实感成为生活的根基吗？这一价值观的动摇让琳迪恍然失神，颤栗不已，如克里斯蒂娃所言，“面对被自己拒斥的异己，在辨认出它的那一刻，我失去了（与异己之间的）边界和容器，曾被我抛弃的记忆重新包围我，我无法淡定”（187）。

埃米莉的“暗恐”则折射出成功与失败的悖论，映照出她的心灵“无家可归”的真相。在世俗标准中，埃米莉和查理是一对小有成就的中产阶级夫妇，已经取得了较高的地位，有舒适的居所，但他们却充满对成功的焦虑，“从不满足”（84），就像阿兰·德波顿（Alain de Botton）所言，“要觉得自己不是一个‘失败者’，我们必须期望更多的东西”（2），唯有与社会的成功典范保持一致，才能避免被夺去尊严和尊重（6）。他们为满足功名心而疲于奔命，焦虑滋生，最终引发婚姻危机。与他们截然相反的是，“失败者”雷蒙德却仿佛与现实脱轨，他听着心爱的音乐，在世界各地教英语，尽管贫困潦倒，他的生活却映现理想主义色彩。在雷蒙德的烛照下，埃米莉压抑的欲望短暂地挣脱了“成功”的牢笼，挣脱了她追随多年的价值理念，不禁疑惑：在这个物欲横流的社会，所谓的成功真的能换回幸福吗？也许成功未必比一段悦耳的音乐更让她安心；面对现实中无尽的诱惑，她未必比雷蒙德更有归属感。惊恐之下，她从雷蒙德的口中听见真相：“人很难知道哪里可以安身，何以安身”（85）。

有关“成功”、“成名”的词汇反复见诸于《小夜曲》中各个短篇，石黑一雄借此诠释了乐坛当前“肤浅”、“虚伪”的文化危机：音乐已经沦为人们追名逐利的手段，诚如阿多诺（Theodor W. Adorno）所言，“神圣的传统音乐的表演风格，在听众生活中所起的作用，已接近成批生产的商品；连它的本质也受到影响”（13）；亦如丹尼尔·贝尔（Daniel Bell）所言，“地位及其象征变成了成功的标志”（77）。这一文化危机从丹尼尔·贝尔笔下的镀金时代延续到当代社会，在石黑一雄的笔下得到全面表现。值得一提的

是,《小夜曲》所描述的危机绝不局限于乐坛。哈贝马斯在《合法性危机》(*Legitimationsprobleme im Spatkapitalismus*)中指出,危机(crisis)“不能脱离陷于危机中的人的内心体会”,它意指某种“客观力量剥夺了一个主体的某些正常控制能力”(3)。可见,危机影响着置身其中的每个主体的感受。正是在这一意义上,石黑一雄以音乐为媒介,将追求成功为核心的文化危机投射到音符所能波及的各个角落,让置身于这张名利网中的托尼·加德纳、琳迪、埃米莉等人“暗恐”频现。

概而言之,《小夜曲》中“暗恐”的根源就是“奉成功为圭臬”的现代社会文化观。这一观念渗透在西方多种理论中,广为传播。比如马斯洛(Abraham H. Maslow)在《动机与人格》(*Motivation and Personality*)中所提出的“需求层次理论”,将人类需求从低到高分为生理需求(the physiological needs)、安全需求(the safety needs)、情感和归属需求(the belongingness and love needs)、尊重需求(the esteem needs)和自我实现需求(the need for self-actualization)五个等级,以生理需求为最低等级,自我实现需求为最高等级(35-47)。无论这样的需求等级划分有多少合理性,它对个体的导向就是忽视乃至压抑自己的生理需求,过度重视自我实现需求,乃至愿意为此牺牲生理和情感需求。实际上,生命的各种需求都是同等重要的,最重要的是达成各种需求之间的平衡。对任何一种需求的忽视和压抑,都会形成“暗恐”心理,导致负面情绪。石黑一雄的《小夜曲》所昭示的正是现代人多种需求之间的失衡,琳迪、埃米莉即是例证。在看似理性的选择背后,隐藏着现代思想理论和价值判断的缺陷,现代人因此成为“无家可归的异乡人”(homeless strangers)(Wang i)。

三、音乐消解“暗恐”

既然“暗恐”指称被压抑的情感在特定条件下被唤醒,而音乐具备复现并释放压抑的作用,那么音乐(或其他艺术)不正可以消解现代人的负面情绪吗?石黑一雄的确对现代人的理想精神家园作出建构,他在《莫尔文山》(“Malvern Hills”)和《大提琴手》(“Cellists”)两则短篇中,书写了真正音乐人的生存状态,探索了音乐的本质,不啻是对现代人负面生存状态的修正。

《莫尔文山》揭示了将音乐同时作为手段和目的的可能性和重要性。现代社会中,音乐、绘画等诸多艺术越来越多作为特定职业出现在人们的生活中,成为谋生的手段,诚如韦伯(Max Weber)所言,“以职业概念为基础的理性行为”是构成“近代资本主义精神”的基本要素(141)。但是,艺术一旦沦为谋生和追逐名利的手段,必然功利主义蔓延;我们需要一种以艺术为目的的思想与之中,或者说,一种以艺术的真善美和艺术的情感表达为目的的思想与之中,唯有如此,现代人才可能同时兼具物质安逸与精神愉悦。《莫尔文山》所描写的正是这样的生存状态。青年歌手在大城市屡次求职失败后,

决定隐居乡间写词作曲，期间遇到一对职业乐坛夫妻，他们不仅能听懂青年歌手歌声中的“户外、空气、回声”（106）等诸多韵味，而且特别用心去感悟并享受音乐的美，“虽然我（歌手，笔者注）看不见他们的脸，但整个过程中他们一直紧紧依偎，丝毫没有不自在的感觉，我知道他们特别享受我的音乐。我唱完后，他们转过身，笑容灿烂，鼓起了掌，掌声在群山间回荡”（107）。这对夫妻自豪自己是职业乐手，在旅馆、酒店、婚礼和宴会上演出，“以此为生”，因为他们“相信音乐”（108）。他们不断创新，用现代方式演绎传统民歌；他们演奏观众喜欢的音乐；他们表演“他们自己真正的音乐”（112），总之音乐既是谋生的手段（职业），也是生存的目的。他们用音乐表达心灵，他们用音乐创造美的形式，他们用音乐与他人交流。他们的生存状态是灿烂的，尤其是丈夫蒂洛，他自由自在地感受美好和快乐，几乎与负面情绪绝缘，因为他的心灵始终是敞亮的，不曾有半点压抑。他的开朗快乐与其他短篇中迷失在名利中的忧郁音乐人形成鲜明对比。

《大提琴手》揭示了音乐的专业性与音乐的心灵性共存的重要性。大提琴手蒂博尔从伦敦皇家音乐学院毕业，又在维也纳师从著名大师奥列格·彼得洛维奇，然而受过如此顶级音乐教育的乐手，却心甘情愿地接受一位不知名、不会拉大提琴的美国女士的指点，这样的情节设计几乎不可理喻，却又在情理之中。顶级的专业教育可以培养精湛的技艺，却无法赋予音乐以灵魂，而独具天赋的女士能够给予蒂博尔的演奏“新的深度和含义”（201）；她可以帮他剥去“外面的表层”（212），帮他深刻挖掘内心，帮他从一个演奏中辨明究竟该表现的是“喜悦”还是“追忆逝去的快乐时光”（205）。蒂博尔如获至宝，“我突然看到了什么东西”，“一座我不曾进入的花园。它就在那里，在远处。有东西阻挡着我的去路。可这是第一次，我看见它坐落在那里，一座我不曾见过的花园”（202）。那是心灵的花园，是真正的音乐天堂，但只有专业技艺与心灵感悟珠联璧合才可能进入这座艺术与心灵合一的花园。只有心与琴合一，现代人才可能依托它去抵御和消解“暗恐”的侵袭。

但是，故事的结尾却出人意料，几年后人们再次看到蒂博尔时，发现他并不快乐，音乐事业似乎很不顺利。石黑一雄的深刻用意正从这一奇怪的结尾中透射出来：艺术的心灵性在西方学界较少得到关注，现当代文论的爆炸式发展愈发让艺术远离心灵。艺术自诞生以来，学术界对它的界定从艺术的功用、形式、技艺、方法、媒介等单向度拓展，却较少重视艺术的心灵性。比如“艺术即模仿”（柏拉图）、“艺术即认识”（亚里士多德）、“艺术即可传递的快感”（康德）、“艺术即展现”（叔本华）、“艺术即理想”（康德）、“艺术即救赎”（尼采）、“艺术即经验”（杜威）、“艺术即真理”（海德格尔）、“艺术即灵晕”（本雅明）、“艺术即自由”（阿多诺）、“艺术即文本”（巴特）、“艺术即文化生产”（布迪厄）、“艺术即后殖民”（阿皮亚）、“艺术即虚拟”（戴维斯）（沃特伯格 目录）。从这些挂一漏万的界定中，我们

能够看出，西方思想家对艺术的认识是单向度的，很多时候都远离生命本身。而石黑一雄则重视艺术的心灵性，诺贝尔文学奖颁奖词对他的评价充分说明这一点，“他的小说具有强大的情感力量，揭示出我们与世界紧密相联这一幻觉之下的深渊”（“The Nobel Prize in Literature 2017”）。这个深渊就是人的心灵，虽然它不常被西方思想家认定为艺术的本质，却一直是东方智者心目中的艺术源泉，如先秦《礼记》所言，“诗，言其志也；歌，咏其声也；舞，动其容也，三者本于心”（胡经之 37）。东西方智慧在日裔英国作家石黑一雄笔下得以兼容并蓄，并用音乐传达。

石黑一雄在这两则短篇中展示了他对音乐主题的探索，隐藏在故事下面的是两个有关艺术的根本性问题：真正的音乐人（艺术家）是怎样的？什么是音乐（艺术）？他的答案具有将艺术与生命合一的倾向，这正是消解“暗恐”心理的最好途径。

结语

在《小夜曲》里，石黑一雄对音乐的运用可谓达到极致，不仅让音乐发挥复现“暗恐”和揭露现代人“无家可归”感的作用，而且让音乐成为现代人走出困境后的精神家园。我们不妨用穆勒（John Stuart Mill）的音乐评述作为本文的结尾：音乐最大的影响“在于激发热情……在于唤醒人类品格中潜在的高尚情感，并提升其强度；音乐的这种刺激赋予情感光和热，虽然后者的巅峰状态稍纵即逝，但音乐却能维持这种升华的情感，因而弥足珍贵”（119）。这一席话不失为对石黑一雄《小夜曲》中音乐的深层意蕴的折射。

Works Cited

- Adorno, Theodor W. *Philosophy of New Music*. Ed. Robert Hullot-Kentor. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2006.
- 丹尼尔·贝尔：《资本主义文化矛盾》，严蓓雯译。南京：江苏人民出版社，2012年。
- [Bell, Daniel. *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism*. Trans. Yan Beiwen. Nanjing: Jiangsu People's Publishing House, 2012.]
- Cheng, Chu-chueh. “Cosmos of Similitude in Nocturnes.” *Kazuo Ishiguro in a Global Context*. Eds. Cynthia F. Wong and Hülya Yildiz. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2015. 121-31.
- 阿兰·德波顿：《身份的焦虑》，陈广兴、南治国译。上海：上海译文出版社，2007年。
- [De Botton, Alain. *Status Anxiety*. Trans. Chen Guangxing and Nan Zhiguo. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2007.]
- Freud, Sigmund. “The ‘Uncanny’.” Trans. James Strachey. *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends* (3rd edition). Ed. David H. Richter. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2007. 514-32.
- Fusco, Carla. “‘Come Rain or Come Shine’: Kazuo Ishiguro and Frank Sinatra, Two Crooners in

