Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

ISL

Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature

文学跨学科研究

Volume 6, Number 1
March 2022

Advisory Board

Contents

目　录

New Perspectives into Children's Literature: An Interview with Peter Hunt

Zhang Shengzhen & Peter Hunt

Abstract: Peter Hunt is a pioneer of the academic study of children's literature as a literary, rather than educational, discipline at university level, and he has been instrumental in creating a global network of scholars in the field. The courses he ran at Cardiff from 1985 were the first of their kind in the UK. He has lectured on children's literature at over 150 universities, colleges and to learned societies in 23 countries, and over the past few years he has been Visiting Professor at Trinity College, Dublin, Università Ca'Foscari Venice, Newcastle University and Hollins University, Roanoke VA, USA. He has written or edited 26 books and over 500 papers, reference book entries, and reviews on the subject. His books have been translated into Arabic, Chinese, Danish, Greek, Japanese, Korean, Persian, Portuguese (Brazil) and Serbian. In 1995 he was given the Distinguished Scholarship Award from the International Association for the Fantastic in the Arts, and in 2003 the Brothers Grimm Award for services to children's literature, from the International Institute for Children's Literature, Osaka. His most recent books have been two for the Bodleian Library Publishing, Oxford: *The Making of* The Wind in the Willows (2018), and *The Making of Lewis Carroll's* Alice (2020). This interview covers many facets of children's literature, including the importance, its relationship with cultural norms, British children's literature, new challenges and perspectives in academia and the impact of *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature* (edited by Peter Hunt). Peter Hunt holds that perceptions of children's literature depend on historical and cultural context—what was and what is acceptable. As children's literature has always both mirrored and been influenced by adult literature and attitudes, it seems probable that the future of children's literature will continue in sync: reflecting and being reflected by cultural norms.
Keywords: children's literature; challenges; culture norms; childhood; crossover

Authors: Zhang Shengzhen is Professor at the School of Foreign Languages, Beijing Language and Culture University (Beijing, China 100083). Her areas of research include children's literature, British and American literature, and comparative literature (Email: zhangshengzhen@blcu.edu.cn); **Peter Hunt**, a British scholar who is Professor Emeritus in English and Children's Literature at Cardiff University,

UK (Email: peterhunt1@hotmail.com).

标题：儿童文学研究新视野：彼得·亨特访谈

内容摘要：作为儿童文学研究的先驱，彼得·亨特是世界第一位将儿童文学设在文学系的学者，突破儿童文学被当作教育学科进行学术研究的藩篱。亨特教授创立的学科范式迄今仍发挥着引领作用。自 1985 年起，亨特教授在英国卡迪夫（Cardiff）大学开设了首门儿童文学课程，其后在 23 个国家的 150 多所大学和学术机构讲授儿童文学，并在都柏林圣三一学院、威尼斯大学、纽卡斯尔大学和美国霍林斯大学等担任客座教授。亨特教授撰写（主编）了 26 部著作，发表了 500 多篇学术论文，部分成果已被译成阿拉伯文、中文、丹麦文、希腊文、日文、韩文、波斯文、葡萄牙文（巴西）和塞尔维亚文等。1995 年亨特教授获国际艺术奇幻协会颁发的杰出学者奖，2003 年获大阪国际儿童文学研究所颁发的格林兄弟儿童文学奖。牛津大学博德利图书馆出版社出版了亨特教授新作《〈柳林风声〉的形成》（*The Making of* The Wind in the Willows, 2018）和《刘易斯·卡罗尔"爱丽丝"的创作》（*The Making of Lewis Carroll's* Alice, 2020）。本访谈覆盖了儿童文学研究的诸多领域，包括儿童文学之重要性、儿童文学与文化范式的关系、英国儿童文学学术研究领域的新挑战和新观点以及《世界儿童文学百科全书》（彼得·亨特主编）（*International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*, edited by Peter Hunt）的学术影响等。亨特教授认为，对儿童文学的认知取决于历史和文化语境。世界各国的历史渊源和文化接受范式决定了儿童文学的产生和发展。由于儿童文学既是成人文学的镜子也是成人文学的产物，因此，未来的儿童文学极有可能继续与成人文学相向而行：既呈现特定民族的文化范式，又为文化范式所形塑和制约。

关键词：儿童文学；挑战；文化范式；童年；跨界文学

作者简介：张生珍，北京语言大学英语学院教授、博士生导师，主要研究领域为外国儿童文学、英美文学和文学翻译；彼得·亨特，英国科迪夫大学资深教授，儿童文学研究学者。本文系 2019 年国家社科基金重大项目"《世界儿童文学百科全书》翻译及儿童文学批评史研究"【项目编号：19ZDA297】阶段性成果。

Cultural Norms and the Importance of Children's Literature

Zhang Shengzhen (Zhang for shorter hereafter): Prof. Hunt, you are a pioneer of the academic study of children's literature as a literary, rather than educational, discipline at university level. Why and how did you promote the literary scholarship in the discipline?

Peter Hunt (Hunt for shorter hereafter): The answer to this is, at least in the

beginning, very personal. I come from a non-academic, non-literary, background, and I have always been acutely aware that whatever I studied must have some *practical* value—and that originality was to be valued above anything else. Children's literature provided the opportunity!

Having taken a first degree in English Literature—which at that time, nearly sixty years ago, was the most important (or, at least, the largest) of the humanities subjects in British universities - I wanted to pursue my literary studies in some original way. However, I found that, even then, it was difficult to find areas which had not already been studied. I had developed a taste for eighteenth-century English fiction, and accordingly spent two years researching a (still) little-known novelist, Robert Bage, for my MA degree (a 100,000-word piece of original research). When it came to selecting an area for a much longer-term project (in those days, PhDs commonly took ten years or more), my criteria were that the area must not have been researched before; that it must have some *practical* value; that I enjoyed it; and that I would be able to think for myself—after all, those were the days of the primacy of the literary canon: we were told what was good, and expected to endorse that judgement.

Children's literature fulfilled all those criteria. There were no more than a dozen books in English covering the whole of the subject area, and it was distinctly not canonical: the academic establishment positively disapproved of it. It was, as one Professor of English said to me, 'not worthy of University study.' I was therefore compelled to think for myself. As for practical value, children's literature was then primarily studied and taught in education colleges and library schools: it was a *practical* subject—its task was to bring the right books to the right children—to develop literacy and cultural literacy (or conformity). But this was not what I regarded as being of *practical* value. Indeed, it seemed to me that much of what had been written about children's books, having such a narrow aim, was without the kind of intellectual rigour that I felt the subject deserved. Even now, fifty years later, what educational or literacy experts write about children's literature, and what academics in literature and theory and cultural studies departments write about children's literature seem hardly to be speaking the same language—although I have now learned that there are different kinds of rigour, and I have great respect for my colleagues in education and literacy! My aim, across my career, has been to try to build bridges between disciplines concerned with children's literature, and to build on the best in all these fields.

It is only recently that I have realised why I was attracted to children's literature—apart from the fact that I enjoyed reading it and I did not enjoy reading

a great deal of 'canonical' literature. The children's novel has a great deal in common with the early English novel, which flourished in the 18th century. In contrast to the 19th century, post-romantic novel, which was character-driven and concerned primarily with internal states of mind, the 18th century novel was action-driven and theme-driven: it dealt with externals—how characters were affected by their environment. Things were, in many ways, simple. There was little character development, the picaresque form was dominant; the books commonly used circular narrative structures, often ending in closure, or a reversion to the status quo or to fairy-tale endings. Landscapes were functional, solutions often physical; good and bad were clearly distinguished; characters were often outsiders, and were very iconoclastic and subversive. Although the genre of the novel in the 18th century quickly developed conventions, it was essentially an experimental form, often, in effect, explaining to a new reading audience how the form worked. And the majority of the books were written by women. Critically, they have been seen as inferior by post-romantic critics and as their characteristics are very similar to the popular or ephemeral novel, they have been doubly dismissed.

I am, of course, also describing children's literature: it too was regarded, by definition, as being simplistic—childish and unsubtle; it too had a low academic status; it too was confused with 'popular' or 'ephemeral' literature, and so was not treated seriously nor properly studied—but it was still, of course, widely read.

Zhang: But why is children's literature of special importance to you?

Hunt: It soon became clear to me that far from being simple texts for simple minds, texts for children were of huge cultural importance, and that the audience had to be taken into account in the discussion of them (something not fashionable in 'adult' critical circles). Even more dauntingly, to study them was a multidisciplinary activity: a critic would need to have at least some knowledge of history, psychology, art, film, music, publishing and many other things. And children's literature is *international*.

It was also clear, from observing popular political movements of the time, that a change in the prejudice against these books was more likely to be achieved from a position of strength, rather than from an enthusiastic and well-meaning position of academic weakness - however valid the arguments. For this reason, I attempted as far as possible to publish books with mainstream publishers, and to develop courses in an English Literature department rather than in an Education department, which had lower status.

I was fortunate to be working in a university (Cardiff) that allowed us to teach

what were then seen as marginal subjects, and so I was able to establish the first undergraduate module on children's literature on a BA English degree in Britain. To begin with, for tactical reasons, I included only texts which were also recognised as members (if minor members) of the 'literary canon,' such as *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, *Treasure Island*, or *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer*, books which were old, predominantly by men, and not necessarily of any interest to children. The courses were, however, very popular, and I was able to broaden the content to include picture books and books that would not have been canonical. Equally, I was working at a time when interdisciplinary subjects were fashionable, when literary theory was undermining the idea of the canon—and when colleagues in the USA, Canada, Australia, Germany, France and elsewhere were following the same path, so I cannot claim to be any more than one fortunate pioneer.

Zhang: The definition of children's literature, seems straightforward—texts for children—but in English each of the three words can cause problems. Should our subject area include texts in the broadest sense—printed, video, audio; does 'for' the child mean for the child's education, or for the child's enjoyment; and what does 'children's' mean?

Hunt: The concept of children's literature in any culture depends almost entirely on the concept of childhood current in that culture. Different cultures at different times see childhood differently, and consequently have very different ideas about what texts for children should do—or, indeed, whether there should be any texts for children. Equally, some cultures see texts for children as educating gender identity, others as inculcating state-defined values. Very often texts for children are driven by a nostalgia for childhood and may have very little of interest for actual child readers.

The least ambiguous definition, therefore, is 'texts designed for children'—whatever that may mean at that place and time—rather than a definition that derives from the form or content of texts. Form and content are almost infinitely variable—but the most common, inescapable, and defining characteristic of texts for children (with some very rare exceptions, if any) is the power imbalance between the writers and the implied audience. Until very recently, with the development of electronic publishing, virtually no texts were produced by children for children, and consequently the form involved an inevitable manipulation of (inexperienced) child readers by (experienced) adult writers.

Zhang: This leads to another question, what is the relationship between child reader and adult writers?

Hunt: These issues have been extensively theorised in recent years, especially on the question of how far the (child) reader can read *against* the power of the (adult) writer. My own theory of 'childist criticism' was designed to acknowledge that, in very general terms, the way in which the inexperienced reader makes meaning of any text is likely to be very different from that of the experienced reader, and that this should at least be acknowledged when we are describing or evaluating texts for children. This was not to claim that it was possible to know what a child, or a group of children, understand from a text: merely to point out that judgements and analyses of children's texts but adults are inevitably flawed. What is 'obvious' to an adult reader is *probably* rarely 'obvious' to a child reader.

Most recently critical ideas based on cognitive science have begun to acknowledge that because of differences in brain structure as children develop, it is not possible for either an adult writer or an adult reader to re-experience childhood. We are left only with memory, approximations, and guesses. This makes coherent criticism of texts for children very difficult, and, equally, makes any totalitarian attempts to manipulate children through their literature a very uncertain undertaking.

Zhang: How should people view the cultural norms?