- Comparison.” *Symphony and Song: The Intersection of Words and Music*. Eds. Victor Kennedy and Michelle Gadpaille. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016. 186-93.
- 尤尔根·哈贝马斯：《合法化危机》，刘北成、曹卫东译。上海：上海人民出版社，2009年。
[Habermas, Jürgen. *Legitimationsprobleme im Spatkapitalismus*. Trans. Liu Beicheng and Cao Weidong. Shanghai: Shanghai People’s Publishing House, 2009.]
- 萧碧莉：“石黑一雄《夜曲》中之音乐与自我形塑”，《高雄师大学报》33（2012）：23-34。
[Hsiao Pi-li. “Music and the Construction of Selfhood in Kazuo Ishiguro’s Nocturnes.” *Journal of National Kaohsiung Normal University* 33 (2012): 23-34.]
- 胡经之主编：《中国古典文艺学丛编》（二），北京：北京大学出版社，2001年。
[Hu Jingzhi, ed. *Collection of Classical Chinese Theories of Literature and Art*. Vol. 2. Beijing: Beijing U P, 2001.]
- Ishiguro, Kazuo. *Nocturnes: Five Stories of Music and Nightfall*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2009.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Strangers to Ourselves*. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia U P, 1991.
- Lewis, Barry. *Kazuo Ishiguro*. Manchester: Manchester U P, 2000.
- Maslow, Abraham H. *Motivation and Personality*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 1999.
- 梅丽：“现代小说的‘音乐化’——以石黑一雄作品为例”，《外国文学研究》4（2016）：73-81。
[Mei Li. “Musicalization of Modern Fictions — A Case Study of Kazuo Ishiguro.” *Foreign Language Studies* 4 (2016): 73-81.]
- Mill, John Stuart. *Autobiography*. London: Penguin Books, 1989.
- “The Nobel Prize in Literature 2017”. Nobelprize.org. Nobel Media AB 2014. Web. 8 Nov 2017.
<http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/literature/laureates/2017/>
- Wang Ching-chih. *Homeless Strangers in the Novels of Kazuo Ishiguro: Floating Characters in a Floating World*. New York: The Edwin Mellen P, 2008.
- 托马斯·E·沃特伯格编著：《什么是艺术》，李奉栖、张云等译。重庆：重庆大学出版社，2011年。
[Wartenberg, Thomas E. *The Nature of Art*. Trans. Li Fengxi, Zhang Yun et al. Chongqing: Chongqing U P, 2011.]
- 马克斯·韦伯：《新教伦理与资本主义精神》，于晓、陈维纲等译。北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，1987年。
[Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. Trans. Yu Xiao, Chen Weigang et al. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1987.]

责任编辑：杨革新

文学经典与文化传承：论利维斯的“鲜活的传统”

Literary Canon and Cultural Continuity: Leavis's Construction of the "Living Tradition"

熊净雅 (Xiong Jingya)

内容摘要：“传统”是20世纪西方文学批评的关键词之一，也是利维斯批评体系的统领性要素之一。论文首先追溯了利维斯传统观的主要理论渊源，探究其如何受到艾略特传统观的影响，又最终扬弃了艾略特传统观在“非个性化”等问题上的观点；其次，考察了利维斯传统观的内涵在“经典”问题上的集中体现；评析了利维斯通过重新评价英国文学经典从而重塑英国文学传统所表现出的现代主义革新精神；论述了利维斯的经典书单在特定历史条件和教育环境中的必要性；再次，认为利维斯之传统以“传承”为纽带连接了文学批评和文化批评；指出利维斯以英国文学传统为出发点力求传承文化传统并以此救赎文化；阐明作为传承剑桥批评传统中的重要一环，利维斯的传统观反映了工业化和功利化社会中具有大众情怀的精英主义文学和文化观。

关键词：利维斯；传统；艾略特；经典；传承

作者简介：熊净雅，文学博士，中国科学院大学外语系讲师，主要从事英美现当代文学研究。

Title: Literary Canon and Cultural Continuity: Leavis's Construction of the "Living Tradition"

Abstract: Tradition is one of the keywords of Western literary criticism in the 20th century and one of the leading factors in F. R. Leavis's critical system. This essay first traces a major theoretical origin of Leavis's idea of tradition by exploring how it was influenced by T. S. Eliot's idea of tradition and then sublated his thoughts especially the theory of "impersonality." Then, it investigates Leavis's view of "canons" in which connotations of his idea of tradition are embodied, comments on the revolutionary spirit of modernism shown in Leavis's endeavour to reshape British literary tradition through revaluation of literary canons, and analyses why his list of canons is necessary in particular historical time and educational environment. Moreover, based on Leavis's idea of tradition it indicates that "continuity" serves as the link between literary criticism and cultural criticism, points out that Leavis

fought for cultural continuity and cultural salvation from the standpoint of British literary tradition, and elucidates that as a crucial link in the tradition of Cambridge criticism Leavis's idea of tradition reveals a kind of elitist literary and cultural criticism that concerns for the public in an industrial and utilitarian society.

Key words: Leavis; tradition; Eliot; canon; continuity

Author: Xiong Jingya, Ph.D., is Lecturer of English at the Department of Foreign Languages, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences. Her research areas are modern and contemporary British and American literature (silviaxiong2014@126.com).

“传统”（tradition）是一个既具体又模糊的概念，因而对其进行抽象全面的定义并非易事。传统常常是和其他表示特质的概念共同使用而获得具体意义的，譬如“新古典主义传统”或是“苏格兰民谣传统”。1919年现代主义方兴未艾之时，托·斯·艾略特（T. S. Eliot）对此有过微妙的阐释：“在英语写作中，我们很少谈到传统，尽管我们偶尔也使用这个名词来惋惜传统的消失”（艾略特 1）。半个多世纪之后的1976年，雷蒙·威廉斯（Raymond Williams）也指出“传统这个词就其现代普遍的意涵而言，特别复杂难解”（威廉斯 491），并最终将其归纳为“‘年代久远’的事物，以及‘礼仪’、‘责任’与‘敬意’”（492-493）。从1977年至今已再版五次的《企鹅文学术语和文学理论辞典》（*The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*）中的词条阐释侧重于传统的丰富的具体内涵：“它意指可供作家研究和学习的被继承下来的过去。因此可以指作家的母语、文学形式、准则、方法、惯例以及各种来自过去的文化”（Cuddon 730）。而《牛津文学术语词典》（*The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*）以艾略特和利维斯对经典的重构为例，更强调经典文本的作用和传统的动态性，将传统定义为：“被体现为从过去‘留传’到现在的任何作品、风格、惯例或者信仰。在实践中，这是指依照对过去的某种阐释而排列的被挑选出的某些作品，通常是为了赋予现在的某种批评观点以权威性”（Baldick 361）。虽然各家有关传统的阐释侧重点各不相同，但是均指出了传统的如下特质：第一，传统关乎“过去”；第二，传统通过“经典”得以体现；第三，传统是承上启下的“传承”过程。从上述三个方面出发，通过探究弗·雷·利维斯（F. R. Leavis）和艾略特传统观的渊源、利维斯对经典的认识，以及利维斯文学和文化遗产的主要思想，我们可以对利维斯的传统观进行较为完整的考察。

一、渊源：艾略特的追随者和扬弃者

利维斯的传统观在形成时期深刻地受到了艾略特传统观的启发，其文学批评一度可谓是对艾略特传统观的实践。利维斯后期扬弃了艾略特传统观在

“非个性化”等问题上的观点，发展出具有独特理论价值的传统观。

利维斯传统观的建构早在 20 世纪 20 年代末利维斯正式登上批评舞台之时便已于字里行间显露出端倪，只不过尚缺乏理论化的阐释，其主要渊源是艾略特。利维斯的批评生涯滥觞于诗歌批评，艾略特是这一进程中最具有决定性的影响力量。一方面，艾略特的诗歌为利维斯提供了批评的对象和理想诗歌的范本。另一方面，艾略特的文学批评理论为利维斯提供了批评方法的来源。¹ 传统是利维斯与艾略特之间的一条关键纽带。1920 年出版的《圣林》（*The Sacred Wood*）² 收录了名篇《传统与个人才能》（“Tradition and the Individual Talent”），其中提出的“传统”和“非个性化”等概念在利维斯批评思想的形成时期打下了鲜明的烙印。艾略特认为作家要将个人交付于传统，强调作家面对“过去”时的“历史意识”：“这种历史意识包括一种感觉，即不仅感觉到过去的过去性，而且也感觉到它的现在性。……有了这种历史意识，一个作家便成为传统的了”（艾略特 2-3）。无独有偶，利维斯曾就诗人和传统的关系这样说道：“一个批评家在对待具体作家时，不论是否做到了清楚详细，其实是在对待传统，因为这些作家活在传统之中”（Leavis, *Revaluation* 3）。这无疑是对艾略特“去个性化”的传统观在诗歌批评和诗歌史研究领域具体化的发展。不仅如此，艾略特传统观的影子在利维斯的小说批评中仍然依稀可见。譬如，利维斯考察了简·奥斯丁在传统中承前启后的角色，称她为“‘个人才能’与传统关系的绝佳典范”（利维斯 7）。艾略特非个性化理论中所言具备“历史意识”的传统观可以视为利维斯通过《英语诗歌的新动向》（*New Bearings in English Poetry*）、《重新评价》（*Revaluation*）和《伟大的传统》（*The Great Tradition*）等诗歌和小说批评专著来重建英国文学史光荣传统的一大理论支撑。

需要指出的是，利维斯的传统观远非对艾略特的复制，而是对其的继承和扬弃。二者的主要分歧在于是否要鼓励作家的个性。艾略特认为诗人面对传统时要通过牺牲个性获得价值，“一个艺术家的进步意味着继续不断的自我牺牲，继续不断的个性消灭。剩下要做的事就是对个性消灭的过程、以及对个性消灭和传统意识之间的关系，加以说明”（艾略特 6）。与艾略特相比，利维斯强调作家与传统的关系时更侧重于作家的个性和创造性，因而后期转向批判“这篇文章 [《传统与个人才能》] 既混乱又模糊”（Leavis, *Living* 186）。譬如，他指出诗人最本质的特质是能够“交流一些诗人自身所有的东西”（Leavis, *New* 11），作为小说“伟大的传统”之起首，“她 [奥斯丁] 与传统的关系却是创造性的”（利维斯 7），实际上是指个性和创造性与传统是相

1 有学者将早期二者的关系形容为“信徒关系”（Bergonzi 21），也有人称利维斯为艾略特的“追随者”（Mulhern 319），这些评价是恰如其分的。

2 对于利维斯而言，《圣林》是“他在当代对文学进行严肃思考的形成时期所接触的第一部也是最受影响的一部作品”（Bell 57）。

辅相成的。其实，艾略特本是极具个性的诗人，作为批评家的他也并没有彻底否认作家的个性，只是认为个性在创作中用处不大，这种倾向影响了新批评。虽然利维斯主义和新批评在对文本的重视上有渊源，但是二者的主要区别就在于利维斯强调作品在传统中的位置、作家的个性和生活经验以及批评的道德功能，等等。利维斯所指的“传统”的意义有所变化，他所理解的“非个性化”的概念兼具社会的、道德的和审美的维度。

作为 20 世纪西方文学批评的关键词之一，“传统”是被世纪之交新旧变革的历史洪流推上批评舞台之中心的。英国维多利亚时代被认为是亘古不变的秩序自 19 世纪末起即受到质疑和挑战，然而到 20 世纪初，在生产方式和社会结构发生了巨大变化，欧洲大陆的思潮不断涌入的情况下，怀旧情绪和根深蒂固的旧观念仍然挥之不去，人们的思想经历着强烈的多重的冲击。这一切激发了作家和批评家对过去和现在关系的阐释以及对未来可能性的探索，从而使得传统前所未有地成为了现代主义乃至 20 世纪文学批评的重要议题。利维斯的传统观正是肇始于这个新旧冲突激烈，呼唤理性反思和大胆构想的年代，艾略特是这一时期启发利维斯的主要渊源。在随后约半个世纪的批评生涯中，利维斯的传统观不断发展丰富。

二、经典：理解传统的必经之路

作为坚定的经典拥护者，利维斯曾经这样解释传统与经典的关系：“如此这般强调为数不多的几个出类拔萃者，并不是要漠视传统；相反，理解传统之义正该由此入手”（利维斯 4）。也就是说，经典作品最能代表传统的精髓和发展脉络。所以，要全面理解利维斯的传统观必须考察其经典观。

利维斯的传统观在文学批评领域集中体现在两方面：一是对英国诗歌进行了“重新评价”，并指明了现代英语诗歌的“新动向”；二是重塑了英国小说的“伟大的传统”。这既是对英国诗歌史和小说史进行的现代主义意义上的宏观重构，又是细察敏锐的具体批评实践，其背后主要的理论支持是利维斯对于经典的认识。首先，利维斯是极具现代主义革新气质的诗歌批评家。1932 年出版的《英语诗歌的新动向》剖析了维多利亚时代诗歌套路化的主题、意象和手法对诗歌的束缚，指明了以艾略特为代表的现代主义诗歌的萌芽现状和发展方向。利维斯的批评在艾略特早期被接受的历史上起到了重要作用，从此曾经饱受争议的《荒原》和艾略特获得了几乎是公认的定论¹。正如同布鲁克斯所评价的那样，“尤其是在弗·雷·利维斯和弗·奥·马西森²之

1 艾略特早期在文坛地位的确立得益于以利维斯、马西森（F. O. Matthiessen）、威尔逊（Edmund Wilson）、布鲁克斯（Cleanth Brooks）为代表的众多批评家的协同努力；其中，利维斯的工作十分关键。

2 指《英语诗歌的新动向》和马西森于其后三年出版的《托·斯·艾略特的成就》（*The Achievement of T. S. Eliot*）。

后,倘若要大胆地进一步写任何关于《荒原》的东西是需要解释甚至是道歉的”(Brooks 185)。更重要的是,这部专著体现了大量极具学术价值的诗学思想,其核心是诗歌应当运用口语化的“鲜活的语言”(the living language),以“生活”(life)和“经验”(experience)为基础,反映诗人的个性和现代社会的时代性。利维斯紧接着于1936年出版了《重新评价》,梳理评价了英国16世纪至浪漫主义时期的诗歌。他推崇多恩等玄学派诗人莎士比亚式的口语化的诗歌语言,同时强硬批判弥尔顿的宏大风格和拉丁化的语言,与艾略特合力掀起了20世纪初弥尔顿之争的高潮。此外,主要浪漫主义诗人也经历了褒贬各异的重新评价:利维斯高度肯定了华兹华斯关注生活的道德感,赞扬他创造天才与批评意识并存的理想状态,但仍对其《不朽颂》(*Immortality Ode*)中的宏大风格表示了不满;利维斯对雪莱进行了颠覆传统观点的批判性的重新评价,指出“雪莱之流畅雄辩风格的效果是将诗歌交付于和心智没有联系的感受力”(Leavis, *Revaluation* 210),雪莱的诗“从情感自身出发表达情感,不与其他事物相联系,存在于空洞之中”(214),等等;利维斯推崇济慈放弃学习弥尔顿之后写出的“莎士比亚式的”(263)作品,肯定其兼顾艺术和生活的高超造诣、悲剧性的非个性化特征,以及成熟的道德感。我们可以发现,利维斯进行重新评价的主要标准是诗人是否使用口语化的“鲜活的语言”、体现“生活”和“经验”、保持非个性化,最重要的是其是否具有关乎人性的道德关怀。《英语诗歌的新动向》和《重新评价》“坚定地为企业诗歌重新绘制了一幅地图”(Bergonzi 22),与晚期的《鲜活的原则》(*The Living Principle*)等著作共同勾画出了英国诗歌的一个伟大的传统。

其次,利维斯重构了英国小说的伟大的传统,树立了具有时代眼光的小说经典。《伟大的传统》指明了“简·奥斯丁、乔治·艾略特、亨利·詹姆斯、康拉德以及D. H. 劳伦斯——他们即是英国小说的伟大传统之所在”(利维斯 37)。利维斯力求摆脱维多利亚时代以来对小说和小说家的固有评价,以根植于生活的道德观念来鉴别小说。这种道德批评绝非类似维多利亚时代的道德说教,而是艺术创作的有机要素。例如,利维斯赞叹乔治·艾略特在塑造特兰萨姆夫人时深刻的道德想象和可信敏锐的心理观察,并指出:“我们感到,若把这里的乔治·艾略特说成是个道德家,那便是踩错了点。她完全是个大艺术家——一个小说大家,具有一个小说大家在把握人性心理上的洞察力和知人论世的敏锐烛幽”(利维斯 75)。他认为乔治·艾略特捕捉到了真实的人性,创造出悲剧效果:“这段文字没有一点儿说教的味道;它乃是戏剧化的论断,深刻犀利又完全可信,而个中所隐含的道德教训乃是建立在形象展示的必然性之上的,是一个心理现实主义者所认识到的那种教训”(79)。乔治·艾略特可谓是得益于利维斯重新评价的最典型的例子,“可以毫不过分地说,没有《伟大的传统》就没有《米德尔马契》(及其作者)在今日英国文学史上崇高的地位”(陆建德 15)。亦如乔治·斯坦纳

(George Steiner) 在《伟大的传统》问世 14 年后的 1962 年所指出的那样, 当时的书评作者和本科生都能对列入伟大的传统的作家作品发表一番洞见, “这样的成功不应使我们忘记利维斯的重新评价在当时不仅十分新颖, 而且无畏大胆” (Steiner 230)。利维斯具有开创性的批评工作改变了这些作家作品在文学史上的地位, 树立了新的经典。直到今天, 斯坦纳的这番评论在很大程度上仍然适用。20 世纪后半叶, 利维斯所思索过的有关传统和经典的话题在批评界和教育界引发了新的经典辩论以至激烈的经典之战。然而经典开放和经典修正的过程存在着矫枉过正的风险, “选择将什么包括到经典中(并将其他作品排斥在经典范围之外)看起来成为了具有政治意义的行为”(Peer 97)。其实, 利维斯重构经典时所秉承的艺术标准和道德准则具有借鉴意义。

利维斯对于经典的界定与阐释为他的传统观做出了注脚, 体现出无畏的革新精神, 然而综观 20 世纪前半期英国小说的图景, 利维斯仿佛又是保守的。《伟大的传统》成书之时已经声名显赫的现代主义小说家詹姆斯·乔伊斯(James Joyce)被斥为死胡同, 以弗吉尼亚·伍尔夫(Virginia Woolf)和爱·摩·福斯特(E. M. Forster)等为代表的布鲁姆斯伯里团体的品位亦遭到了批判。表面上看, 利维斯对上述英国现代主义文学鼎盛时期领军人物的态度似乎趋于保守。事实上, 这样的比较是不成立的, 以乔伊斯和伍尔夫为代表的小说家所开创的是与利维斯的伟大的传统并行的另外一个传统, 二者是对维多利亚时代文学不同方式的反拨。在小说形式上进行的意识流等试验固然体现了现代人的精神诉求, 然而利维斯最主要的甄别标准是英国文学传统中一脉相承的基于生活的道德关怀和人文精神。其实这种多样性正是现代英国文坛生命力的一种体现。正如利维斯所指出的, 所谓小说大家“不仅为同行和读者改变了艺术的潜能, 而且就其所促发的人性意识——对于生活潜能意识而言, 也具有重大的意义”(利维斯 3-4)。如果从这个角度来看, 我们便能够于纷繁之中觅得一种纯粹的契合。

若是望文生义, 很容易认为利维斯只鼓励(允许)学生和其他读者阅读他所开具的经典书单上的作品, 不免自大狭隘。然而, 当我们将视野投向英国 20 世纪早期和中期的社会历史图景时, 利维斯的所谓经典书单就变得更好理解了。两次世界大战和大学教育的扩大化导致许多大学新生的底子相对薄弱, 数量有限的文本在教学上更具操作性。更进一步而言, 两次世界大战导致了英国国际地位的动摇和普遍的焦虑情绪。在这一历史契机下, 英国悠久灿烂的文学理所当然地成为了重建民族自信的载体, 现代英语文学顺势从古典文学中摆脱出来成为了独立的学科。利维斯采撷经典并重塑英国文学伟大的传统顺应了历史需要, 体现了批评家的时代责任感。必须指出的是, 利维斯不仅本人博览群书而且在音乐等多方面均有造诣, 还鼓励学生在阅读上“培养混杂性”(MacKillop 163)。但是可以推测, 利维斯所言的混杂性仍然是有一定标准的, 譬如他拒绝侦探小说等通俗作品和好莱坞电影等, 视之为“标

准降低”（Leavis, *Continuity* 18）后庸俗文化的产物。这种所谓的偏见被后来的文化研究者所扬弃。

利维斯对经典的重构引发了争议，其本人也进行过少量修正。例如，利维斯对雪莱的贬低激起了传统学者的不满；他曾试图将弥尔顿“拉下马来”（Leavis *Revaluation* 42），但最终在围剿下陷入沉寂。此外，利维斯早年对狄更斯的评价不高，认为他仅算得上“娱乐高手”（利维斯 25），故而将其排除在伟大的传统之外。但利维斯夫妇晚年合著的《小说家狄更斯》（*Dickens: the Novelist*）则表示“狄更斯是最伟大的从事创造性写作的作家之一”（F. R. Leavis & Q. D. Leavis 9），这可谓是对其早年经典书单的重大修改。事实上，我们不需要完全同意利维斯所划分的经典范围，盲从或是批评他对具体作家的褒贬，也勿需因批评家在批评生涯不同阶段改变观点而对其可信度产生怀疑。利维斯所勾勒的传统不可避免地具有历史局限性，但其在当时的进步意义弥足珍贵。毋庸置疑的是，经过时间考验的利维斯主义本身也已经成为英国文学和文化批评传统的有机部分。

三、传承：传统的归宿和使命

传统以“传承”（continuity）的形式在利维斯文学批评和文化批评有机结合的连接点上担任了核心角色。首先，利维斯相信“文学批评可以拯救世界”（Leavis *Living* 50）。传承是传统的归宿和使命，是实现文化救赎的关键途径。正如韦勒克所指出的那样：“这种主张始终是每个人文学者面临的必然的任务”（韦勒克 435）。这种批评救世的思想将文学传统视为文化传统的承载者，这种传承是用大量的文学作品来支撑的“文化遗产”，它能够“超越‘现在’和‘过去’，赋予时间以意义，赋予人性以对真实意义的把握”（Leavis, *Valuation* 130）。归根到底，这种相辅相成的文学和文化传统的内在核心是人性价值和道德关怀。其次，利维斯是传承的实践者，继承了英国人文主义批评传统，兼具鲜明的现代性。利维斯曾表示：“他[批评家]努力将现在的诗歌视为一种延续和发展；这是传统在当代最具有决定性和最重要的生命”（Leavis, *Revaluation* 1-2）。可以推断，不论是“鲜活的传统”（Leavis, *Education* 130），还是现在与过去的文学之间“鲜活的关系”（Leavis, *English* 87）都暗含了传承的创造性。