Hunt: For much of the 20th century, there were, in the west, undefined but rarely questioned 'accepted' cultural norms about literature, as to what constituted quality; these norms were—and to a certain extent still are, subliminally—dictated by an undefined group—old, male, European, authoritarians. Certain kinds of content—such as the exploitation of other races in the Empire in British children's books, or the virtual genocide of the native Americans and the assumption of inferiority in African Americans in American children's books were never challenged. These assumptions, in some parts of the world, are being revised as the views of minorities, or those previously disempowered are becoming politically powerful. Also, in the English language (and in some others) the word 'literature' implies a superior quality of text, often with particular forms, which is only accessible to, and suitable for, mature audiences. This means—and it is particularly the case with poetry—that it is easy to see 'children's literature' as a contradiction. Current thinking would be that this kind of comparative value-judgement is unhelpful: 'children's literature' is a 'system' different from other literatures and should be treated as such.

Zhang: Do you think that the importance of children's literature depends on cultures?

Hunt: Children's literature influences children in terms of ideas, cultural attitudes, and modes of thinking; it establishes norms of right and wrong, and social behaviour. As both advertisers and totalitarian regimes know, adult behaviour is formed in childhood. It has a symbiotic relationship with the concept of childhood. As a body of texts, children's literature contains some of the most innovative narrative and visual art, which cannot, by the very nature of communication, be simple. For example, what appears to be minimalist art in picture-books for the very young is necessarily highly symbolic. Children's literature commonly has roots in ancient tales and modes of understanding the world, and these are frequently international. Children's literature demonstrates the highly complex relationship between adults and their childhoods, with extensive social consequences; it commonly pivots on an adult's perception of childhood.

Children's literature has, commercially, in the west, accounted for up to 40% of sales and revenues, frequently subsidising 'adult' publishing (including film and internet). Children's literature is bound up with literacy, the necessary prerequisite of an effective education. It is part of the intellectual makeup of higher education across the world; a recent congress of the International Research Society for Children's Literature had delegates from 43 countries; the International Board on Books for the Young, which concentrates on building the resources of children's literature, operates in around 80 countries. It is frequently censored, which indicates its perceived political importance; and is endlessly fascinating and entertaining. For me, this is perhaps the most important thing about it: it is a major player in increasing the sum of human happiness.

Zhang: These are very interesting and persuasive aspects of children's literature. Children's literature is no longer an "emerging" discipline, but an established one. What factors have promoted this change?

Hunt: As I have suggested, this is the result of complex changes in society and academia—most notably the move away from authoritarian concepts of value and quality in literature. Equally, childhood is now recognised as an integral part of adulthood in terms of psychology and culture: consequently, the study of texts designed for childhood, and which must, by definition, be influential, is now regarded as legitimate.

Zhang: Questions of how we make sense of texts for children, and how we intervene in the process of transmission between author and child, as educators, commentators and theorists, are challenging on many levels. What are the specific

challenges of Children's Literature?

Hunt: I have mentioned the prejudice against the study of children's literature, which is often based on ignorance—which is in turn based on the principle in *The Bible* (Corinthians 13.1): "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things." In fact, the denial of the importance of childhood, and the connections between childhood and adulthood (and hence children's literature) leads to interesting and ongoing challenges.

Children's literature, for all its success in universities across the world, and in academic publishing, remains marginalised. For example, the latest volumes in the highly prestigious *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain,* and *The Oxford History of the Novel in English,* contain between them over 90 chapters. Each has one chapter on children's literature—but given that in the period that they cover, children's literature accounted for something like 40% of publications, proportionally it should have had 35 chapters.

Zhang: What are the attitudes and assumptions that (still) need to be challenged?

Hunt: Children's texts are written for simple, childish readers, and must therefore be simple (both not true and not possible). children's literature is part of 'popular literature' and so neither style nor content can be taken seriously (there has been a considerable shift in recent years as to what should and should not be taken seriously in literary and cultural studies). The writing and teaching of children's literature are dominated by females, and females generally have lower status (this is a surprisingly persistent view).

Children's literature as a study breaks academic boundaries, and so does not fit neatly into departments and fields of study (twenty years ago, this was an advantage, but with the diminution in importance of the humanities in western universities and the consequent reduction in funding, it has become a challenge). The study of texts for children is very often seen as a part of Educational Studies, and Educational Studies, at least in the UK and the USA tend to have a lower status than Literary studies (this does not seem to change over time); and because it is so influential in childhood, children's literature produces loyal, not to say obsessive readers, and as a result a lot of the best and most detailed research into it is by amateurs (this was once a stigma, but the internet has changed what is perceived to be legitimate and admirable).

Zhang: Are there also challenges inherent in the nature of the texts and the different

readership, which make the study of children's literature inherently more complex than that of other disciplines?

Hunt: Yes. Power relationships are central: there is an inevitable imbalance of the power-relationship between writer and reader (which intensifies the power imbalance inherent in all literary experiences). The implied audience for the texts differs in many ways, in terms of cognitive skills, and knowledge of allusion, intertextuality, and so on, from adult readers. There is a difference between books that WERE for children and ARE for children. Adults read children's books in at least five ways: to discuss with other adults; as the implied reader; as the child they were; as the adult they are now; on behalf of a child or children; and they will also read different parts of a book in different ways; and judgements of content are in the hands of readers who are not necessarily publishing professionals, and the depictions of a wide variety of content items, such as sex, violence, depression, nihilism, religion, childbirth, and race become problematic. And all of this depends on the time period and the cultural context—what was and what is acceptable.

British Children's Literature and *The International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*

Zhang: How does British children's literature come into being? What factors have promoted the development of children's literature in the UK?

Hunt: Stories that were read and (presumably) enjoyed by children, although not specifically intended for them, can be traced back for many centuries in China, Japan, and Sumeria. For example, Britain has the oldest history of commercially produced books for children. This is the result of a complex social, political, and religious history which led to a particular commercial climate. But most of all, it depended on how childhood was understood; since the mid-eighteenth century there have been changes that have been replicated throughout the west.

Before about 1500CE there was little to distinguish child from adult, apart from size and experience; from then until the twentieth century, childhood was seen as an imperfect condition to be corrected and educated; for much of the twentieth century it was seen as a separate, vulnerable and innocent phase to be protected; and for the past fifty years it has again become hardly distinguishable from adulthood, except for marketing purposes. Consequently, the form and content of materials written for children in Britain (and in other western countries) changed from there: being no distinguishable difference from that written for adults (children and adults shared, for example, folk tales); being primarily concerned with education; being

primarily concerned with a safe form of entertainment; and now being very few distinguishing differences.

However, history, it is said, is written by the victors, and in the past 25 years the people in charge have changed. Thus, for example, for many years the 1920s and 1930s in Britain were seen as 'impoverished' in terms of canonical works of children's literature. The general 'standard' of texts was deemed by historians who made their judgements in traditional terms, to be low and regressive. Recently, there has been a movement—empowered by both the breakdown of the canon and authoritarian thinking in universities, and the increasing resources devoted to research—to revisit and revise these judgments. For example, a vast amount of politically left-wing—socialist and communist—material designed for children has been unearthed, often in magazines and ephemera which had not previously been on the critical radar. Equally, it has been discovered that one of the major writers whose books have survived that period, Arthur Ransome, was in fact but one figure among many exploiting Britain's interests in its maritime heritage, and the fashion for 'camping and tramping,' imported from Germany. Since around 1940, publishing for children has thrived, and it is now a fully integrated part of the publishing system.

Zhang: What was the importance of the *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*? What is included?

Hunt: The publication of the *International Companion Encyclopedia* was important because it was a volume in a series produced by a major international publisher, the other volumes of which covered major literary forms. It was an indication that the study of children's literature had reached parity with other subjects. Since then, books on children's literature have routinely been included in major series published by mainstream and prestigious academic presses, such as Cambridge University Press and Oxford University Press in the UK. It followed the pattern of other books in the series the first half being primarily a description of (Anglophone) genres, and the second half being a survey of children's books worldwide. Where it differed from other volumes was in having substantial sections on theory and critical approaches, contexts—including censorship, translation, storytelling, and research collections—and 'applications,' something unique to the series.

Zhang: What are the characteristics of *International Companion Encyclopedia of Children's Literature*?

Hunt: One of the critics of the first edition of the *Encyclopedia* described it as

'uneven.' In my view, that was totally inadequate as a description: it was very, very, very uneven in all possible ways! I did not assume that 'even-ness' was either possible or desirable. The distinctive feature of children's literature as a body of texts is that it is a world-wide phenomenon, covering an astonishing range of forms and genres, verbal, aural, and visual. Cultural attitudes to it, the uses to which it is put, and judgements of its value are as diverse as the cultures of the world. To study it, we need to have available the work of academics with expertise in a correspondingly vast range of disciplines, and it should be obvious that these academics will speak in different voices, with different tones: not only will what they think and say be different, but how they think and what they think is worth saying will be different.

Thus an educationalist/teacher recommends a certain poet using terms like 'good,' 'well-crafted'; poems 'mesmerise' children. That is not the language of critical theory: it assumes that 'good' is understood, and that 'well-crafted' means the same thing to all readers. This is friendly, accessible writing; it could be argued that it does not increase our understanding of *why* or *how* the poems are good - but it does not find it necessary to do so. Here is a literary-critical theorist, on the other hand, discussing pictures in picture-books: 'The combination of two sign systems clearly provides a way of problematising the representational function of visual and verbal signs and of foregrounding the ways in which relations between signs and things are structured by culturally inscribed codes of representation and signification.'

What do those writers have in common with an historian, probing the earliest children's books, whose work is based on very specialist archaeological research, and is not in the least concerned whether anyone reads the texts, or how they are read or understood — and is definitely not concerned with living children and books? Or writers who are both historians and critics concerned with national heritage: '*The Analects*, is an example of a classical piece of literature considered very heavy reading material for adults, let alone children—yet children in ancient China had only these texts as literature. However, many of the earliest versions of myths and legends were incorporated into these philosophical writings and historical chronicles.' Or, at another extreme, here is a psychotherapist, writing about the *effect* of books—psychology and 'bibliotherapy': 'Originating as a variant of strategic family therapy, but employing Foucauldian notions about power, language and meaning, Narrative Therapy invites clients to become aware of how they have been participants in the construction of a 'dominant story' of their own life … and instead to consider alternative ways in which they might have constructed

their personal narratives.' Note how, once again, we have a different language—a different preoccupation - and casual assumptions that we know about Foucault, and that we require scholarly references and would be prepared (or have the time) to read them.

Zhang: What are your attitudes between educational and literary studies in the field of children's literature?

Hunt: The position of children's literature, somewhere between educational and literary studies has often led to mutual snobbery: the teacher is not intelligent enough to cope with theory: the theorist is too out of touch to write intelligibly. The *International Companion Encyclopedia* refused to accept such stereotypes. Just as we need to accept that the concept of children's literature differs in every one of the countries and cultures explored in this book, and that none is superior to or inferior to any other, so we need to accept that each critical contribution is equally valid. From this position a style of criticism—one that comes *from* children's books, one that reflects the uniqueness of children's books and the fact that people concerned with children's books come from many fields and that we are writing for experts in other fields—is steadily emerging.

Zhang: What is the leading role of *Encyclopedia* plays in the field of children's literature?

Hunt: *The International Companion Encyclopedia* represents a major step towards a new style of criticism - one that comes *from* children's books—one that reflects the uniqueness of children's books and the fact that people concerned with children's books come from many fields and that we are writing for experts in other fields. Thus we need to develop a way of critical thinking that embraces all these fields, and which gives the way people think in these fields equal status and importance. We need to understand what other people can contribute.

Scholarship and New Development in the Field

Zhang: What do you think about recent attention by scholars working in children's literature to hot topics such as climate change, ecocriticism, environmentalism, critical race theory and Indigenous studies? Does the theoretical interest have any impact on the cultivation of ecological awareness of responsibility among children?