大学英语教育和《细察》（*Scrutiny*）杂志的编辑出版是利维斯除著书立说以外推进文学和文化遗产的重要阵地。这些实践有力地推动了利维斯传统观的传播，产生了实际的文化影响和社会效应。利维斯将英语树立为大学教育体系中各学科的“联接中心”，旨在推广人文教育和培养良好的文学品味，从而传承英国文学和文化的优良传统。同时他也意识到只有通过少数精英辐射到“大众”才有可能真正改善文明的状况。利维斯的几代学生如种子般对其批评思想的传播与承证明了这一构想的实际成效。然而我们应当

意识到，利维斯的精英标准极高，部分学者和众多剑桥学子尚且难以达到，普通读者更是望尘莫及。所以，文化救赎最终并未完美实现，其本人晚年也曾坦言批评救世理想之难。利维斯希望通过践行批评的功能来达到救赎文化之目的，恪守了“我的剑亦不会”¹落下的誓言，虽然留给世界的是一个悲壮的背影，但并不影响他毕生追求的历史意义。此外，利维斯苦心经营了 20 余年的《细察》杂志激发了众多作者对文学、艺术、社会等的思考，培养了一批严肃的读者，对文学批评品位和批评方法产生了远超越其出版年代的影响。《细察》停刊 10 周年之际，剑桥大学出版社于 1963 年再版了 20 卷的《细察》，继而又于 1968 年出版了 2 卷本的《〈细察〉选集》(*A Selection from "Scrutiny"*)，及时拯救和保存了这一具有历史文献性质的出版物，以及其背后一个时代关乎文学和批评的变幻风云。今天的读者仍然可以通过这些真切文字真实感触到细察派的思想火花，这正是成功传承文学和文化传统的又一例证。

作为剑桥批评的四大核心人物之一，利维斯对英国文学和文化传统的传承是剑桥批评传统的一个重要方面。他在剑桥的求学生涯及其一生的批评与教育实践是剑桥英文兴起发展具有代表性的写照，他的躬耕是塑造剑桥批评传统和英文教育体系的重要力量。在两次世界大战和帝国渐衰的历史背景下，利维斯重构的具有自豪感的伟大的传统突显了剑桥英文的时代性。综观剑桥英文和剑桥批评传统的发展进程，“他们[瑞恰慈、燕卜苏、利维斯和威廉斯四位剑桥批评家]所描述和定义的文学与文化、文化与社会之广阔联系及其相互影响成为推动英国乃至英国之外的英国文学教学和文化研究的源泉和借鉴”(曹莉 41)。几位剑桥批评家的观点各不相同，继承与扬弃背后隐含着一脉相承的默契，构成了剑桥英文的批评传统，折射出英国文学和文化的不断传承。

此外，利维斯以经典文学作品和作家为重心的传统观指向精英主义，此乃学术界之公论，然而对此的理解却大相径庭。若简单地贴上精英主义的标签难免会使人认为利维斯轻视大众，鄙夷中眉和低眉读者的品味，放弃关照“少数人”以外的读者和作品，陷入了狭隘。而事实上，经过利维斯的重新评价而跻身于经典之列的作品在许多方面打破了旧传统的所谓高雅规范。例如，若按照浪漫主义和维多利亚时代末期的诗歌评价标准，《普鲁弗洛克的情歌》(*The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock*)必被判为不入流之作。与此同时，在工业化不断加速推进的社会环境下，面对工具理性和功利主义的蔓延，利维斯极为欣赏民间文化，推崇具有民众集体性和历代传承性的“鲜活的语言”，向往在具有文化救赎意义的“有机共同体”(organic community)中生产、艺术、

1 1972 年出版的《我的剑亦不会》(*Nor Shall My Sword*)是利维斯晚年文化批评的重要文集，涉及“两种文化”等深刻话题。书名“我的剑亦不会”源自威廉·布莱克的诗歌《弥尔顿》(*Milton*)。虽然 70 年代利维斯主义大势已去，但是这部文集彰显出利维斯老当益壮的深刻洞察力和犀利的批评精神。

生活和谐相融的自然状态。不仅如此，利维斯批评救世的文化理想决定了他所秉承的精英主义并非固步自封和孤芳自赏。虽然他的方法是自上而下的，但是其指向是大众的，其目的是以经典作品为媒介，以受过良好教育的知识分子为主体，以严肃批评刊物为阵地，培养有真正鉴赏能力的广泛的读者群，以此来保障传承。我们应当认识到，在大学教育日益普及化和市场化的时代，这种意义上的精英意识不仅是维系人文教育之本质所必需的，而且是传承文学和文化传统之精髓所应坚持的。

综上所述，利维斯以英国文学传统为出发点审视文化传统，对文学批评、文化批评、教育、出版和社会意识等都产生了深刻影响，是 20 世纪早期和中期英国文化自觉的一面旗帜。

2018 年是利维斯逝世 40 周年，他为文学批评和文化批评传统所留下的精神遗产依然具有现实意义。1996 年，加里·戴（Gary Day）出版了《重读利维斯：文化与文学批评》（*Re-Reading Leavis: Culture and Literary Criticism*）。2003 年，同名学术会议“重读利维斯”在利维斯工作过的剑桥大学唐宁学院召开。以此为契机，20 多年来对这位理论之前的批评家的重读和重新评价在西方尤其是英国方兴未艾。在利维斯学会（*The Leavis Society*）的支持下，2017 年于伦敦和剑桥举行的学术研讨会围绕“文学为什么重要”（*Why literature matters*）和“重读利维斯：在我们的时代重视（各种）文学”（*Re-reading Leavis: valuing literature(s) in our time*）展开。2017 年 6 月，由利维斯学会和清华大学等中国相关机构联合举办的“剑桥批评：中国与世界”国际研讨会于清华大学召开，跨文化背景下对利维斯的重读是会议的主要议题之一。利维斯协会主席彼得·沙罗克（*Peter Sharrock*）在开幕致辞中指出：“全世界所有深切关心文学和阅读在维持真正的人类生活时所处位置的人，所有目睹了在我们的大学里批判性的阅读以及对文学经典的评估所经历的危险的衰退的人，都会称赞在清华大学举办的这次会议是恰逢其时”（*Sharrock 7*）。回望利维斯的传统观，正是于一定的历史距离以外审视英国 20 世纪早期和中期的文学、文学批评和文化批评，并看到其与当下我们的文学和文化之间紧密的联系。我们不妨也采用利维斯尊崇的“鲜活的”态度，以知识分子的道德情怀和人文关切为出发点，面对时代变迁中出现的新情况和跨文化语境下的新问题，肩负起我们在传统中所被赋予的具有历史意义的责任。

Works Cited

- 艾略特：《艾略特文学论文集》。李赋宁译，南昌：百花洲文艺出版社，2010 年。
 [Eliot, T.S. *A Collection of Eliot's Essays on Literature*. Trans. Li Funing. Nanchang: Baihuazhou Literature and Art Publishing House, 2010.]
- Baldick, Chris. *The Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford: Oxford U P, 2015.
- Bell, Michael. *F. R. Leavis*. London: Routledge, 2004.

- Bergonzi, Bernard. "Leavis and Eliot: The Long Road to Rejection." *Critical Quarterly* 26 (1984): 21-43.
- 曹莉: "'英国文学'在剑桥大学的兴起", 《外国文学研究》6 (2014): 40-46。
[Cao Li. "The Rise of 'English Literature' at the University of Cambridge." *Foreign Literature Studies* 6 (2014): 40-46.]
- Cuddon, J. A., ed., M. A. R. Habib, rev. ed., Matthew Birchwood, Vedrana Velickovic, Martin Dines and Shanyne Fiske, asso. eds. *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. London: Penguin Books, 2014.
- Leavis, F. R. *For Continuity*. Cambridge: The Minority Press, 1933.
- *Revaluation: Tradition and Development in English Poetry*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1949.
- *New Bearings in English Poetry: A Study of the Contemporary Situation*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1961.
- *The Living Principle: 'English' as a Discipline of Thought*. New York: Oxford U P, 1975.
- *Education and the University: A Sketch for an 'English School'*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1979.
- *English Literature in Our Time and the University*. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1979.
- *Valuation in Criticism and Other Essays*. Ed. G. Singh. Cambridge: Cambridge U P, 1986.
- Leavis, F. R., and Q. D. Leavis. *Dickens the Novelist*. London: Faber & Faber, 2008.
- 利维斯: 《伟大的传统》。袁伟译。北京: 生活·读书·新知三联书店, 2009年。
[Leavis, F. R. *The Great Tradition*. Trans. Yuan Wei. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2009.]
- 陆建德: "序: 弗·雷·利维斯和《伟大的传统》", 《伟大的传统》。袁伟译。北京: 生活·读书·新知三联书店, 2009年。
[Lu Jiande. "Preface: F. R. Leavis and The Great Tradition." *The Great Tradition*. Trans. Yuan Wei. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2009.]
- MacKillop, Ian. *F. R. Leavis: A Life in Criticism*. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1997.
- Mulhern, Francis. *The Moment of "Scrutiny"*. London: New Left Books, 1979.
- Peer, Willie van. "Canon Formation: Ideology or Aesthetic Quality?." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 36 (1996): 97-108.
- Sharrock, Peter. "Address for the Opening of the Conference." Conference Brochure. "*Cambridge Criticism" beyond Cambridge: F. R. Leavis and Others, An International Conference*. Beijing: Tsinghua University, 2017.
- Steiner, George. *Language and Silence: Essays on Language, Literature, and the Inhuman*. New York: Atheneum, 1967.
- 韦勒克: 《近代文学批评史》(第五卷)。杨自伍译。上海: 上海译文出版社, 2009年。
[Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism*. Vol.5. Trans. Yang Ziwu. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2009.]
- 威廉斯: 《关键词: 文化与社会的词汇》。刘建基译。北京: 生活·读书·新知三联书店, 2005年。
[Williams, Raymond. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Trans. Liu Jianji. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 2005.]

忠实而又灵活的中国文学译介：《汉学家的中国文学英译历程》述评

Loyal and Flexible Translation and Dissemination of Chinese Literature: A Review of *Journey of Sinologists' English Translation of Chinese Literature*

陈开举 (Chen Kaiju)

内容摘要：“中国文学走出去”是实现“中国文化走出去”工程的核心组成部分。朱振武教授等著的《汉学家的中国文学英译历程》填补了对汉学家中国文学译介研究的空白。该著评介的英、美、澳汉学家在中国文学英译历程中的主要工作环节如作品选择、中西文化融通、译文标准和传播效果等方面展现了相似的显著特点，值得中国的文学外译者关注和借鉴。该著高度赞誉了汉学家们在中国文学英译方面的卓越贡献，强调文学翻译工作中必须贯穿着主动的文化自觉和翻译自觉，在忠实于原文学作品所反映的中国文化精髓/精神的原则下，在具体的翻译实践中充分发挥译者的自主性、创造性，以提高译作在目标读者群中的接受性，使文学翻译成为文化交流的桥梁，促进中西文化的融通。

关键词：汉学家；中国文学；英译；文化自觉；文化融通

作者简介：陈开举，博士，广东外语外贸大学国际商务英语学院教授、外国文学文化研究中心研究员。研究领域：文化研究、文化哲学、翻译。

Abstract: Translation of Chinese literature takes a core part of the Chinese cultural strategy of “going out”. *Journey of Sinologists' English Translation of Chinese Literature*, by Professor Zhu Zhenwu et al., fills the gap of related studies. As reviewed in this book, the 21 British, American and Australian sinologists and translators have demonstrated similar characteristics in the different translating phases of Chinese literature such as text selection, translation criteria and reading effect based on the comprehension of the target readers. Their success is surely valuable to the Chinese translators in their Chinese literature translation. Highlighted in this book are the prominent contributions of the reviewed sinologists' meticulous and abundant achievement in English translation of Chinese literature, their loyalty to the Chinese cultural essence/spirit entailed in the original texts, and their creative,

flexible, and enchanting linguistic skills in promoting the acceptability of their translation to suit the reading habits of the target readers. Such qualities of culture-awareness and translation-awareness have proved invaluable in the communication and fusion of Sino-Western cultures through the translation and circulation of Chinese literature.