Hunt: The criticism of children's texts has always closely followed (and occasionally anticipated) its adult counterparts, and so it is not surprising to find a sudden interest in eco-criticism and race-related criticism. To some extent this is

what we call in English 'jumping on the bandwagon'—that is, following a fashion for one's own profit. The recent *Edinburgh Companion to Children's Literature* (Edinburgh University Press, 2017) has chapters on such fashionable and politically correct topics as 'Critical Plant Studies,' 'Health and Sickness,' and 'Feminist Ecocriticism,' and these are symptomatic of the relationship of criticism to the texts it criticises.

Pragmatically, it would seem that criticism would like to think of itself as having a symbiotic relationship with texts: that is, that its interest in ecocriticism is not only the result of more texts having been published that deal with environmental issues but is also the *cause* of more texts being published that deal with environmental issues. This is certainly the case with race-related criticism, where organisations such as the Children's Literature Association (USA) are making it a positive policy to influence publishers to increase the number of Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic (BAME) central characters in texts.

In my view it seems unlikely that academia, for all its theories, can have such an influence on the pragmatic world of publishing, and that ecological or racial change is more likely to be driven through the popular press and primary and secondary education. This is already happening, and non-fiction books on ecological themes are commonplace and this is being followed by fiction. Academic critics may have something valuable to say about these developments, but whether they could, *or should*, influence them is more questionable.

Zhang: "Ethical literary criticism," put forth by Nie Zhenzhao, is "defined as a critical theory for reading, analyzing, and interpreting the ethical nature and function of literary works from the perspective of ethics. Seeing literature as a product of morality, it argues that literature is a form of ethical expression in a specific historical situation" (Nie, 189). Would you please remark on the importance of ethical literary criticism to children's literature?

Hunt: I would say that in the literature that interests me the most, ethics and psychology are mixed together. Focusing entirely on ethics in literature runs the risk of missing what is often most interesting about the great characters of literature, which is that they are imperfect even when they try their best, because human nature is complicated and even contradictory at times. So, I think that studying literature can lead to a better understanding of the psychological complications within ourselves, whether or not it also leads to more ethical behavior.

Zhang: How has the concept of children's literature changed in recent years? What

are the new trends for the past twenty or ten years in children's literature?

Hunt: With the 'disappearance of childhood' recognised in the 1990s—that is, the erosion of childhood as a 'protected' state—children's literature has become increasingly difficult to distinguish from adult literature. Clearly, some forms, such as the picture book for young children are immediately distinguishable, but they even follow the same graphic (often computer-generated) styles, and their messages of social behaviour and narrative expectation, are identical. Otherwise, texts are increasingly dominated by major international publishers, and the concept of commodification of the audience has been perfected. The vast majority of texts are controlled (and commissioned) often in marketing 'cycles' in which themed series dominate across a marketing arc. In terms of sales, bookselling (in the UK and the USA) is dominated by a small number of conglomerates, and as few as 6% of published titles make their way to (standardised) shelves.

Zhang: It is an obvious phenomenon that the market also fuels the boom in crossover fictions. What are the dominating factors in this change?

Hunt: The past twenty years have been dominated by globally-successful books, such as the 'Harry Potter' franchise, and franchises in general; the exploitation of 'crossover' titles and franchises which are designed to be read by both adults and children. There has been a strong emphasis on 'age-banding' to which writers are implicitly or explicitly expected to conform, while for many years the cost of warehousing and accounting systems that demanded any book must make a profit within its first year meant that 'back-lists' were neglected, and series-books flourished. To balance this, the freedom to publish on the internet (together with print-on-demand services) has meant that individuals and small publishers can circulate material as never before, and so some kind of individuality, if not originality, may survive.

Zhang: People across the world are reading *Harry Potter* series which is viewed as the success of crossover fiction. How did crossover fiction come into being? What are the codes of its popularity?

Hunt: As I have suggested, the form of children's books depends on concepts of childhood and adulthood. And so, in the Anglophone tradition, there is nothing new about 'crossover' books—books that are published for, and read by, both adults and children. Similarly, books that have *moved* from one readership to another because of changing attitudes to childhood, have a long history.

In the UK, before the mid 18th-century, when children were first seen as a

separate market, books were read equally by children and by adults. In the late 19th century, when children were seen as small adults, books such as the adventure stories of G. A, Henty, were read by both boys and men, and the romances of Frances Hodgson Burnett, by girls and women.

As the 20th-century concept of childhood as a protected space was eroded, and fantasy was acknowledged as being legitimate reading for adults, so the conditions for dual-audience books, such as Richard Adams' *Watership Down* (1972), or the Harry Potter franchise became favourable. Similarly, the erosion of strict ideas of what is thought acceptable for 'children' has meant that books designed in, say, 1935 for 15-year-olds, would now be marketed to 9-year-olds. In turn, this has meant that the border between children's reading and adults' reading has become particularly fuzzy. This means that that adults can (and do) read harmless fantasies originally designed for 6-year-olds, such as *Winnie-the-Pooh*, while lists of children's 'classics' now routinely include books that deal exclusively with adult themes, such as *Huckleberry Finn* or the 'Sherlock Holmes' stories.

Zhang: Why do you hold that the most important changes are to the very essence of what texts for children are?

Hunt: Electronic media are not simply changing the way stories are transmitted, they are changing the very nature of story, of what we understand (or do not understand) to be narratives. Traditionally—and in the book as we know it—a story is told in a series of linked elements, all marked by change of some kind; these units are given coherence by links such as character, scene, atmosphere, theme or motif, and overwhelmingly aim towards a resolution. All of these elements and resolutions are guided by *generic* traditions. Now, narratives in the internet world—hypermedia stories—do not live by these rules. The 'beginning-middle-end' structure may seem, in the west, 'natural,' but it is demonstrably 'culture-specific': it is not how many readers now see 'story.' Equally, there need not be a 'storyteller': electronic narratives have no traditional structure and can have many authors.

Traditional linear narratives, then, offer fixed outcomes but imaginative opportunities. We have to supply the images. In contrast, a good many computer 'games' (which lean towards the conditions of hypertext) offer us landscapes, visualised characters, and images of all kinds, but allow the players to choose different outcomes or personalities. What were previously thought of as external or extraneous items (back stories, actors' biographies, cut-out toys, adaptations) become part of the 'narrative.' By 'surfing' the internet—interacting with the world of stored data, we build up a matrix or constellation of 'items': they are the story—

but that story is complex and intensely personal. It is continually changing and cannot be transmitted to anyone else: the reader is making and claiming his/her own meaning. This leads to the paradox that these new narratives are both personal and involve 'shared authorship' and they are all unstable works-in-progress. Criticism, if it has a place at all, has to be to be an intervention, an interruption, and an extension of the story itself.

Fundamentally, for the foreseeable future, two quite different mindsets will be operating at the same time in our educational system, and what we now think of as children's literature—narrative for children—will be at the centre of it. It need hardly be said that the political implications are quite revolutionary. Just as the internet has the potential to destroy cultures, so the admission that individual internal narratives (or co-operative narratives without any authoritarian centre) totally undermines politically and culturally established standards.

Zhang: Children's literature is defined and changed by the changing faces of the world. What are the most conspicuous changes of children's literature in the past ten years?

Hunt: In the past ten years, the concept of children's literature (in the west) *as a discipline* also shows signs of change: activists in the two major international organisations, IRSCL and ChLA, have become more visibly concerned with inequalities in the profession and perceived inequalities in the literature itself. There is, of course, no question that, by its nature, texts for children have always reflected the conscious and unconscious prejudices and shortcomings of the culture/ ideology that surrounds them. It has, for example, been a common observation over the past forty years that the number of characters in western children's books of 'minority' ethnic origin has been disproportionately small. Similarly, the variations of gender that have now come to the fore are, it is suggested, under-represented. Until recently, the critical 'establishment' has taken a descriptive role, and what is published is something to be observed, not manipulated. In the current political and cultural climate, such 'neutrality' is increasingly being seen as culpable, and critics have turned not only to foregrounding those books that have been written for 'minority' audiences but are actively promoting their publication. These trends have been linked to such contemporary movements such as 'Black Lives Matter.'

Zhang: Would you like to predict the future of children's literature?
Hunt: Predictions are always dangerous: who would have predicted in 1996, when the *International Companion* was published, that the world children's book market,

which at that time was flatlining [not developing] in terms of sales and creativity, would be dominated for the next two decades by a series of books that would break all previous publishing records. It may have been possible to predict that international market forces, including the growth of huge publishing conglomerates would accelerate the trends of homogenisation and commodification of children's books. But it would seem unlikely that anyone would have predicted the increase in internet users—from 16 million (0.4% of world population) to well over 5,000 million (60+%) over the next 25 years—nor the effect of this on children's texts.

But, as children's literature has always both mirrored and influenced adult literature and attitudes, it seems probable that this will continue. The future of children's literature is the same as the future of the human race: whichever ideology dominates will determine what books are written.

Zhang: Is there anything you want to share with Chinese readers?

Hunt: It seems to me that, perhaps more than at any other time in human history, it is essential for our survival that we understand the cultures of different countries. Understanding the children's literature of a country provides a key to how its citizens see the world, to what their underlying values are, and how they are likely to react. Reading children's literature does, quite literally, reveal another world, and I hope that Chinese readers will be entertained, as well as informed, by the experience.

Works Cited

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

Biofiction, Heterobiography and the Ethics of Speaking of, for and as Another

Lucia Boldrini

Abstract: Novels that choose historical individuals as their protagonists—"biofiction" (Buisine 1990; Middeke and Huber 1999; more recently Lackey 2016) or, especially in the case of first-person narration, "heterobiography' (Boldrini 2012)—can be a powerful tool to reflect on historical and philosophical constructions of the human subject; on individual identity, its representations, its autonomy and/or relationality. Ethical questions are at the core of the form, insofar as it contends with the ethics of assuming another's voice, of narrating another's story, and therefore with the ethical implications of literary practices of representation. The historicity of that "another" sharpens the urgency of these questions, and also diffracts them into a myriad of related issues, including the different ethical horizons of distant historical times; the ethical duty of giving voice to those that have been historically silenced vs the ethical risk of speaking for (appropriating the voice of) another; the ethical dilemmas inherent in the disputed ownership of stories; the tension between individual and collective narratives; the potential violence of the demand of coherence intrinsic in narrativization; the inevitable gap between authorial words and lived life. This article examines these key question, illustrating them through the analysis of a range of textual examples narrated in the first and/or third person: Patricia Duncker's 2015 *Sophie and the Sibyl* (in which the Sibyl of the title is the Victorian novelist George Eliot); Gavin McCrea's 2015 *Mrs Engels* (narrated by Lizzie Burns, Friedrich Engels's lover, partner and finally wife); Monica Truong's 2003 *The Book of Salt* (narrated by "Binh," a figure based on Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas's Vietnamese cooks); and Susan Sontag's 1992 *The Volcano Lover* (based on William Hamilton, collector and British Ambassador to the court of Naples in the 18th Century, his wife Emma, famous for her poses impersonating legendary figures, Admiral Horatio Nelson, and various other real and imaginary characters); the consideration of the latter also touches on Anna Banti's *Artemisia* (1947), centred on the early modern painter Artemisia Gentileschi.

Keywords: biofiction; heterobiography; ethics of representation; Patricia Duncker; Gavin McCrea; Monique Truong; Susan Sontag; Anna Banti

Author: Lucia Lucia Boldrini is Professor of English and Comparative Literature and Director of the Centre for Comparative Literature at Goldsmiths, University of London. Her research interests include fictional biography and autobiography; Joyce, Dante and modernist medievalism; comparative literature; and literature on and from the Mediterranean area. Among her books: *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction* (Routledge, 2012); *Joyce, Dante, and the Poetics of Literary Relations* (Cambridge University Press, 2001); and as editor, *Experiments in Life-Writing: Intersections of Auto/Biography and Fiction,* with Julia Novak (Palgrave, 2017)(Email: L.Boldrini@gold.ac.uk).