Key words: sinologists; Chinese Literature; Chinese-English translation; cultural awareness; cultural fusion

Author: Chen Kaiju, Ph.D in cultural studies, is Professor of English language and culture at School of English for International Business Studies, Guangdong University of Foreign Studies (Guangzhou 510420). His major research interest includes cultural studies, philosophy of culture and translation (Email: 200010931@oamail.gdufs.edu.cn).

“中国文化走出去”是实现中华民族伟大复兴的中国梦之题中应有之意。这个系统工程中，一个“走”字充分说明了这个过程是一个主动的、有意识的、有明确目的的文化传播过程。随着中国文学外译发展到自觉阶段，有计划、成规模地推进，促成了“中国文学走出去”空前的繁荣。对该项学术研究系统的反思、研究渐次展开。但是，对国外汉学家在中国文学翻译方面的研究则一直处于缺失的状态，朱振武教授等著的《汉学家的中国文学英译历程》（华东理工大学出版社，2017年）（以下简称“《汉》”）填补了这个空白。可以说，该著是“中国文学走出去”学科化的一项标志性成果。

全书按照汉学家们所属的几大主要英语国家分英国、美国和澳大利亚三大部分对汉学翻译家们的中国文学英译作了综合评价。其中英国8位、美国12位、澳大利亚1位。对于汉学家们在中国文学英译中的卓越贡献，评述者们给予了一致的高度评价，体现在对细节和内容的精致安排和处理中：每篇均以对仗/对偶句为篇名，概括出每位汉学家英译的历程、细述汉学家们的中国文学翻译渊源、重要作品翻译过程、所取得的卓越成就，并在文尾详细列出其成果，彰显其对中国文学、文化的传播所做出的巨大贡献。

一、汉学家中国文学英译的成功之道

《汉》著中评述的汉学家们均是所在国家中国文学英译的代表人物，其译介事业的成功源于不可缺失的学术素养，这里仅从他们严谨的学风及其与中国文化的良好互动两个方面加以简述。

（一）严谨的学风

其中国文学英译历程中既要遭遇中国学者也要碰到的问题，还会经历额外的困难。凭着严谨的治学态度和对中国文化的热爱，化作他们长期的努力，达成了其汉学英译的突出成就。

一方面，双方在中国文学英译的全过程中同样经历着诸多的共同体验：译前，同样要经历作品甄选和文化价值评判；翻译中，同样经历对原作意义和风格的理解、考证和译成目标语时的处理；译成后，同样经历着社会接受的考验，如读者问答、与批评界的互动，以及推广环节中的某些必要工作。另一方面，面对非母体语言、文化，汉学家们对中国文学的理解、考证过程中经受的资料匮乏、缺少同行咨询探讨等困难必然更多、更大。

实际翻译的过程充分体现了汉学家们全身心的投入和严谨的学风。如英国汉学家翟里斯无与伦比的汉学英译成就与他在中国长期而全方位的生活和研究密切相关：足迹踏遍中国沿海、笔触涵摄中国社会多个方面。罗慕士以近 20 年的时间精译《三国演义》，近 10 年的时间翻译《道德经》；威廉·莱尔将汉学、译学、从教有机结合，其鲁迅研究、著述、翻译相得益彰；芮效卫潜心数十载翻译了《金瓶梅》1-5 译卷 / 本；韩斌为了专注于中国文学翻译，竟于 2011 年毅然辞去了伦敦大学帝国理工学院讲师一职。

（二）与中国文化的深度互动

对文学作品准确的理解是做好翻译的前提，这离不开对作品的社会文化语境的充分了解。《汉》在这方面给予了足够的关注，以相当的篇幅挖掘了这些汉学家们与中国文化之间的渊源和良好的互动关系。《汉》书中对每位汉学家在本国、他域及来华学习、研究、考证、交流中华文化及其关注和选译中国文学作品的过程做了大量的介绍。

除了威廉·莱尔和安德鲁·琼斯，其他 19 位汉学家们都采用了符合汉文化习惯的汉语名字，体现着对中国文化的深刻理解，本著的评述者们将他们的名字巧妙地以各种修辞方式嵌入文章的对偶句标题中，概括出他们的卓越贡献和学术特点。早期的汉学家如翟里斯，因为种种际遇，长期在华工作、生活，积淀起深厚而全方位的汉学研究基础。翻译了中国古代文学经典作品《楚辞》、《离骚》、《石头记》的霍克思也在交通极不便利的时代远涉重洋来华研习，并见证了 1949 年的开国大典。新中国以来社会的全面发展极大地方便了汉学家们来华体验、交流和生活。《聊斋》的英译者“出于对中华文化的热爱，白亚仁一向不吝自己来华交流访学的时间，每有会议或是朋友相邀共商学术，他总是欣然前往，而后满载而归”。（朱振武等 71）为了准确理解《马桥词典》，蓝诗玲于 2000 年和作者韩少功一起亲赴“马桥”，实地体会作者的用意和作品中的生活背景。

很多汉学家对中国社会文化生活的亲身体验往往超出了纯粹的文学作品翻译所需，通过交流将源文化与自身生活融为一体。英国汉学家狄星 1993 年大学刚毕业就毅然选择来贵州支教及后来她与中国学人、学界之间的紧密交流。刘文杰评介了韩斌与作家韩东、曹锦清等相识、交流的情况。汉学家们回国后也会对本国相应社会文化生活形成相应的影响，如霍克思改革了牛津大学中文课程，增加白话文的教学。

长期受到中国文化的熏陶，汉学家们的人生基本上都透露出汉文化的深刻影响：儒雅、仙风道骨的风范。通过他们的工作、生活、治学等言传身教地传播，影响周边的人们，本身就是极好的文化传播之道。文化是人的真正的家园，故美国汉学家葛浩文之研习、翻译中国文学的经历乃是找到了真正的人生、事业和精神家园，因此朱砂以“浪子回头成正果”为题评述了他的成功转身。杨世祥指出翟里斯在诸多工作上的不得志，而他从外交界的黯然离开却成就了英国汉学界光辉一页的开始。长期的汉学影响甚至会重塑其人生观、价值观，成就了一些汉学家的隐士生活，如赤松、闵福德等。打动他们的不仅仅是语言、文字、风格等文学形式上的美，而是对中国文化精髓理解后的认同，促使其努力实现中国文化和他们母体文化之间的融通。

二、本著关涉的几个重要学术问题

同为中文翻译、研究、教学的学者，本书的作者们表达了向他们致敬，激励着后来者不断努力，也提出了诸多中国文学外译中值得借鉴的特点，凝成了该著独特的价值。

（一）文学翻译的标准

除了文学翻译中信、达、雅等传统翻译标准问题，本书一再强调了目标读者群的接受度问题，值得中国学者文学外译中高度重视、学习和借鉴。

论及译入读者群的接受度问题，霍克思提出了文学翻译四原则，认为有时必须对原作品做适当的改动。获得2015年度茅台杯人民文学奖的英国汉学家韩斌充分强调了译者自主性，强调归化，即译入语的接受性。狄星强调“汉语双关语中的微妙之处几乎是不可译的”（朱振武等89），如何译只能由译者灵活处理，可谓一语中的！蓝诗玲坚持“以归化策略为主，注重中英之间的语言和文化差异，注重译文的可读性和可接受性……‘忠实性再创造’”。（朱振武等103）这一点用葛浩文的话说，就是要强调译者的“创造性”。

归化也好，创造性也罢，灵活度的衡量尺度是什么？答案是在忠实于原作的前提下，充分照顾到译作在目标受众中的接受度。杜迈可“善于把握中国文学之精髓，采用异化为主的翻译策略，致力于传递原作的地道特色。一方面，忠实地译出原文学作品中所蕴含的核心中国文化价值是必须坚持的基本原则。失去这个原则去翻译，就会丢失掉原作品的精髓，就是失去了文化自觉。另一方面，在具体词语的选择上充分考虑到读者的接受性属于创造性的翻译艺术。市场经济社会中成长起来的欧美汉学家具有强烈的社会/读者接受意识，从作品的选择、翻译中的情节处理、异化与归化策略的选用、译作的发表与推广、与源文化之间的互动交往等方面积累了诸多成功的经验。

（二）汉学家中国文学英译的变化发展特征

汉学家们译介的中国文学作品涵盖古今，体裁多样。早期的汉学家接触的多是中国文化经典作品。与之相应的是，他们集中译介了中国经典文学作

品。如翟里斯译《聊斋志异》、《三字经》、《庄子》；霍克思和闵福德译《红楼梦》及后者对《易经》的译介；罗慕士译《道德经》、《论语》、《三国演义》，等等。后来的汉学家们将翻译的重心转移到现当代作品，如美国汉学家威廉·莱尔对鲁迅和老舍的译介、研究；白睿文长期精研细译老舍；英国汉学家狄星、蓝诗玲，以及1978年出生的米欧敏等，体现了向大众文化作品转移的当代文化发展特征。澳大利亚汉学家杜博妮也译介了大量的现当代中国文学作品。随着中国国际影响力的提升，当代文学逐步成为汉学家英译的重要文本源，莫言获得诺奖更是对汉学家英译中国文学的褒奖。

另外，汉学家翻译的专业化发展趋势，如蓝诗玲本科即以中文为专业，后续学位和研究工作也围绕汉学、中国文学翻译展开；狄星、蓝诗玲、米欧敏有着相似的科班化教育和翻译经历。多数汉学家们除了中国文学的英译，还从事汉学研究、著述。如罗鹏就亦著亦译、安德鲁·琼斯既翻译也研究现当代中国文学。大部分当代汉学家虽然大多从事着多种跨界工作，但中国文学翻译始终是其工作的重心。

（三）中国文学、文化的地位问题

文学担负着个人与社会之人文化成、启迪心智、提升审美素质等其它文化形态难以替代的重要功能，传统上一直属于主流文化形态。源于生活、高于生活的文学作品也属于文化教育、文化交流与文明传承的主要形式和内容，深受人们的喜爱。跨文化文学作品的翻译、传播与交流是满足人们对文学需求的重要途径之一。随着社会文明的进步，文化形式的丰富、多元发展，以伦理、教诲功能为己任的文学经受着以审美、娱人功能为主旨的其它文化形式的强力冲击，这使得以人文关怀为己任的文学由于缺乏了直接的实用性而失去了往日的光环。后现代文化娱乐化的泛化，读图时代的到来，且随着网络、新媒体传播形式强势进入社会文化生活，传统的文学阅读、体悟方式进一步式微，文学面临着空前的危机。

在这种宏观背景下，回到中国文学翻译话题本身。中国文学有古典、现代、当代之分。古典中国文学对应的是最成熟、最稳定的农耕文明社会形态，而诠释文明发展、维护社会秩序的中国古文学全方位表征了所对应的社会秩序即（儒）“礼”，具有独特的价值，是人类文化宝库中的瑰宝。正是这些优秀的特质，使得不同时代的汉学家们克服重重困难，反复译介中国古文学文化经典，如《道德经》、《易经》、《红楼梦》等。

中国现代文学，虽然鲁迅、老舍等多位作家的作品吸引了汉学家们的译介，但仍相对较少，这与我国社会向现代工业文明社会的转型起步晚、处于现代性的学习者角色是分不开的。自20世纪六十年代以来，后现代思潮全面而深刻地批判了现代文明理性至上、工具理性对人的异化和由此带来的一系列文化危机。人们回望历史，用返璞归真的办法进行纠偏，传统汉学间歇式地引起学界的回溯、译介，希冀找出良方，应对现代社会文化生活中遭遇到

的问题。同时，基于不断变化的社会现实生活，探索、生成新的文学作品。

现代化的当代中国与西方现代社会一道迎来社会渐次向后现代文明、文化的转型，随着西方经济社会的式微和中国社会各方面的持续进步，大有后来居上、引领向后现代信息文明的转型之势。诠释、设计、优化、滋养生活的文化、文学必将迅速反映时代变化和新的社会历史语境中人的生命体验，为世界其他民族提供可资借鉴的文学资源，为外译、“走出去”提供好的作品源。这也是中华文化复兴和中国文学复兴的良机。

以上是中国古代文学和当代文学在《汉》著中两头大而现代文学中间小的深层次原因。深度挖掘反映中华文明、中国文化对人类具有独特贡献的文学作品，译介传播并自觉地紧扣作品中所蕴含的独特的文化价值精髓/精神，就能做到忠实与创造有机的结合，恪守用世界语言讲好中国故事的初心。

（四）翻译之于文化交流和传播效果问题

人类有意识的、成功的物种移植促成了文明的进步，如大豆、土豆、玉米等农作物从原产地向外的移植大幅度改善了粮食供给，成为人口大增长的物质保障。翻译、引入优秀的异质文化带来了文化的巨大发展，思想的革新可导致社会的革命性发展，如马克思主义在中国的翻译和传播。所谓“成功的”指被社会接受、认可、践行，否则，移植也好、翻译也罢，难以实现可能的价值，达到理想的效果。汉学家们既从彼域来，必知彼域事，对其所在的社会文化有着中国学者难以达到的理解和认知程度。他们围绕其社会语境下读者的接受性成功的“忠实的再创造”宝贵经验，很值得中国的文学外译者重视和学习。

信息时代传播渠道的多样化也是文学翻译与传播工程中值得研究的课题，从当代中国文学作品被翻译、改编成电影、电视剧和在国外的传播效果可以得到很多启示，值得研究。尤其是近年来《木兰》、《功夫熊猫》等中国文学作品、文化要素在国外频频“触电”，传播效果值得文学翻译界的重视。此外，信息、网络新媒体在我国国内的发展很快，如何运用到文学的译介、改编和传播是新的挑战 and 机遇，值得研究。

最后，“中国文化走出去”是自觉的文化传播工程，国家每年做了很大的投入。毕竟，中国文学外译的彼岸语境是目标语读者群，这些彼域志儒的中国文学翻译工作从一个极好的角度玉成着中国文学“走出去”的宏愿，故建议把汉学家们的中国文学译入工作纳入资助范围。将中国的文学外译与汉学家们的译入有机地结合

【 Work Cited 】

朱振武等：《汉学家的中国文学英译历程》。上海：华东理工大学出版社，2017年。

[Zhu Zhenwu, et al. *Journey of Sinologists' English Translation of Chinese Literature*. Shanghai: East China University of Science and Technology Press, 2017.]

责任编辑：张连桥

日本当代社会文学研究的集大成之作：评《社会文学的三十年——泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》

A Masterpiece of the Research on Japanese Contemporary Social Literature: *Thirty Years of Social Literature: Bubble Economy, the End of Cold War, March.11*

刘玮莹 (Liu Weiying)

内容摘要：由日本社会文学会主编的《社会文学的三十年——泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》是日本第一部以主题研究为切入点，对日本当代社会文学进行整体梳理和总结的研究著作。该著作紧密联系日本当下的社会现实，在比较文学的视域之下，采用社会历史批评和文本细读等多种研究方法，考察了20世纪80年代以来日本当代社会文学在社会功能、主题思想、体裁形式、创作主体、语言艺术等方面的特点。该著作全方位、多维度的研究，为推进日本当代社会文学研究的开展提供了重要参考与借鉴。

关键词：社会文学；主题研究；日本；当代

作者简介：刘玮莹，华中师范大学文学院比较文学与世界文学专业博士生，主要从事日本左翼文学研究 (wy_liu@sina.cn)。

Abstract: *Thirty Years of Social Literature: Bubble Economy, the End of Cold War, March.11* edited by Japanese Social Literature Society, is the first work in Japan which has given a whole review and summary to Japanese contemporary social literature on a basis of theme research. As a study on Japanese social literature since 1980s, this work shows a great concern for the current social reality in Japan, and also investigates, from the perspective of comparative literature, the characters of Japanese contemporary social literature in social function, theme, style, creative subject, language arts, etc. by using various research methods such as social historical criticism and close reading. The comprehensive and multi-dimensional research provides an important reference and promotion to the study of Japanese contempo-

rary social literature in the future.

Key words: Social literature; theme research; Japan; contemporary

Author: Liu Weiyang is a Ph.D. candidate of Comparative Literature and World Literature at Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China), specializing in Japanese left-wing literature studies (Email: wy_liu@sina.cn).

20世纪60年代末至70年代初期,日本文坛在新左翼社会思想遭遇挫折之后出现了大量“内向派作家”,他们以虚无主义的态度逃避现实问题,将文学的视野从社会现实转向了日常生活。1985年,日本各种社会问题日趋严峻化,为了引导文学创作者和研究者们关注社会问题,日本社会文学界的同仁成立了日本社会文学会,该学会的成立是对日本近现代文学发展方向的反省,极大促进了日本社会文学的发展与繁荣。2016年,为了纪念日本社会文学会成立30周年,学会编写了纪念论文集《社会文学的三十年——泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》,该部著作集合了成田龙一、竹内荣美子、小林孝吉、高桥敏夫、小森阳一、岛村辉、谷口绢枝、棚泽健、根岸泰子、佐川亚纪、川村凑、村上阳子、山本昭宏、河合修、浦田义和、秦重雄、绫目广治、高口智史等众多各自领域最权威的文学评论家、文学研究者的研究成果,系统梳理和总结了日本社会文学迄今三十年的发展历程,可以说是一部真正意义上的集大成之作。下面拟从如下三个方面对本书的研究内容、方法和观点进行介绍和评述。

一、主题研究与现实关怀

该书的主干部分由一篇座谈会记录和十五篇论文组成。位于开篇的座谈会记录总结了近三十年间日本社会文学的创作主题,它们有战争、天皇、贫困、性别歧视、在日朝鲜人、环境、劳动、冲绳、原爆、核利用、部落民歧视、文学教育等等。后面的十五篇论文则分别由十五位学者在所给定的主题框架之下对日本社会文学三十年间的发展状况进行了梳理和研究。第一部收录的有:9.11、3.11、9.19(高桥敏夫)、象征天皇制与井上靖(小森阳一)、石牟礼道子(谷口绢枝)、无产阶级文学(棚泽健)、00年代家庭与重松清(根岸泰子)、诗与语言(佐川亚纪)、第二部收录的有:原爆文学(村上阳子)、核利用文学(山本昭彦)、“在日朝鲜人文学”(河合修)、“冲绳”现代小说(浦田义和)、歧视与文学(秦重雄)、劳动与文学(绫目广治)、文学教育(高口智史)等等。作为一部具有文学史研究性质的著作,该书并没有因循以往的模式,按照时间阶段划分,以几部代表作品为中心,流水账式地介绍文学作品的主要内容、思想意义等等,而是以主题研究为切入点,在某一社会问题的框架之下进行梳理,这样既紧紧把握住了社会文学描写社会、反映社会的本质性特征,又将文学研究与现实关注结合起来,突显了文学研究

的现实关怀意义。

并且，在众多主题之中，“贫困”、“核安全”和“战争”是被探讨最多的三个主题。绫目广治、棚泽健考察了日本当代无产阶级文学和劳动文学；山本昭宏、村上阳子总结梳理了1985年以后的日本核利用文学和林京子的原爆文学；小森阳一、高桥敏夫、岛村辉、浦田义和剖析了日本当代社会文学对日本的战争责任、战争记忆等问题的思考，以及对9.11事件以后日本国内战争倾向的探察。事实上，贫困问题、核安全问题、战争问题是日本当下最受关注的社会问题。首先是非正式雇佣工、派遣员工的贫困问题日益加剧。1990年，日本在泡沫经济破裂之后进一步推行了新自由主义体制改革，改革使得日本“一亿总中流”社会解体，非正式雇佣工、派遣工数量不断增加。2012年，安倍首相上台之后实施了“安倍经济学”，非正式雇佣工、派遣工的人数增长更加迅猛。由此造成日本的贫困、贫富分化、劳工纠纷等问题进一步严峻化。其次是核安全问题。2011年的3.11东日本大地震所引发的福岛第一核电站核泄漏事故使日本乃至全球陷入了“核恐慌”之中，核安全问题受到了人们的高度关注。然而，2015年8月，日本政府推翻了原有的“零核计划”，宣布重启核电站。还有日本的战争倾向问题。2015年9月19日，在二战结束70年之际，日本政府不顾民意反对强行通过了新安保法，解禁了集体自卫权，使日本重新成为可能主动发起战争的国家。另外，日本与东亚其他国家的关系围绕着战争、领土、慰安妇等问题分歧与争议不断。回归44年的冲绳基地问题也至今没有找到解决的路径。因此，贫困、核安全、战争问题日本当前最受瞩目的社会热点。《社会文学的三十年——泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》对这三个主题的重点探讨，立足于当下，把握时代脉搏，使文学研究具有了鲜明的时代意义。

二、互为方法的“文学”与“社会”

社会文学是与现实社会有着紧密联系的文学，所以社会历史批评是分析社会文学时最常被采用的方法。它侧重研究文学作品与社会生活的关系，重视作家的思想倾向和文学作品的社会作用。事实上，社会历史批评主要有两种研究范式，第一种是以探讨作品所反映出来的社会问题为目的的研究范式，即“作为目的的社会”。这种研究范式以解决现实问题为着眼点，把文学看成是观察病兆、开出药方的“医生”。它突显出了社会文学针砭时事、反映现实问题的社会功能。第二种是将社会作为参照标准来考察文学本体的研究范式，即作为方法的“社会”。“作为方法”一语，最初来自日本汉学家竹内好，他提出了“作为方法的亚洲”，之后子安宣邦、沟口雄三相继提出“作为方法的江户”和“作为方法的中国”。此后，“作为方法”逐渐形成了一种研究范式，它通过将研究对象中的异质因素“他者”化、“对象”化——即所谓的“作为方法”的“方法化”，从而显示出研究对象自身的主体性——即所

谓的“特殊性”。

该著作采取两种研究范式结合的方式，也就是将文学与社会互相作为方法来对社会文学进行了考察。其中，绫目广治在比较文学的视域下考察了日本当代无产阶级文学、劳动文学与战前无产阶级文学中的贫困描写，发现当代日本非正式雇佣工、派遣工的劳动境遇与战前的苦工们一样悲惨，并且指出“今天日本派遣员工以及非正式雇佣工悲惨的劳动境遇并不是现代才出现的，而是很早以前就存在的问题。…要解决这一问题需要进行社会体制的改革”（246）¹。还有，高桥敏夫认为，旅居日本的伊朗女作家席琳·内泽玛菲创作的《Salam》（『サラム』2007）反映了9.11事件之后日本社会中民族主义情绪的高涨。吉村万壹的《波兰德病》（『ボラード病』2014）则反映了3.11东日本大地震之后专制极权主义在日本社会的抬头。并且呼吁将民主主义作为抵御日本再次走向军国化道路的社会思想力量。通过将文学作为“方法”的研究，研究者们追踪了文学作品中所反映出来的社会问题，并对其提出了一些具体的解决策略，充分突显了社会文学的社会功能。