标题：传记小说、他者传记以及以他者为主题、为他者发声、作为他者的叙述伦理

摘要：选择历史人物作为主人公的小说，即"传记小说"（这一名称最早由比希纳于 1990 年提出，米戴克和胡贝尔在 1999 年沿用，拉基在 2016 年也提到过），或尤其是以第一人称叙述的"他者传记"（由博尔德里尼于 2012 年提出），可以成为从历史和哲学角度建构反思人类主体性、个体身份、文学再现、自主性和（或）关系性的有力工具。伦理问题是这种文学形式的核心，因为这涉及到利用他者声音、讲述他者故事的伦理冲突，因此也和文学实践的再现的伦理意蕴相冲突。"他者"的历史性加剧了这些伦理问题的紧迫性，也通过这些伦理问题衍射出诸多相关议题，包括时空差异导致的伦理视野的差异；为历史沉默者发声时所担负的伦理责任，为他者发声（挪用他者声音）所产生的伦理风险；具有争议的故事归属权内在的伦理困境；个体叙事与集体叙事之间的冲突；叙事过程中内在关联性被破坏的风险；作者话语与现实生活之间不可避免的鸿沟等。本文探讨了以上关键问题，并通过分析一系列以第一人称和（或）第三人称叙述的文本来阐述这些问题：帕特里夏·东克 2015 年出版的小说《索菲和西比尔》（小说标题中的西比尔是维多利亚时期的小说家乔治·艾略特）；加文·麦克 2015 年出版的小说《恩格斯夫人》（小说的叙述者莉齐·伯恩斯是弗里德里希·恩格斯的情人、伴侣，最终成为他的妻子）；莫妮卡·特朗 2003 年出版的小说《盐之书》（小说的叙述者阿彬的原型是格特鲁德·斯坦和爱丽丝·托克拉斯雇佣的越南裔厨师）；苏珊·桑塔格 1992 年出版的小说《火山爱人》（小说围绕收藏家、18 世纪驻那不勒斯王国的英国大使威廉·汉密尔顿、以模仿神话人物出名的妻子艾玛、子爵霍雷肖·纳尔逊以及众多真实和虚构的人物展开）；安娜·班蒂 1947 年出版的小说《阿尔泰米西娅》也涉及到虚构的人物，主要讲述了早期现代派画家阿尔泰米西娅·真蒂莱斯基的故事。

关键词：传记小说；他者传记；再现的伦理；帕特里夏·东克；加文·麦克雷；莫妮卡·特朗；苏珊·桑塔格；安娜·班蒂

作者简介：露西娅·博尔德里尼，伦敦大学英语和比较文学教授，伦敦大学戈德史密斯比较文学研究中心主任。她的研究兴趣包括：虚构性传记和自传，乔伊斯、但丁和具有现代性的中世纪主义，比较文学，关于和来自地中海区域的文学等。她的著作包括《他人的自传：历史主题与文学小说》（劳特利奇出版社，2012 年）、《乔伊斯、但丁和文学关系诗学》（剑桥大学出版社，2001 年）、与茉莉亚·诺瓦克共同撰写《生活写作实验：自传 / 传记与小说的交叉点》（帕尔格雷夫麦克米伦出版社，2017 年）等。

In this paper I wish to consider some of the ethical questions raised by novels that choose historical individuals as their protagonists. While the presence in fiction of characters drawn from history is not a new phenomenon, novels that centre on them have increased exponentially over the last few decades, and have been recognized as a separate genre. Different terms have been used to describe these texts, but the label "biofiction," originally used by Buisine in 1990 and later by, for example, Middeke and Huber, has acquired currency and has more recently been adopted and further popularized by Lackey. I too have contributed to the multiplication of terminology, using "heterobiography" to designate what may be seen as a subgroup of the broader category of biofiction: "autobiographies of others," that is, novels presented as if written, fully or partially, in the grammatical first person by a historical personage (*auto*-), though of course written by someone else (thus, *hetero*-).[1] These biofictional narratives, whether written in the third or first person (that is, as if biographically or autobiographically), or, as is often the case, in a combination of these grammatical forms, can be a powerful tool to reflect on the changing historical, cultural and philosophical constructions of the human subject, on individual identity, its representations, its autonomy and/or relationality. Ethical questions are at the core of the form, insofar as it contends with the ethics of assuming another's voice, of narrating another's story, and therefore with the ethical implications of literary practices of representation. The historicity of that "another" sharpens the urgency of these questions, and also diffracts them into a myriad of related issues. I will outline the main ones in the next paragraphs, before turning to a selection of novels that allow us to consider the range of forms that these issues can take, and some of their ramifications.By their very nature, biofictional and heterobiographical texts posit a choice between two ethical positions: on the one hand there is the potential to give voice to, or tell the story of, someone whose voice

---

1   See Boldrini, *Autobiographies of Others* 9-11 for a more extended discussion of the origins, rationale and implications of the term.

or story may have been forgotten, even erased from history, or whose perspective may need to be re-examined from a different angle. On the other hand, there is the appropriation of those subjects' voices or stories, without their consent, and with the effect of substituting one's own voice, one's own narrative reconstruction, for theirs. The choice of subject is crucial in this respect: the ethical implications of appropriating the voice of an emperor, a tyrant, a nobleman, or even a famous writer—of figures that have had the historical opportunity to speak for themselves or of having their stories celebrated—can be very different from those raised by the appropriation of the story or voice of someone who has not had the same opportunity, whether due to subordinated political or social position, or to lack of access to writing or publishing, or to illiteracy (I'm thinking, for example, for the first group, of Marguerite Yourcenar's *Mémoirs d'Hadrien*, of Manuel Vázquez Montalbán's *Autobiografía del general Franco*, or of the many fictional rewritings of the life of Ovid, such as those by Horia, Malouf, Ransmayr, and Mincu; and, for the second group, of Peter Carey's narration of the semi-literate outlaw Ned Kelly, or, even more aptly, of Jean Bedford's narrative of Kelly's sister Kate; or of the working class servants of famous people such as Virginia Woolf's cook Nelly in Alicia Giménez Bartlett's *Una habitación ajena* and in Danièle Roth's *Bloomsbury, côté cuisine: roman*). And, of course, there are the cases of stories that are disputed, where different versions are given by different agents. A peculiar example of the latter is the already mentioned *Autobiografía del general Franco*, in which Franco's first-person, heterobiographical, self-aggrandizing narrative is countered by the (fictional) narrator's inability to put up with the narrative he is himself writing in the dictator's name, so that he answers back with his own perspective, that of the historically defeated.[1]

The genre has thus an ethical dilemma at its core—either appropriation or silencing—with each choice involving the opposite ethical risk: either refuse the appropriation of another's voice but leave them without any voice; or give them the possibility of having their history represented, but at the cost of substituting one's voice for theirs, appropriating it, and with that, their identity. Inextricably connected to this dilemma is the explicit, sometimes even flaunted, historicity of the narratives' subjects, and the way their specific historical circumstances can affect the ethical texture of these questions, the way readers perceive and engage with them. The double nature of the protagonist-narrator as historical person and fictional character requires us to consider not only a possible ethical duty to historical

---

1   I have discussed this aspect of Vázquez Montalbán's novel in *Autobiographies of Others,* 168-177.

accuracy (and I say "possible" because the fact that these are novels authorizes, beyond any doubt, historical inaccuracy and invention), but also the relationship between different ethical horizons, that of the now and that of the historical time and place of the individual: how do the ethical concerns of the writer and of us as readers today re-cast, in the re-narrating, those of the individuals being narrated? We must differentiate them, no doubt—but is it possible (to what extent is it possible) to untangle them, separating our contemporary and subjective perspective from that of a historical subject who is now being reconstructed? To put it bluntly, is an objective ethical reading possible? Moreover, in their gesturing to biographical or autobiographical forms, these novels place the focus on the individual, yet their relationship with history very often involves a concern with larger historical phenomena, and therefore with collective subjects: how do they negotiate this relationship between the personal and the collective, a relationship that is both political and ethical?

It is within the frame provided by these questions that I want to discuss, very briefly in the space available and with no hope of doing justice to their richness, a range of biofictional and heterobiographical novels chosen to provide examples of diverse though related configurations, with distinct mixtures of invented and historical characters, each novel focusing to various extents on literary, historical, and (broadly conceived) political matters. The first two novels discussed below were published in 2015 and are set in the nineteenth century; in both, we encounter characters seeking to define ethical horizons for their time and the future. The subject of Patricia Duncker's *Sophie and the Sibyl* is the novelist George Eliot, often seen as concerned with the articulation of an ethics of individual and human sympathy, though accused of hypocrisy by Duncker's narrator. The political philosopher Friedrich Engels, seen through the eyes of his lover Lizzie Burns in Gavin McCrea's *Mrs Engels*, is more concerned with the emancipation of collective subjects (the working class), yet, through biofiction's focus on the individual, we also see him getting entangled in the paradoxical quandaries raised by the conflict between ethico-political principles and the difficulty of complying with the personal demands of those principles—demands that, as we shall see, may in themselves be underpinned by ethical violence. The next two books will allow us to consider further the ethical demands placed on writers that choose under-represented historical subjects, and to continue to explore the extent to which the aporias identified above may be intrinsic to the genre itself, drawing us readers too into these ethical quandaries and hypocrisies. This will be discussed in particular through Monique Truong's choice of Gertrude Stein's and Alice B. Toklas's cook (or, in fact,

a composite of their Vietnamese cooks) in *The Book of Salt* (2003); and through Susan Sontag's both asserted and denied desire to speak for the underrepresented in *The Volcano Lover* (1992). We shall observe how these texts (as well as a fifth one, Anna Banti's *Artemisia*, of 1947) address the distance between the "now" of writing and the "then" of the subjects' lives and times, and how they seek to trace layers of history and links of inheritance across time, establishing a dialogue between subjects divided by centuries.

Patricia Duncker's *Sophie and the Sibyl* (2015) starts in Germany in 1872, as the German translation of George Eliot's *Middlemarch* is being published in instalments by Duncker Verlag (the coincidence of the publisher's name and Patricia Duncker's is just that, a coincidence, but it provided the "starting point" for writing this novel (Duncker 288)). The Sibyl of the title is the formidable, intelligent, ugly Victorian novelist George Eliot, who scandalized her contemporaries by living with George Henry Lewes unmarried, and then, after his death, marrying a man much younger than her. Despite the scandalous life, Eliot is often seen as a moralist, even a heavy-handed one by some, as well as a major representative of ethical sympathetic realism. Eliot's novels, moreover, repeatedly place their characters in positions where they have to make choices (about themselves, about others) without having the knowledge of all the facts that may enable them to reach a balanced decision; situations in which the rational choice may contrast with their desires or their feeling of what is right; where they are, in other words, constantly faced by the necessity and inevitability, but also the imponderability, of ethics.

What is striking in Duncker's novel is the narrator's hostility to Eliot, whom she accuses of hypocrisy by "maintaining genteel fictions in her life that she seldom countenanced in her novels"; she is "a master of pretence"; "Her fiction championed the honesty she preached, but never practised"; she "clawed her way back into Victorian respectability by denying her fictional women the satisfied ambitions and desires she claimed for herself" (30). There is a black-and-white approach to judgement in this narrator that accepts no complexity or nuancing of moral choice, whether within Eliot's life or her fiction. However, something interesting happens *around* the narrative, in the paratexts of Epigraphs and Afterword. First, we find in one of the Epigraphs that the narrator metafictionally distrusts her own author (Duncker—or, insofar as this is also a construct of the (para)text, "Duncker"):

> our author is one of those sentimental people who need to admire their chosen heroes and heroines. She cannot bear it if her appointed gods turn out to be made of flesh and blood ... she has scores to settle with ... Mrs. Lewes, but she

adores [her]. ... Her vindictive little game is undermined by love.

The author's vindictive little game is undermined by love—these are quite striking words: one would expect the opposite, that love (an emotion we normally regard as positive) is "undermined" (a word with clearly negative connotations) by vindictiveness (surely a negative desire to harm or spite); but no, this narrator metafictionally comments on her own author's choices by inverting the ethical and emotional positions that we may expect to be in place. These startling words put us on notice to expect something odd in the ethical structure of what we are about to read.

Then, in the Afterword, we find that the author, "Duncker," doesn't fully share her narrator's views of Eliot. The fallibility of the narrator was a pillar of Eliot's realism. Here, however, it is the author that, after the end of the narrative—that is, left with the privilege of the last word on the matter—effectively disavows her narrator (even if with the somewhat amused forbearance of the older person towards the younger one), thereby undermining the moral and factual reliability of everything we've just read. The author describes the narrator as "a sceptical young woman ... very firmly based in the present day . . . the second decade of the twenty-first century." The emphasis on the context of the time is surely important: it leads us to relate the narrator's attitude to the age of social media, of the democratization of communication but also of often offensive comments made under the cloak of anonymity, of increased radicalization of positions, of even refusing to share a platform with those with whom one disagrees (the practice of "no platforming"), of accusing of hypocrisy those who do not constantly live up to their principles. So, as the young narrator condemns Eliot (and, incidentally, also utterly condemns, within the narrative, John Fowles's 1967 post-modern take on the Victorian age in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*), it seems that it is she, rather than the author, that has "scores to settle" with "Mrs Lewes," with what appears as a sense of vindictiveness accompanied by little love. Yet of course it is the author that has created this inflexible, prejudiced narrator.

So we have a historical, nineteenth-century subject, George Eliot, who was thematically concerned with moral choices and is known for her sympathetic realism, and who is narrated and condemned by a contemporary unsympathetic and rather unreliable narrator (who also starkly condemns Fowles), who is in turn created and, at the same time, more or less explicitly disavowed by her author, who may herself be more sympathetic to the historical subject Eliot, but who treats her own narrator in a way to an extent similar to how the narrator treats Eliot. If the

accumulation of "who" in the previous sentence becomes a little confusing (the first two refer to Eliot, then two refer to the narrator, and the last two refer to the author), that's because of the text's playfulness, its dizzying distorted reflections, its blatant exhibiting of metafictionality that may make the novel seem like a belated post-modernist game. Yet Duncker—academic and author of fictions that also engage with literary theory—is too canny for that, for being an author come late to the postmodernism party, or still hanging on at the party when everyone else has left. The novel uses the trickery of postmodernism—including pastiche: the novel is studded with (unattributed) quotations from other, mainly nineteenth-century, literature—to denounce the political and ethical limits of postmodernism (especially in the person of Fowles within the fiction, and in the way the narrator is treated in the "paratext" around the narrative). It uses a fiction about a historical character known for her sympathetic ethical moral stance in order to explore and question the (in)compatibility of different ethical horizons (the Victorian, the postmodern, that of the twenty-first century), highlighting in the process the impossibility for any ethical stance to remain unaffected when literature meets reality—as it does, programmatically, in the literary form of biofiction; and as it does in the Epigraphs and Afterword, that is, in the paratext that mediates between world and novel.[1]

The second case I discuss, Gavin McCrea's *Mrs Engels*, was also published in 2015 but it is very different from Duncker's novel. It is narrated by the semi-literate Lizzie Burns, sister of Friedrich (or Frederick, as he is here called) Engels's lover Mary Burns; after Mary's death, Lizzie herself became his lover and finally wife. The narrative is full of quotations from, paraphrases of, and allusions to Friedrich Engels's and Karl Marx's writings and to the writings of their families and associates. For example, in the novel, Marx's daughter Eleanor introduces Lizzie to a party of friends as "An Irishwoman and a true proletarian" (59), echoing a letter of 1878 by Engels in which he described Lizzie, after her death, as having been "of genuine Irish proletarian stock" (Kapp 114). A little later, Lizzie recalls Mary telling her about showing Engels around the slums of Manchester, an experience that, as most historians agree, Engels could not have undertaken on his own (he would undoubtedly have been robbed), and which provided the basis for his work *The Condition of the Working Class in England*:

> "What do you do when you go out with him?"
> "I show him around."

---

1   I discuss Duncker's *Sophie and the Sybil* at more length, in relation to Alicia Giménez Bartlett's *Una habitación ajena*, in "Biographical Fiction's Challenge to Realism."

"Around where? What's there to be shown?"

"He wants to see where we live."

"We? We who?"

"We the Irish. We the workers." (47-48)

The novel opens with Lizzie travelling on the train to London with Engels as they are moving from Manchester to a grand house on Primrose Hill. She is reflecting on the fact that for a working-class woman "Love is a bygone idea; centuries worn" (4), and that bread and heat are more important: a poor woman has to settle for what can give her economic security and keep her alive. Lizzie's thoughts linking family to economic conditions may put the reader in mind of Engels's work on *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, which attributes women's servitude to the evolution of property- and inheritance-based social systems, culminating in the bourgeois social organisation, which erode women's rights. Throughout the novel, statements abound on the need to "educate" workers about class consciousness, even though these statements are accompanied by scepticism on the workers' ability to fully grasp the concept. Marx says, for example: "we must get them educated" (214); "we mustn't presume a high level of self-consciousness or theory in these men" (215), alluding to the historical Karl Marx's famous words, in "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte," "They cannot represent themselves, they must be represented" (Marx 347). These much repeated (and at times distorted) words are of interest here because their echo brings directly into the novel the question at the heart of biofiction and heterobiography: the representation of the other that may be necessary when others cannot speak for themselves, but which carries the attendant risks of appropriating the voice and perspective of those others, erasing their autonomy. Significantly, in McCrea's novel, the "true proletarian" Lizzie retorts, but "Oughtn't we be hearkening to what they themselves have to say? . . . They being the revolutionaries?" (215).

The novel thus highlights the role that the largely forgotten and barely literate Mary and Lizzie Burns had in the development of one of the most influential political theories of the nineteenth century, as the narrative seeks to recover those erased female voices. However, other ethical dilemmas can be found at the centre of the text. After the fall of the Commune, when many French refugees have escaped to London, one of the French wounded fighters by the name of Bouton seems intent on picking a fight with Frederick Engels during a gathering at their house: Engels's money, wealth, his going foxhunting with rich people and aristocrats, all lead to accusations of hypocrisy (140-147). The injured Bouton's real target however,

Lizzie soon realizes, is Marx, who promotes armed revolution but does not himself participate in the fighting: he is the intellectual that theorizes the revolution without risk to his own person, for whom the lives of others are expendable in the name of the Cause. Bouton is chided by other refugees for his lack of courtesy and respect to their host, but we may also consider another angle: he is himself here in the Engels' home, drinking their wine, eating their food, socializing with them— arguably, a similar form of hypocrisy to the accusation he levels against Engels. Two complementary questions arise: must the philosopher always put his ideas into action himself for his ideas to be credible—must the philosopher be free from fault for his theories to be valid? Conversely, if Bouton has no right to question them, is there no position from which criticism can be made other than one of absolute purity?

Two other episodes point to dilemmas that are central to the ethical value of the encounter between the personal and the political. The first is Frederick's refusal to marry Lizzie when, after Mary's death and the start of their public relationship, she says explicitly that she wants to be married, and he responds that he cannot make that promise, because "I have to live according to my convictions" (252) and can only offer a spoken vow. However, years later, when she is on her deathbed, he finally marries her—it's his desire too, he tells her, but she knows that "his actions come not from his own desires, but from a wish to give me something; a gift that will please my God and ensure me a good death" (343). The second concerns the illegitimate son of the Marxes' governess Helen (or Nim, as she is known); Engels acknowledged paternity, but towards the end of the novel Lizzie discovers that the father was actually Marx, and Engels had declared paternity to protect his friend from scandal (not all historians agree on this version of the facts, but this is how the book presents the matter). Lizzie, who had never quite liked Marx's wife Jenny, now feels greater sympathy for her. She understands that ethical choices and judgements are always made in the dark, not in possession of the full facts, and can thus lead to the wrong decisions; or, to put it slightly differently: moral judgements are given on the basis of principles we believe to be correct, but because we are always at least partially in the dark, the moral choice may turn out to be the wrong one ethically— "how often we admire the wrong thing" (316), she reflects.

"And what about Frederick himself?" Lizzie wonders, "How ought he to be judged?" (316). By putting Karl and the cause "before everything—by being more loyal to *him* than to his own woman, his own name, his own *life*—he has made of Karl something like a wife" (316, emphases in the original). Engels has sacrificed his name in the name of the cause, and his principles for the benefit of Lizzie's and

Karl's. Lizzie's words can be read as condemnation of his choices, but they may also be seen as recognizing a kind of heroic generosity, in that Engels's actions admit the sacrifice of his own coherence for individual others (his friend Marx, his lover Lizzie) and collective others (the proletariat, those who cannot represent themselves).

The novel thus pitches the question of moral judgement within the clash between individual claims and political collective claims—or, one could say, to use Lyotard's terminology, between the small narrative of private truth and the grand narrative of historical social emancipation. It is the novel itself that encourages us to interpret this in such Lyotardian postmodern terms. At the very end, Lizzie thinks, in postmodern, post-Nietzschean way, "The truth is, there's naught but what you have in your mind about them. In front of us aren't our husbands but the stories we make of them, one story good till a better one comes to replace it" (344).

Lizzie Burns's story and voice can therefore be seen as a recovery of unheard, silenced voices or of alternative points of view on history, typical of a postmodern ethos; or—especially if we bear in mind the principle that we must represent, not only narratively but also politically, those that cannot represent themselves—as inviting us to re-think, after the critique of grand narratives in the last decades of the twentieth century, how historical grand narratives can still retain collective political and ethical value. The uneasy fit between personal desire and public, political commitment that we witness in the narrated lives of Lizzie, Engels and Marx can then be seen within this larger framework. However, it also raises another question about the potential violence of the demand for ethical coherence. As mentioned above, after refusing to marry Lizzie because this would have been against his convictions, Engels does so when she is close to the end, to allow her a good death: individual choices may not always be coherent with one's principles and life story, but do not for that cease to be ethical. In fact, it is possible that asking for complete coherence may itself be unethical, even violent. Judith Butler's words on autobiographical narratives express this point clearly and succinctly (and are, incidentally, also appropriate for the narrator of *Sophie and the Sibyl*): to demand "that we manifest and maintain self-identity at all times and require that others do the same" implies "a certain ethical violence":

> It may even be that to hold a person accountable for his or her life in narrative form is to require a falsification of that life in the name of a certain conception of ethics. Indeed, if we require that someone be able to tell in story form the reasons why his or her life has taken the path it has, that is, to be a coherent

autobiographer, it may be that we prefer the seamlessness of the story to something we might tentatively call the truth of the person. (Butler 34)

If narrative is employed in order to give shape and meaning to the continuum of the discrete facts of life and history,[1] the very form of biofiction or heterobiography (just like autobiography in Butler's analysis) may itself, in its search for *narrative* coherence, perform—or at least risks performing—an act of ethical violence on the represented subject, on which it seeks to impose a *personal* coherence, and from which it seeks self-explanation (an explanation of the self's life trajectory).