同时，该著作还进行了将“社会”作为方法的文学研究，即将“社会文学”中的“社会”作为异质因素进行“他者化”，考察了日本社会文学在创作主体、体裁形式方面的特点。例如，川村湊在论文“作为社会文学的亚洲小说”中，将亚洲小说置于世界近代史的背景之下进行考察之后发现，“在亚洲，文学的创作主体通常是叛乱者，文学发挥着引发谋反、革命的导火索的作用。也就是说，文学是另一种形式的‘武力’和‘政治’”（161），因此，亚洲的近代小说是“败北者的文学”。还有，糊泽健在“想读出声的无产阶级文学”中指出，“进入2010年代以来，川柳的创作主体在近几年间逐渐从男性工薪族向不安定的派遣员工、女性、学生、老人、穷人、受灾者等等转变，随着贫困和贫富差距问题的严峻化，川柳的创作主体范围不断扩大，并逐渐向社会底层渗透”（129），可以说，“川柳是新自由主义体制下陷入不安定生活状态的无产阶级的文学”（129）等等。这些研究通过将“社会”纳入参照视野，总结了日本社会文学的创作主体以及体裁形式的变化。这种将社会文学中人们所习以为常的社会元素进行了“陌生化”、“他者化”的处理，可以为略显陈旧的研究对象提供一种新的观照视野，令人耳目一新、茅塞顿开。

这样，通过“文学”与“社会”互为方法的研究范式，该著作对日本当代社会文学的社会功能、主题思想、体裁形式、创作主体等进行了考察。不仅从社会文学中看到了现实社会的病兆，为其开出了一些“药方”。还在社会背景的参照之下，总结了日本当代社会文学在体裁形式、创作主体等方面的发展变容。

1 本文相关引文均出自日本社会文学会：『社会文学の三十年—バブル経済、冷戦崩壊、3・11』（東京：葺柿堂，2016年）。以下标明具体页码，不再一一说明。

三、社会文学中的语言艺术

社会历史批评的方法，比较注重文学的思想性及其载道功能，较少关心文学是如何表现思想或是以怎样的形式载道的；比较热衷“文学的意识形态性”之类的宏大叙事，较少以足够的耐心阐发文学作为语言艺术的精妙特性。该著作作为对日本社会文学的整体性研究著作，除了采用社会历史的批评方法之外，还立足于日语语境，借鉴西语理论，潜入社会文学作品的文本内部，以精微细致的语义分析阐发了文学语言作为艺术符号的魅力。

在论文“象征天皇制”中，小森阳一根据“天皇”与“天子”在语义上的区别指出，井上厦的“东京审判三部曲”将巡幸时的天皇“裕仁”称作“天子”暗含着对日本天皇利用象征天皇制逃避战争责任的讽刺。“裕仁从伊势神宫到大正天皇多摩御陵的巡幸，是在政治军事主权丧失的政治生涯中，以作为宗教权威的‘天子’身份向日本的皇祖皇宗汇报终战结果的旅行”（83）。小森对井上作品的分析注意到了文学语言作为艺术符号的特点。“文学用语言来创造形象、典型和性格，用语言来反映现实事件、自然景物和思维过程”（高尔基：294）。作品的思想内涵就蕴藏在文学的语言之中。因此，只有细致把握语言的所指意义，才能解读出作者的真正意图，否则极易造成误读。在目取真俊的作品《水滴》的结尾处，死者告诉主人公自己终于不口渴了，很多研究者据此认为作品意在表现战争受害者与战争加害者最终和解的主题。但是，在该著作所收录的座谈会记录中，成田龙一指出，冲绳出身的死者使用的是标准语，所以作品的真正意图恰好与和解相反。“‘石岭’所说的‘不再口渴了’很明显只是安慰‘德正’的话语，事实上他的口渴并没有解除。作品的批判性就蕴含在‘清晰的标准语’这一表达中”（32）。成田正是通过对文学作品的语言表述进行的细致剖析，才发现了作品的真意。像这样运用语义学分析的方法，从字、词、句等言语材料的释读入手来探究作品思想内容的文本细读，是本书中的研究者们在对具体文学作品进行个案分析时经常采用的批评方法。它十分注重从文学语言表述的所指意义去解读作品的思想内涵。

另外，该著作还结合了话语权力理论解读了社会文学通过其语言表述的能指意义所表达出来的思想意识。例如，浦田义和在论文“‘冲绳’现代小说的挑战——崎山多美小说的‘共同体主题’和‘语言表达’”中指出，崎山多美在她的多部冲绳题材作品的文本叙述中均杂糅了许多不同的声音，不仅有标准语、冲绳方言、冲绳民谣，还通过大量使用拟声词营造了一些异质的音响，如海声、水声等等。浦田认为，崎山多美试图以这种语言与声音的杂糅来消解不同语言之间的边界，摆脱冲绳在长期的殖民历史中逐渐被固化起来的形象，实现冲绳与日本本土在主体意义上的平等与融合。还有，在论文“想读出声的无产阶级文学”中，榎泽健认为，《蟹工船》中出现了大量拟声拟态词、

方言以及生活用语，是“对由‘标准语’所建立的语言秩序所进行的有意识的拒绝”（118）。

索绪尔认为语言有两个基本功能的划分，即所指功能和能指功能。所指功能是概念的确定，而能指功能则涉及声音和画面的组合。文学语言作为一种语言的艺术，它所传达的语义信息不会仅仅停留在语词的所指意义上，还具有丰富的能指意义。或者说，正是文学语言的能指意义使它们从抽象的语言符号成为了艺术符号。语言的符号形式和声音形式对于文学来说从来都不是次要的，相反，它是构成文学的本质要素。伽达默尔指出：“一个文学文本要求其语言的面目出现，不仅是为了执行其传达一个信息的功能。它不仅必须被读，它也必须被听，哪怕大多数情况下只是用我们内在的耳朵来听”（伽达默尔：72）。糊泽健和浦田义和的研究考察了社会文学的语言表述在符号形式和声音形式上的特点，挖掘出了文学语言的能指意义中所包含的社会思想。

这样，该著作对社会文学的研究充分建立在对作品文学语言的所指和能指意义的细致剖析基础之上，因此，其对文学作品的艺术判断是极为精准和敏锐的。同时，这种深入语言内部的解读使社会文学的研究有效地避免了陷入泛政治化、泛文化化的研究误区，起到了使文学研究回归本体、回归语言和艺术的重要作用。

小结

20世纪90年代冷战结束之后，日本政党格局开始向“总体保守化”方向转变，民族主义、右倾化思潮也在全国逐步蔓延。喜好针砭时事、具有左翼倾向的社会文学遭遇到了更多来自日本主流政治力量的排斥和压制，受此影响日本文学研究界对社会文学的研究成果也相对较少。《社会学的三十年——泡沫经济、冷战结束、3.11》是日本近年来首次出现的对本国当代社会文学进行整体性研究的著作。该著作以主题分析的方式对日本20世纪80年代以来的社会文学进行了宏观梳理，探讨了日本社会目前所面临着的贫困、战争、核安全等重大社会问题。同时还以“社会”作为方法，考察了文学本体的社会性。并潜入到文本内部，阐发了社会文学作为语言艺术的精妙特性。该著作集合了众多相关领域的权威学者、评论家的研究成果，是一部有相当学术水平的集大成之作，也为促进日本当代社会文学研究的深入提供了重要的参考与借鉴。不过，该著作也尚存在着一些未甄至善之处。例如，以论文集的形式来梳理文学史固然有集思广益、各采众家之长的妙处，但是难免也会出现缺乏系统性、风格不协调等等的弊端。当然，瑕不掩瑜，即便该著作存在上述一些微瑕之处，也仍是日本社会文学研究领域一部不可多得的佳作。

Works Cited

- 日本社会文学会: 『社会文学の三十年—バブル経済、冷戦崩壊、3・11』。東京: 菁柿堂, 2016年。
[Japanese Social Literature Society. *Thirty Years of Social Literature: Bubble Economy, the End of Cold War, March.11*. Tokyo: Seishido Publishing House, 2016.]
- 玛克西姆·高尔基: 《文学论文选》, 孟昌、曹葆华译。北京: 人民文学出版社, 1958年。
[Maksim Gorky. *Selected papers on literature*. Trans. Meng Chang, Cao Baohua. Beijing: People's Literature Publishing House, 1958.]
- 汉斯·格奥尔格·伽达默尔: “文本与解释”, 《伽达默尔集》, 严平译。上海: 上海远东出版社, 2003年。
[Hans-Georg Gadamer. “Text and Interpretation.” *The collected works of Gadamer*. Trans. Yan Ping. Shanghai: Shanghai Fareast Publishing House, 2003.]

责任编辑: 张连桥

The Becoming and Developing of British Children's Literature: Review on *From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern British Fairy-tale Novels*

Zhang Shengzhen

Abstract: Children's literature of a nation reflects its thinking mode and spirit. British children's literature not only invigorates British literature but also helps with the formation and development of the indigenous literature and culture in Britain. Therefore, British children's literature has its particular historic status and social value. *From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories* illustrates the main thread of the artistic components and evolutionary trend in the history of British children's literature. It is the first book in China that focuses on the evolution of British fairy tales. Overcoming the narrow views on fairy-tale literature, it enriches the content and broadens the horizons of foreign literature studies in China. The book will certainly exert great influences on the macrocosmic studies on children's literature for its outstanding value in historic studies and its exemplary role in academic quality.

Key words: children's literature; fairy-tale stories; morality

Author Zhang Shengzhen, Ph. D., is Professor and Dean at International College, Jiangsu Normal University. Her research interest includes British and American literature, comparative literature and children's literature (Email: zhangshengzhen2008@126.com).¹

标题: 英国儿童文学的产生和发展——评《从工业革命到儿童文学革命：现代英国童话小说研究》

内容摘要: 儿童文学蕴含着特定国家和民族独特的思维方式和民族精神。作为欧洲文学重要组成部分的英国儿童文学遵循英国文学的价值体系，影响了英国本土文学和文化的形成与发展，造就了其特殊的历史地位和社会价值。中国学者代表性成果《从工业革命到儿童文学革命：关于英国现当代童话故事研究》对英国童话小说的发展历程、文学思潮、艺术流变以及代表性作家

1 本文得到国家社科基金重点项目“英国儿童文学中的国族意识与伦理教诲研究”（项目编号：17AWW008）的资助。

作品进行了全景式的深入探讨，建构起了英国儿童文学史的主体艺术构架与发展思潮的主脉，是思想深刻的英国儿童文学发展历史的专著，具有重要的学术价值和文献价值。

关键词：英国儿童文学；童话；道德观

作者简介：张生珍，文学博士，江苏师范大学特聘教授，主要研究领域为英美文学、儿童文学和比较文学。

Introduction

From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern British Fairy-tale Novels by Professor Shu Wei and his team is a national-funded project, which has been accomplished with seven years' efforts. There are more than 700 thousand Chinese characters in total, 694 pages in thickness and 31 chapters excluding the introduction and conclusion parts. Published in 2015 by the prestigious publisher China Social Sciences Press, it has won immediate concerns and enthusiasm in the field of children's literature and comparative literature in China. Among which, Wang Quangen's review is most typical, who holds that this great work "fills the void in the field. The publication is an event to be cherished in the long run. It is an encyclopedia and a philosophical book" (Wang Oct.31). Other scholars like Du Chuankun, reviewed the significance of this book in the "construction of children's literature theory" (Du, 2016). Jiang Taidi & Sun Xiaoyu, argues that "this epoch-making work will even change people's understanding of children's literature" (Jiang &Sun 64).

As is known Britain is viewed as the center of European children's literature. Each innovation, revolution or transition in European children's literature and even in global children's literature would not have happened without the changes in British children's literature. In ancient Greece and medieval Europe, there were no texts written exclusively for children. In the 17th century, there appeared religious pamphlets written by British puritans; in the 18th century, there were picture books for children to enjoy sensory pleasure; in the 19th and 20th centuries, there came forth the writing exclusively for children. The emergence of children's literature results from the modernization process under the influence of the developing humanism since the Renaissance and the Enlightenment. Essential elements in British children's literature link history, present and future, for example, ideas about nation, citizenship, human nature, ethic issues of goodness and evil, dreams and pursuits, etc. British children's literature not only invigorates British literature but also helps with the formation and development of the indigenous literature and culture in Britain. "To understand the history of children's literature is to understand the

history of all our forms of literary experience (Lerer 16)". Therefore, British children's literature has its particular historic status and social values.