The third novel I now turn to, Monique Truong's *The Book of Salt*, originally published in 2003, is narrated in the voice of the semi-literate Binh, based on Trac and Nguyen, the historically real Vietnamese cooks of Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas in Paris. Within the novel, *The Book of Salt* is the title of a manuscript written by Gertrude Stein. Binh is asked by his lover Marcus Lattimore, who borrows the cook from the Stein-Toklas household on Sundays, to "borrow" one of Stein's manuscripts, promising to return it the following week. Binh does so reluctantly as he knows this is a breach of the trust of his employers, but picks, in the cupboard where Toklas keeps Stein's manuscripts, one that, we later discover, is called *The Book of Salt*. As Binh looks at it, he recognizes that his name is all over the pages; he can't read English, so doesn't understand what the text says, but he knows it is about him. He is upset by this appropriation of his story, to which he did not give his consent: "I did not give you my permission, Madame, . . . My story, Madame, is mine" (215). Binh hands over the manuscript to Lattimore, expecting it to be returned the following week so that he can replace it in the cupboard, leaving his Mesdames none the wiser about the temporary subtraction. However, the following Sunday the lover has disappeared and the manuscript has been stolen; only a note is left, in which Lattimore reveals the title, *The Book of Salt*, and cruelly thanks Binh for it (238). There are various layers to Lattimore's deceit: he pretends he needs a cook on Sundays to entertain guests; then it turns out he wants sex with Binh; and then it turns out that he was in fact exploiting Binh and his desire, in order to get to the precious manuscripts.

This book that we read, called *The Book of Salt* and "written by" Binh, may therefore be seen as the cook's re-appropriation of his story, which Stein had stolen (unless we read it as the manuscript written by Stein in the first person of Binh, a grammatical sleight of hand to which Stein was certainly no stranger, as we know from *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*; however, the novel doesn't seem to

---

1   See for example Eakin, Freeman, and White.

support such suggestion). Once again, the issues at the centre of the novel and the genre would be about who has the right to write and own someone's story, voice, desires, memories. But, of course, Binh only discovers that Stein has stolen his story because *he* has stolen her manuscript for a lover, who then steals it from him, in a chain of thefts.

Referring to his sexual encounters with other men, Binh says that "real names are never exchanged" (243). Towards the end of the novel, we discover that Binh is not his real name. "I never meant to deceive," he says (243), and yet by not giving us his real name, Binh involves us readers, too, in a transaction which, like the sexual transactions to which the cover of false names applies, is an exchange of pleasure but not of trust.

So: we may query the role of the privileged American author Gertrude Stein who, within the novel, takes the story of her "Indochinese" servant without his permission (or even the role of Truong, who writes this novel), but what is the role of us readers, put in the position of willing receivers of stolen goods? Why do we read this story, of this cook? Isn't it, as it is also in Lizzie's case, because we recognize other more illustrious historical names—Gertrude Stein and Alice B. Toklas, Friedrich Engels and Karl Marx? Even if the purpose of the texts appears to be the restitution of voice, aren't we in fact reiterating the secondariness of these individuals through the telling and reading of these stories that attract their writers and their readers—us—not because of their rather obscure subjects but because of their famous ones? Aren't we readers drawn into the hypocrisy of the transaction too, seeking to extract pleasure out of individuals who, in the end, remain historically anonymous?

Thus the novels, while giving voice to historically forgotten subjects, also cast light on the ethical pitfalls of the genre to which they belong. Which is not of course to say that these novels should not be written (or that they are immoral texts), but to draw attention, once again, to the ethical conundrums that force us, as readers, to accept our own failings in matters of coherence.

The fourth novel I want to consider is Susan Sontag's *The Volcano Lover*, published in 1992. It centres on Sir William Hamilton, British Ambassador to the Kingdom of Naples in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth; his lover then wife Emma; her lover Horatio Nelson. The novel opens with the narrator at a flea market, looking for something to pick, to "rescue," even if it may be "rubbish":

It is the entrance to a flea market. ... Why enter? What do you expect to see? I'm seeing. I'm checking on what's in the world. What's left. What's discarded.

> What's no longer cherished. What had to be sacrificed. What someone thought might interest someone else. But it's rubbish. If there, here, it's already been sifted through. But there may be something valuable, there. Not valuable, exactly. But something *I* would want. Want to rescue. Something that speaks to me. To my longings. Speaks to, speaks of. Ah ... (3; the last ellipsis is in the text)

The narrator has found something: her character, her story. Does this interest in collecting kitsch make the author better able to represent Hamilton, an internationally renowned collector? But are her subjects therefore collected characters of dubious value, like objects in a flea market, recycled, re-sold, tatty, rubbish, and yet somewhat exotic, attractive *because* old and useless? And is the profession of the writer that of rescuing from oblivion, or of taking something and passing it on as something different, "interesting"? Or is it—like much of the collecting done by figures like Hamilton, Elgin, and of course Marcus Lattimore in *The Book of Salt*—a form of plundering, of exploitation, of swindling? Is it what biofiction does, in rescuing discarded, forgotten characters and stories? (It is also worth noting that the other major character in the novel, Hamilton's second wife Emma, was a famous and successful impersonator of legendary, historical, literary females, which she embodied in her poses, known as "attitudes").

Again, I must limit myself to a much shorter discussion than this long novel would require, and skip directly to the end. In the last section of the book, which Sontag calls the "choleric" section, the narrator cedes the narrative to four women, "angry women, speaking [in the first person] from beyond the grave," as she describes them in an interview in the *Paris Review* (Sontag, "Art of Fiction"). The four women are Hamilton's first wife Catherine, his second wife Emma, Emma's mother, and finally the one I will focus on here: Eleonora de Fonseca Pimentel, a minor character in the story but very interesting historical figure in her own right. A well-educated Portuguese noblewoman born in Rome who wrote poetry and frequented the literary circles of the time, she was one of the revolutionaries who, inspired by the French Revolution, overthrew the Bourbons to establish the short-lived Neapolitan Republic in 1799. She directed the Republic's newspaper, writing most of its articles on all sorts of subjects, wrote economic treatises, proposed the establishment of a national bank, and was executed after the failure of the revolution and the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne. It was Nelson himself who signed the sentence of death: as Eleonora had renounced her noble title and was a foreigner, she was not entitled to the guillotine and was hanged, a more humiliating form of execution.

This final yielding of the stage, as it were, to such a strong historical female character that fought for justice, who, maltreated by her husband, had miscarried twice and lost her only child, and unusually for women at the time had sought legal separation, seems to echo another story, narrated in another novel. Anna Banti's *Artemisia* (1947) is based on the early-modern female painter Artemisia Gentileschi, who had been raped by a painter to whom she'd been apprenticed by her father, but who then refused to marry her; very unusually for the time, she took him to court, where she even had to undergo torture to demonstrate she, rather than he, was telling the truth. At the start of the novel, the narrator, a close projection of Banti herself, is sobbing in her nightshirt, having lost everything, including her manuscript of the life of Artemisia, when her house in Florence, close to a bridge, was blown up in 1944 by German bombs in the attempt to delay the advance of the Allied forces. Suddenly, she hears the voice of the young Artemisia bidding her, "Don't cry" (23). This presence comforts her, they begin a conversation, the narrator frequently writing in Artemisia's first person, their voices often merging, sharing their sense of trauma—or, one may say (and Banti's narrator does eventually say so), the narrator appropriating the suffering of the seventeenth-century painter in order to assuage her own. I'll return soon to the dialogue across the centuries between the two voices of narrator and character. At this point I want to note the similarity between Artemisia and Eleonora: two strong women who pursued their own careers, had to fight with the men in their lives who abused them, neither of them conforming to the expected role for female subjects.

In the interview given to Edward Hirsch in *The Paris Review*, a few years after the publication of *The Volcano Lover*, Sontag says: *"*I always knew the book would end with women's voices, the voices of some of the women characters in the book, who would finally have their say." Hirsch asks whether her ending allowed her to "give the woman's point of view," but Sontag disagrees with the assumption "that there is a woman's, or a female, point of view," and adds that "whatever their numbers, women are always regarded, are culturally constructed, as a minority. It's to minorities that we impute having a unitary point of view." Eleonora's narrative, Sontag comments, provides an "ethical wide shot" that shows us that Nelson, Hamilton, Emma "should be judged as harshly as she [Eleonora] judges them." And she adds: "The last word should be given to someone who speaks for victims." Not to a victim, or as victim, though Eleonora is also one at the end, but *someone who speaks for them*. These words seem, as it were, to complete the suspended sentence that we read at the start of the novel, when the narrator visits the flea market: "there may be something valuable, there. . . . Something that speaks to me. To my

longings. Speaks to, speaks of" (3)—or: *speaks for*.

But that "speaks for victims," in the interview, about Eleonora, also causes a double take, with its suggestion that victims, constructed as minority, can speak with a single unitary voice. How can one reject the essentializing of the minority (women, who are not in fact a minority) as having a unitary point of view *and at the same time* regard the final monologue of Eleonora as speaking "for the victims"? (For *all* of them? Surely "victims" can't be thus essentialized as a unitary category?) Who exactly can Sontag—or her narrator—impersonating Eleonora, speak *for*?

Yet, in yielding the stage for the final scene to such a strong historical female character, a revolutionary who fought for justice for those less privileged than she— or to put it differently: in the narrative choice to speak for the one who speaks for the victims—the novel establishes a kind of chain of connection and inheritance, as if each generation had to carry on the battles of the former ones, each voice subsumed into the later one, and yet recovered against a history that continues to seek to erase it again. At the conclusion of her narrative and of the book, Eleonora, reader of Mary Wollestonecraft and radical who wants to redress injustice for the poor and the oppressed, writes:

> Sometimes I had to forget that I was a woman to accomplish the best of which I was capable. Or I would lie to myself about how complicated it is to be a woman. Thus do all women, including the author of this book. (417)

I am not aware whether Sontag had read *Artemisia* yet in 1992, when she completed *The Volcano Lover*, thought she had certainly read it a decade or so later, when she wrote the introduction to a new edition of the English translation, published in 2004 (the Introduction itself appeared as an article in the *London Review of Books* in 2003, under the title "A Double Destiny"). Eleonora's words finally addressing Sontag—"including the author of this book"—seem again an echo of *Artemisia*. Towards the end of Banti's novel, a relationships is established between several of the novel's female characters and their lives: Artemisia herself, the strong artist that defeats gender convention and takes her rapist to court; the younger, very promising Neapolitan painter Annella de Rosa, victim of her husband's violence, abused by him and finally killed by him, whose presence imposes itself in Artemisia's memory when, later in her life, in London, she paints her own self-portrait with the features of Annella:

> Whether it is a self-portrait or not, a woman who paints in sixteen hundred and

forty is very courageous, and this counts for Annella and for at least a hundred others, right up to the present. "It counts for you too," she concludes. (232)

By this point, close to the end of the novel, the narration has been continuously in the third person for quite some time, as the narrator had stepped back, about half-way through the text, from the identification with the earlier woman and from the appropriation of her suffering to assuage her own, declaring it a presumptuous mistake (138). Now Artemisia speaks in the first person one last time, with words directed to the novelist, including her in that chain of connections and inheritance: "It counts for you too," very much like Eleonora's "including the author of this book."[1]

There is, in the distancing and connection across time, across spaces, across social positions, an ethical recognition of the other's integrity, and a dialogic response to that integrity. This is, in the words of the Italian philosopher Adriana Cavarero, "an altruistic ethics of relation" which however should not support identification, even empathy, but should recognize—as Banti does, half way through her novel—the "uniqueness and distinction" (Cavarero 92) of the other: "No matter how much you are similar and consonant, says this ethic, your story is never my story. No matter how much the larger traits of our life-stories are similar, I still do not recognize myself *in* you and, even less, in the collective *we*" (92). Cavarero acknowledges the impossibility, the unethical nature of the appropriation of another's story. However, she does not assume anyone's exclusive right over their story; indeed, we need others to reveal our stories to us. "Tell me my story" is the request at the origin of all autobiography: how can I otherwise know the story of my own birth?

We can now circle back to Eleonora's words which I started quoting earlier, and which conclude the novel:

Sometimes I had to forget that I was a woman to accomplish the best of which I was capable. Or I would lie to myself about how complicated it is to be a woman. Thus do all women, including the author of this book. But I cannot forgive those who did not care about more than their own glory or well-being. They thought they were civilized. They were despicable. Damn them all. (417)

Strong words indeed: uncompromising, not admitting to any possibility of

---

1   I have discussed Anna Banti's *Artemisia*, its references to other women writers (in particular, Virginia Woolf) and artists, and the ethical issues raised by the novel's use of first- and third-person narrative in "Anna Banti and Virginia Woolf" and in *Autobiographies of Others* 154-165.

redemption or of forgiveness for those who did not care or forgive.