The Emergence of Children and Children's Literature

The emergence and development of children's literature are closely related to the understanding of children and childhood. Childhood is considered to be a kind of socialization, which provides a framework to explain the origin and the development of human life. As a variable in social analysis, childhood is rich and colorful instead of being monotonous and homogenous. The culture of childhood has a profound social nature. To children in the West, their childhood is represented by their participation in various public activities. It is a series of periods of socialization and acculturation and is not determined by the social status in their life. These periods with changing goals and values decide the image of childhood. Such an idea about the changing childhood lays a theoretical foundation for the literary creation for children. The evolution of children's literature has close relations to children's history as the evolutionary modes of children's literature to a large extent go in line with the different periods in children's history.

After examining the genesis and development of children's literature, researchers and literary history experts of children's literature in different countries have drawn a conclusion that the artistic consciousness and independence come into being when human society has entered modern times, before which the East and the West alike have a long period without a specific conception of children's literature. In terms of its emergence and existence, children's literature is an inevitable and commensal phenomenon in a particular society when its views on the nation and children have developed to a certain stage. The history of children's literature is a process during which children's literature undergoes gradual developments from poor artistic traits to stronger ones, from an uncertain artistic identity to a well-defined one, from a mixed artistic quality to the artistic purity of its own.

During its ascent in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, children's literature allowed children to have access to didactic literature, such as fables, catechisms, etc. It provided, according to its own value, children with particular content and teachings with no regard to the need of profound reforms on itself. Truly, children's literature was meant to shape children in accordance with values and morals; however, it should also conform to the established literary traditions.

"Discovering the child," generally thought to be first raised by Jean-Jacques Rousseau in 1762 in his *Emile*, or *On Education*, was a great progress in human history. Rousseau's view on education greatly impacted children's literature in the

eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. In the period from late eighteenth to the early nineteenth century, William Wordsworth and other Romantics advanced Rousseau's view. They revered the value of children as human beings, regarding "the Child as father of man" and commended children as subjects of virtues. The Romantic view of literature revitalized nineteenth century children's literature. It made the traditional, genuine and unembellished folklore and legend the only genre of children's literature. Romantic writers believed children's literature must take root in the Mythic Age, the middle Ages or the Classical Antiquity and engage in dialogues with children through telling stories, deeds, legendary reincarnation and farces. It is the very child-centered view on childhood — to emancipate and develop children in accordance with their original desire for life — that gives birth to a child-sized genre of literature.

"The diverse genesis of human cultures decides the peculiarity, richness and self-sufficiency of each culture. It is the same case with children's literature. Each innovation, revolution or transition in European children's literature and even in global children's literature would not have happened without the changes in British children's literature" (Wang Sep.14). Children's literature of a nation reflects its thinking mode and spirit. In Britain, children's literature used to uphold the patriotism that maintained the integration and unity in the British Empire of those parts scattering around the globe. As an important component in children's literature, fairy tales have special significance to a nation.

Changes of Moral Values in Children's Literature

In both western philosophy and literature, the construction of morality starts from Plato. In western literature, children's literature included, the construction of morality, or moral education, can't be separated from philosophy. The artistic manifestation of the construction is inseparable from intellectual thought; it may first appear in literature and then is concluded in philosophy and neither process can be disjointed. *Divine Comedy* by Dante reveals to later generations that it is only when a person of a sound mind examines himself in his deep soul that he can become virtuous. This is the very core idea and humanistic essence in Renaissance. In 18th century, along with the emphasis on rationality and enlightenment, moral education through children's literature was stressed. Writers also became aware of their responsibility as educators. French children's literature in this century presented a stronger moral color. When it comes to 19th century, moralism penetrated into all children's literary works. Children's literature deepens the spiritual plane and life values of children, and undertakes its obligations to educate children to believe in

goodness and justice. “Moralization continued to mark nineteenth-century fairy tales but it was more limited that is had been in the eighteenth-century (Hunt 158)”. For this book, *From the Industrial Revolution to Children’s Literature Revolution: a Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories*, its foreword reviews the basic theoretical issues, namely, some basic issues of cultural studies on fairy tales as well as the status quo of studies on fairy-tale literature and fairy-tale stories, in attempt to clarify the basic issues and key issues of the research on children’s literature. As is mentioned in the Forward, the book deals chronologically with the history of British fairy tales in terms of four major developmental stages.

In the middle and late 19th century, Victorian culture had great influence on the ethos of children’s literature. In the 20th century, childhood was regarded as a process full of adventures instead of a training base for adulthood. Children’s literature evolved into an independent genre with modern aesthetics. This book begins with Victorian Era and Edwardian Era (1840-1910), during which children’s literature gradually received attention. With the English translation of European classics of fairy-tales, British fairy-tale stories enjoyed a surge. This period came out many classical writers, such as John Ruskin, Charles Kingsley, Lewis Carroll, etc. *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* series was published and swept the world instantly. *Peter Pan* also encouraged people to dream of a wonderful world. British children’s literature developed almost in all aspects. The narrative paradigm and practices in the 19th-century British children’s literature play an exemplary role for its later creations. Along with the social changes from the end of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century, British children’s literature experienced significant transition where the nostalgic lens brought the pastoral childhood back to the readers. That childhood is of metaphorical significance. In the upper half of the 19th century, the transition of children’s literature was marked more obviously in political and social dimensions. By means of children’s literature, writers expressed their philosophical insights, which reflected that humankind could rely on its own strength to reach the Utopia. From the early 20th century to WWII, children’s literature was rendered more tasks as it was regarded as an instrument of education or recreation to encourage the young to find the world similar to or different from theirs through travel, explorations and adventures. Children’s literature at this period emphasized ideas and varied methods of story telling, resulting in a considerable amount of works with great aesthetic values.

In the period between two world wars, linking the past and ushering in the new times, the subject of children’s literature changed fundamentally. Children’s literature at this moment reflected political and social challenges via the creation of

a utopian world and through retrospections on ethics, morals, human nature and national identity, etc. Religion and tradition received due attention, and in the meanwhile people were in search of a home and humanistic ideals. Since 1950s, writers gained new successes by means of new subject matters and new narrative formats. Fairy tales became the best means to express their ideas. C. S. Lewis's *The Chronicles of Narnia* series was the result of the period. Making use of history and (fantasy) space, the series combined the criticism of industrialization and illusion of future so as to reconstruct the identity of the individual and the identity of the nation.

Around 1970s, social and ideological situations brought about new development of children's literature. British literature responded duly to the overall changes in Nordic and American children's literature; however, the response was not recognized until the 1980s by the research circle of children's literature. The quality and behaviors traditionally belonging to adults were projected onto the young and children, whereas certain traits of the young or children were found in adults. In terms of relative autonomy, the historic barrier between different worlds disappeared. The only thing emphasized was knowledge, which played a determinant role in the disappearance of the traditional demarcation and was responsible for the differentiation between adults and children.

Since the 1970s, "writers of children's literature took in elements from modernism and postmodernism in diverse directions" (Shu 436). During this period when feminists realized the role of fairy tales in ideological formation, fairy-tale rewriting became a narrative strategy in contemporary literature, particularly the feminist literature. A case most exemplary is the feminist fairy tales and criticisms in North America and Britain from 1960s to 1980s. Fantasy literature (or Science fictions) gained unprecedented development. *Harry Potter* series exerted its great influence in helping with the socialization of children and making children's literature the most popular literary form. With academic thinking and diverse academic perspectives, scholars came to view this series in a serious style. It also enthralled adult readers for the very reason that its unique inclusiveness of the whole genre of children's literature contributed to the complexity that theoretically differentiates adult texts and children's texts, surpassing the simplistic identification of children's literary texts.

Children's literature implies the other, namely, adult literature. Despite the assertion that there is no obvious adult interference in children's literature, it lurks in. During the process of modernization, in the further division between children's literature and adult literature is deepened. Actually the division between children's literature and adult literature is a gradual process since a new form takes shape only

when social modernization has reached certain stage.

Children's Literature Defined by Social and Cultural Context

From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: a Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories features extensive theoretic perspectives and a combination of historic exploration and textual analysis by relating to the history, society and literature. The author of this book conducts profound analyses on representative writers in terms of text-based examination and rational criticism from the perspectives of the developmental process, literary trends and artistic changes of British fairy-tales. In this way, the book presents profound expositions on British history of social, ideological and educational evolutions. The author believes historic events such as the medieval period in Europe, the Renaissance, the Industrial Revolution, the world wars, the civil rights movements, etc., exerted great influence on and brought about the evolution of children's literature. "The study of children's literature is an interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary field, involving literature, linguistics, psychology, pedagogy, reading studies and cultural studies, etc." (Wang Sept.14). Children's literature plays a key role in the understanding of national identity since it conveys the core values of that nation, which, as something of essential importance, bind its history, present and future. The author explores the enlightenment of British fairy-tales on Chinese children's literature and juvenile fantasy literature, indicating the sentiment and attitude of Chinese scholars at the concluding part of this book.

Chinese children's literature did not appear until the 20th century. From its outset, the new literary genre in China was partly modeled on western patterns. Children's literatures in British and American countries were nearly celebrated as standards and examples for children literature in other nations and regions to follow. The author of this book has dealt with the following issues: how to draw lessons from and absorb elements in the creations and academic achievements of modern and contemporary British children's literature, how to create high-level children's fantasy literature with Chinese characteristics in relation to the demands and conditions in the Chinese history, and further to develop the Chinese literature and culture. In this sense, the book bears outstanding academic and cultural significance as well as important social significance.

Conclusion

From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories is the first book in China that

focuses on the evolution of British fairy tales. Overcoming the narrow views on fairy-tale literature, it enriches the content and broadens the horizons of foreign literature studies in China. The book will certainly exert great influence on the macrocosmic studies on children's literature for its outstanding value in historic studies and the exemplary role in academic quality.

At present, it has become an urgent task for us to grasp the developmental course of British children in order to gain a rational understanding of it, particularly, its evolution along the historic changes of Britain from British Empire to a modern nation. With that, we are further expected to comprehend the relevance of British children's literature to world literature and its difference from adult literature, so that we can obtain an insight of how children's literature to be internationalized and effectively spread the core values of a nation when that nation is establishing its international image and its ethics. Although western values are not universally applicable, British children's literature offers successful experiences, which reveal the fact the developing national and ethnic awareness and the ethnic identity should start with childhood. To Chinese writers of children's literature, they are entrusted with a hard but foremost responsibility.

Works Cited

- Du, Chuankun. "Shu Wei Who Meditates on the Re-establishment of Fairy Tales and Fairy Tale heory." *China Reading Weekly*, September 21, 2016.
- Hunt, Peter. ed. *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*. London & New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Jiang, Taidi & Sun Xiaoyu. "A Chinese Perspective on British Children's Literature: Reading *from the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories*." *Jiangsu Foreign Language Teaching and Research* 3 (2017): 62-64.
- Lerer, Seth. *Children's literature: A Reader's History from Aesop to Harry Potter*. Chicago: The U of Chicago P, 2009.
- Shu, Wei etc. *From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution: A Study on Modern and Contemporary British Fairy-tale Stories*. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2015.
- Wang, Quangen. "From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution." *China Reading Weekly*, September 14, 2016.
- . "Shu Wei and His *From the Industrial Revolution to Children's Literature Revolution*." *Wenyi Bao*, Oct.31, 2016.



Published by
Knowledge Hub Publishing Company Limited
Hong Kong

ISSN 2520-4920



9 772520 492184 03