We must be on our guard: these chains of female transmission and inheritance may risk essentializing women as the only ones who can speak about and for women. But there is also the recognition that no individual lives independently of other individuals, that our lives are always shaped by the struggles of others, and in turn shape those of others; that caring for the other (not being despicable; pursuing sympathy and solidarity) requires imagining oneself as another, no matter how different the other is, across time, ethnicity, class; that the link of sympathy and solidarity also transforms and others us; that we must recognize this risk of erasing the other's separate identity, and resist that risk; and that such an act of imagination, therefore, is not always—need not always be: we should attend to the necessity that it does not become—unethical appropriation.

The novels discussed above are just some examples of how biofictional and heterobiographical texts differently inflect the various ethical conundrums that concern the form itself, the individual novels, the authors and their intentionality, the narrator and the narrative choices, the characters' behaviour and that of the historical individuals the characters reflect, and the readers' own role. The novels show how these ethical questions are saturated with inescapable complexities and contradictions—sometimes resolving into accusations of hypocrisy (mismatch between principle and action), sometimes into what we could call a necessary acceptance, even embracing, of (the risk of) hypocrisy; sometimes requiring us to walk a difficult tightrope between our appropriation and recognition of the other as other; sometimes accepting the singularity of the individual and at others the legitimacy of their being subsumed into collective identities; in all cases, holding these ethical issues firmly at their centre. To conclude, I will note a final point about these texts, located at the encounter of historicity and fictional literary representation: in their contending with these ethical matters, explicitly within their thematic content or more implicitly with their formal structures, the biofictional or heterobiographical form is crucial. Ethical questions can of course be raised in fictions that invent their characters rather than finding them in history; however, it is the historicity of these individuals—the fact that they are not (or not just) characters and situations constructed ad hoc to explore a theoretical question, but are presented as, and recognized by readers as, real human beings who had real voices and stories—that gives these novels and this literary form their peculiar ethical force.

Works Cited

Banti, Anna. *Artemisia*. Translated by Shirley D'Ardia Caracciolo. Introduction by Susan Sontag.

London: Serpent's Tail, 1988.

Bedford, Jean. *Sister Kate*. Ringwood, Victoria: Penguin Australia, 1982.

Boldrini, Lucia. "Anna Banti and Virginia Woolf: A Grammar of Responsibility." *Journal of Anglo-Italian Studies,* 10 (2009): 135-149.

—. *Autobiographies of Others: Historical Subjects and Literary Fiction*. London and New York: Routledge, 2012.

—. "Biographical Fiction's Challenge to Realism: Patricia Duncker's *Sophie and the Sibyl* and Alicia Giménez Bartlett's *Una habitación ajena*." In Dirk Göttsche, Rosa Mucignat and Robert Weninger, eds. *Mapping Realism*. Volume I of *Landscapes of Realism: Rethinking Literary Realism(s) in Global Comparative Perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2021. 777-793.

Buisine, Alain. "Biofictions." *Revue des Sciences Humaines* 224 (1991): 7-13.

Butler, Judith. "Giving an Account of Oneself." *Diacritics* 31.4 (2001): 22-40.

Carey, Peter. *True History of the Kelly Gang*. Brisbane: U of Queensland P, 2000.

Cavarero, Adriana. *Relating Narratives: Storytelling and Selfhood*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.

Duncker, Patricia. *Sophie and the Sibyl: A Victorian Romance*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Eakin, Paul John. *Fictions in Autobiography: Studies in the Art of Self Invention*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1985.

Engels, Friedrich. *The Condition of the Working Class in England: From Personal Observation and Authentic Sources.* Ed. by E. J. Hobsbawm. Chicago, IL: Academy Chicago Publishers, 1994.

—. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State.* London: Penguin, 2010.

Freeman, Mark. *Rewriting the Self: History, Memory, Narrative*. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Giménez-Bartlett, Alicia. *Una habitación ajena*. Barcelona: Lumen, 1997.

Horia, Vintila. *Dieu est né en exil*. Paris: Fayard, 1960.

Kapp, Yvonne. *Eleanor Marx*. New York: International Publishers, 1973.

Lackey, Michael. *Biofiction: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2021.

—. "Locating and Defining the Bio in Biofiction." *a/b: Auto/Biography Studies* 31.1 (2016): 3-10.

Lackey, Michael, ed. *Conversations with Biographical Novelists: Truthful Fictions across the Globe*. London: Bloomsbury, 2019.

Malouf, David. *An Imaginary Life*. New York: Braziller, 1978.

Marx, Karl. "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte." In David McLennan, ed. *Karl Marx: Selected Writings*. Revised Edition. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000. 329-355.

McCrea, Gavin. *Mrs Engels*. London: Scribe, 2015.

Middeke, Martin, and Werner Huber. *Biofictions: The Rewriting of Romantic Lives in Contemporary Fiction and Drama*. Rochester, NY: Camden House, 1999.

Mincu, Marin. *Il diario di Ovidio*. Milan: Bompiani, 1997.

Ransmayr, Christoph. *Die letzte Welt: Roman*. Nördlingen: Greno, 1988.

Roth, Danièle. *Bloomsbury, côté cuisine: roman*. Paris: Balland, 2001.

Sontag, Susan. "A Double Destiny: Susan Sontag Writes about Anna Banti's *Artemisia.*" *London Review of Books* 25.18 (25 September 2003): 6-9.

—. "Susan Sontag: The Art of Fiction. N. 143. Interviewed by Edward Hirsch." *The Paris Review* 137 (Winter 1995). https://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/1505/the-art-of-fiction-no-143-susan-sontag.

—. *The Volcano Lover: A Romance*. London: Penguin, 1992.

Toklas, Alice B. *Alice B. Toklas Cookbook*. London: Serif, 1994.

Truong, Monique. *The Book of Salt*. London: Vintage, 2003.

Vázquez Montalbán, Manuel. *Autobiografía del general Franco*. Barcelona: Planeta, 1992.

White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality." In Hayden White, *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987. 1-25.

Yourcenar, Marguerite. *Mémoires d'Hadrien*. Paris: Plon, 1951.

Causes of Formation and Modes of Dissemination of World Literary Classics

Deyi Woody

Abstract: The value of the classics of world literature has been realized through incessant evolution, transformation and discoveries. This paper seeks to investigate the causes for the making of classics of world literature and the modes of their dissemination. As for the causes behind the formation of literary classics, close connections with the primitive religion, ethical teachings as well as human perceptions of nature are easy to identify. Literary classics, first and foremost, serve to satisfy people's spiritual needs such as ethical selection through different stages of human history. The dissemination of literary classics has undergone various forms covering cerebral, hieroglyphic, cuneiform and phonetic texts, varying from papyrus, clay tablets, bamboo, wood, pottery, bronze to the movable-type printing, from oral literature to written literature, from "bylina" to heroic epics, form national literature to translated literature, and from print media to cross-media dissemination. Due to the progress in science and technology, the evolution of modes of dissemination not only has encouraged circulation and popularization of literary classics, but has witnessed the development of human civilization. In this light, exploring the origins and modes of dissemination of literary classics in terms of the cultural context of the source language and cross-media transmission as well as analyzing their cultural function and cognitive values pose an important subject for interdisciplinary studies of literature which deserves deeper consideration.

Keywords: world literary classics; formation; modes of dissemination; moral teaching; cross-media study

Author: Deyi Woody is Professor at Zhejiang Yuexiu University (Shaoxing 312000, China), professor and Ph.D. supervisor at the Institute of World Literature and Comparative Literature, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). His research interests include English Literature, Russian Literature and Comparative Literature (Email: hzwudi@yahoo.com).

标题：世界文学经典的生成缘由与传播途径

内容摘要：世界文学经典在不断发现、不断演变和深化中体现自身价值。本文旨在探究世界文学经典的生成缘由和传播途径。文学经典的生成缘由是多

方面的，但与万物有灵论等原始宗教信仰、伦理教诲以及人类对自然的认知有关，其基本取向是满足人们包括伦理选择在内的精神需求，适应于各个不同时代人类生存和发展的需要。世界文学经典的传播经历了多种途径，以其脑文本、象形文字、楔形文字、拼音文字等多种形式，历经了从纸草、泥板、竹木、陶器、青铜直到活字印刷术的演变，以及从口头文学到书面文学、从"壮士歌"到英雄史诗，从民族文学到翻译文学、从平面媒体到跨媒体传播等多种媒介的发展变换。传播途径的变化，不仅促使了文学经典的流传和普及，而且伴随科学技术的进步，在一定层面上折射出人类文明的历史进程。因此，从源语文化语境以及跨媒介传播等方面探索世界文学经典的生成缘由及传播途径，研究文学经典的文化功能和认知价值，无疑是值得我们深入思考的一个具有跨学科性质的重要命题。

关键词：世界文学经典；生成缘由；传播途径；道德教诲；跨媒介研究

作者简介：吴笛，文学博士，浙江越秀外国语学院教授，浙江大学世界文学与比较文学研究所教授，主要从事英美文学、俄罗斯文学和比较文学研究。本文系国家社科基金后期资助重点项目"俄罗斯古代诗歌发展史"【项目编号：21FWWA002】的阶段性成果。

The charms and powers of world literary classics are enormous, and their value has been realized through constant evolution, transformation and discoveries. Since the word "canon" was first used as an important measure of value in the examination of literary works, the academic circle has been searching for the meaning and value of literary canon, which, in turn, has led to its formation and dissemination.

I. Causes of Formation of Literary Classics

Undoubtedly, literature, though non-utilitarian, has a utilitarian aspect and offers an important access to our perception of human society though not in the sense of providing information. Although literary classics do not usually communicate what we generally consider useful information, they have the specific value of searching for truth, cultivating emotions, reviewing any given epoch, and interrogating social realities. Despite that the causes of formation of literary classics are multifaceted, literary classics, first and foremost, serve to satisfy people's spiritual needs such as ethical selection through different stages of human history.

To begin with, literary works were first created in close connection with primitive religions in ancient times. For instance, it is "animism", the worldview of ancient Egyptians, which leads to the genesis of *The Book of the Dead*, a collection of poetry, which is considered the oldest written literature in the world. Moreover, the doctrine of witchcraft is also associated with primitive religions. Although it

is possible to find some connection between early poetry, such as *The Vedas*, and witchcraft, the latter, as an important social activity of early humans, plays only a minor role in the creation of poetry. As a matter of fact, when we talk about "literary classics" and "literary canon", we almost talk about the same thing, but the difference is obvious. When we say "literary classics", we usually refer to literary works that are "exposed to the test of time"(Easterling 35),while the word "canon" is most directly associated with religion, and has its origins in an internal debate within the Christian church about the "canonical" aspects of poetry. "The idea of a canon of writings first developed in relation to the *Bible*, in the 4th century of the modern era" (Makaryk 514). As such, it is not difficult to see the relationship between literary classics and their connection with religion. As Jeremy Hawthorn notes that what is accepted as having divine authority in the church is called classic, while that which has no authority or whose authority is doubtful is said to be pseudepigrapha (Hawthorn 34).

The formation of literary classics is also closely related to people's emotions and aesthetic needs. Those who advocate the "imitation theory" also have emotional communication in mind. The "imitation theory" begins with two ancient Greek philosophers, Democritus and Aristotle. Democritus believes that poetry originates from man's imitation of the sounds of nature, while Aristotle states in his *Poetics*, "Poetry in general seems to have sprung from two causes, each of them lying deep in our nature" (Aristotle 15). He goes on to explain that these two causes result from man's instinct to copy and that the pleasure is always felt in the work being copied. He further notes, "The graver spirits imitated noble actions, and the actions of good men. The more trivial sort imitated the actions of meaner persons, at first composing satires, as the former did hymns to the gods and the praises of famous men" (Aristotle 16). The "emotion theory" holds that poetry originates from the expression of emotions and the need to communicate ideas. This view reveals some essential connections between poetic composition and emotional expression, but it fails to explain the source of poetry, and only illustrates certain motives for the creation of poetry.

The history of world literature also proves that the earliest oral literature in the world is work songs. It is the work that determines the formal characteristics of poetry as well as its functional significance, linking it to rhythm and rhyme. Since shouting or yelling while working is accompanied by swinging of the tool and twisting of the body, one of the important features of primitive poetry is the unity of poetry, music and dance. Zhu Guangqian notes that both Chinese and Western countries believe that the origin of poetry lies in human nature, that poetry, music

and dance are originally a trinity, and that the very thing that unites the three arts is rhythm. "With the passage of time, the three arts diverged, each retaining its rhythm, while in addition to rhythm, music developed towards 'harmony', dance towards gesture, and poetry towards words. Eventually, the three arts grew further apart" (Zhu 11). This also indicates that literature is produced out of the need for emotional communication and pleasure. "Mere aesthetic essentialism can hardly explain the nature of canons, including literary classics" (Yan 1).

Furthermore, the creation of literary classics is related to people's ethical needs including ethical teachings. A literary classic must be an exemplary work which is widely revered. In this context, the word "exemplary" is already an element of value judgment. In fact, the formation of literary classics which have been handed down through generations, does not merely depend on the charm of their language or aesthetic values, and ethical values also play a significant role in obtaining their esteem. It is the ethical choices that make people yearn time and again for answers and lessons from literary classics, and that offer them the enduring value and charm. The ethical and aesthetic values in literary works are not necessarily incompatible for the reason that aesthetic reading is not the only way to study literary classics. In the process of reading, "we are willing to allow our various interests as human beings to become subordinate to the total experience" (Brooks 227).

In this respect, Harold Bloom's conception of aesthetic creativity is too biased, and he overemphasizes the importance of aesthetic creativity in Western canon-formation, opposing the moral philosophy and ideological criticism embedded in literary theories such as New Historicism. Aesthetic standard is important in its own right, however, if the aesthetic function is regarded as the only function of literary classics, it clearly weakens the "raison d'être" of literary classics. Moreover, the moral and political values in literature are even less, as Bloom puts it, "the greatest enemies of aesthetic and cognitive standards" (Bloom 40). The cognitive function of literary classics is precisely their ethical value; especially when we say the purpose of reading literary works is to cultivate moral sentiments, we are already talking about the ethical need.

In *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*, Nie Zhenzhao gives a theoretical account of the ethical value of literary classics as well as the practical use of ethical criticism in literary genres such as fiction, drama, and poetry. In comparison with Bloom's aforementioned statement, Nie's view is undoubtedly more scientific and objective. In regard to the relationship between aesthetic and ethical value, Nie insists that, "the value of literary classics lies in their ethical value, and their aesthetic value is only an extension of the ethical value, or a form or means of

realizing the latter. In this sense, whether a literary text can become canonical is determined by its ethical value" (Nie, *Introduction* 142). Clearly, there is no aesthetics without ethics, and without ethical choices, aesthetic choices are even less available. Discovering the ethical value of literary classics, cultivating the ethical consciousness of the reader, and learning from literary classics, makes the values of literature more keenly felt than ever before. One of the missions of literary classics is to emphasize the ethical teachings and awaken the reader's ethical consciousness. French philosopher Emmanuel Levinas constructs a "to do something for the Other" view of ethical philosophy, arguing that "the authentic relationship with the Other" is "discourse and, more exactly, response or responsibility" (Levinas 88). Also, Canadian scholar Markus Poetzsch places more emphasis on the practice of literary ethical criticism and its ethical teachings (Poetzsch 134).

Needless to say, ethical teachings should become one of the goals literary classics strive to achieve. The connection between the formation of literary classics and their ethical teachings can be strongly felt in works such as *Oedipus the King*, *Aesop's Fables* and *Legend of Lena Fox*, to name just a few. Obviously, ethical teachings are more prominent in ancient literature, not to mention the fact that many literary forms originate from ethical teachings. Early Egyptian autobiographical works, for instance, display salient tendencies of ethical teachings. *The Autobiography of Methen*, *The Autobiography of the Weni*, and *The Autobiography of Harkhuf*, for example, mostly either state the noble virtues of the emperor's ministers, or show off how to serve the emperor and instill moral codes in the minds of ancient Egyptians. "The praises of the virtue of charity, which permeate many autobiographical inscriptions of the times, undoubtedly have influenced later biographical literature" (Lin 286). Apart from autobiographical works, oracular literature of ancient Egypt also offers direct examples of ethical teachings such as the earliest *The Instruction of Prince Hardjedef*, and the most well-preserved *The Instruction of Ptahhotep*, both concerning various aspects of social ethics.

Finally, the formation of literary classics is related to human perception of nature. Literary classics are, to a certain extent, records of human cognition of nature. In particular, some ancient literary works are interpretations of natural philosophy. Almost every nation has had its peculiar system of mythology, and a significant body of these myths conveys the perception of nature. Both Greco-Roman and Eastern mythologies invariably reflect man's comprehension of natural forces and his exploration of the relationship with nature. In earlier times before the Renaissance, due to poor knowledge of natural sciences and limitations of the way people think, people can only accept the control of natural forces passively, which

leads to fear of nature and being in awe of God's mercy, as a result of which, people begin to deify natural forces. Many myths and legends as well as various rituals are motivated by man's fear and deification of nature. In terms of language, people even consider "heaven" and "God" one and the same concept and allow each to play the role of supreme power, so the word "heaven" is a typical example of human deification of natural forces.

II. The Evolution of the Modes of Dissemination of Literary Classics

In the course of time, the dissemination of literary classics has undergone various forms covering cerebral, hieroglyphic, cuneiform and phonetic texts, varying from papyrus, clay tablets, bamboo, wood, pottery, bronze to movable type, from oral literature to written literature, from "bylina" to heroic epics, from national literature to translated literature, and from print media to cross-media dissemination. Due to the progress in science and technology, the modes of dissemination not only have encouraged circulation and popularization of literary classics, but have witnessed the historical process of human civilization. Generally speaking, the dissemination of literary classics has gone through seven important stages or modes, which are oral, performative, written, printed, organizational, visual, and internet transmission respectively.

The oral stage marks the beginning of the formation and dissemination of literary classics, which is closely connected with the birth of language. Not a small number of ancient literary classics have undergone a long phase of oral transmissions such as *Iliad* and *Aesop's Fables*, and not until later when writing is invented, are they collected and recorded to form fixed texts. Actually, the evolution from oral to written literature marks the transformation of brain texts into material texts. "The only way to preserve brain text relies on oral expression, so that brain text can be kept permanently. Consequently, a vast number of brain texts possessing literary significance disappeared, and only a small part could be passed down via written texts" (Nie, "Ethical Literary Criticism" 194). Obviously, brain texts as oral literature can only be preserved and transmitted after being transformed into a fixed form, be it material or electronic.

Theatrical activities have contributed a great deal to the formation and dissemination of literary classics. Take literary classics of ancient Greece, for instance, the works of the three best-known tragic poets, namely, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides, were then transmitted through theatrical performances. Back then, theaters were mostly amphitheaters, such as the Dionysus Theater in Athens, which was large enough to hold 30,000 people. In addition to theatrical

transmission of literary classics, chanting is also an effective way of spreading poetry. Much of the lyric poetry of ancient Greece was transmitted by chanting to the accompaniment of instruments such as the flute and the lyre. In ancient Persia, the works of the poets were transmitted by the "poetizer," a person who disseminated poetry by chanting.

Writing, invented at the beginning of the slave society, marks a crucial stage in the formation and dissemination of literary classics. Around the third or fourth millennium B.C., in China, Egypt, India and the region of Tigris-Euphrates River, early pictographs emerged successively. The invention of writing is undoubtedly a fundamentally important event in the development of human civilization, because writing overcomes the weaknesses of oral transmission and is able to preserve information precisely and permanently. From this moment onward, the preservation of literature overcomes the limitations of human memories as well as the spatial and temporal constraints of oral transmission, greatly enhancing the dissemination of literary classics.

Even with the invention of writing, mass dissemination of literary classics would still not be possible without the development in printing technology. Before the movable-type printing was invented by Bi Sheng, literary works could only be recorded on plants such as papyrus and bamboo, or engraved on clay tablets or slates. Thanks to the movable-type printing, mass dissemination of literary classis was eventually made possible.

Organizational dissemination is also an efficient way of transmitting literature. With the development of science and technology, especially the invention of the printing press, the concept of "community" is more strongly felt than ever before, which includes the expansion of reading and writing groups, literary salons, schools, journals and publishing houses. The dissemination of literary classics cannot be separated from a particular medium, and each medium reflects the zeitgeist of a particular historical period. In effect, the word "medium" has multiple meanings under different circumstances. "In a broader sense, transmission mediums of literature can be understood in two aspects. On the one hand, it is the carrier, channel, tool, and technical means of literary information such as 'fiction texts,' 'dramatic scripts,' 'epic legends,' 'textual web pages;' on the other hand, it may refer to organizations engaged in information collection, symbol processing and dissemination…However the objects and domains indicated by the two aspects may differ, transmission mediums are an indispensable part of social information systems" (Wen 52).

From the 20th century to the present day, mass media has become a major

means of transmission of literary classics which provide a steady source for film and TV adaptations. Since the advent of the Internet in the late 20th century, Internet has added a new dimension to the dissemination of literary classics. With the popularization of computers as well as the development of information technology such as image scanning and text recognition, electronic books have become popular with more readers and researchers, which are easier to read, carry and disseminate. Besides, online dissemination has made literary classics reach out to a larger audience. From papyrus and clay tablets to Internet, the evolution of transmission modes has not only witnessed the development of human civilization but contributed immensely to the circulation and popularization of literary classics.

III. Video Texts and New Media Circulation of World Literature

Classics of world literature deserve to be considered as an important part of the cultural and spiritual heritage of all humankind. All through the 20th century, film, television and media together have had a great impact on people's daily life, and accordingly, literary classics have also become popular materials for film and television adaptations and other new media communications, and thus continue to play an active part in the construction of national culture. Ever since the literary classic *Cinderella* hit the screen in 1900, film and television creations have constantly turned to literature for inspirations. According to statistics, 85% of the best Oscar films are based on literary works (Chen 1). Well-known films such as *Troy*, *Dante's Inferno*, *The Lion King*, *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, *Olive Twist*, *Doctor Zhivago*, to name just a few, are all successful adaptations of literary classics. Hollywood adaptations of Chinese classics such as *Kung Fu Panda*, and *Mulan*, as well as Chinese adaptations of foreign classics such as *How Steel is Made*, further prove that literary classics are not only able to provide affluent materials for film and animation adaptations, but can be globally popularized and even integrated into other cultures.

Considering different characteristics of literature and visual arts, when discussing film and television dissemination of literary classics, we cannot take "faithfulness" as an absolute criterion to judge the quality of a film. As a matter of fact, we seldom expect film or television adaptation to be completely "faithful" to and fully represent the content of the original text. Nevertheless, the conversion of linguistic symbols into visual symbols is not a conversion in the general sense of the word, but a "translation" from one artistic form to another. Now that it is a screen "translation," faithfulness to the original text, especially to its ideological content, is an important factor that cannot be neglected, which can also be considered a major

criterion for measuring the quality of a "translation."

Scholars at home and abroad have different views on what principles should be followed when it comes to a cinematic adaptation of literary texts. Xia Yan notes that, "If the original text is one of the classics authored by Tolstoy, Gorky, Lu Xun and other literary masters, I believe that the adaptation should always strive to be faithful to the original text, even necessary additions and deletions should be consistent with the themes and unique style of the text. On the other hand, if the original text is one of the myths, folklores or the so-called 'anecdotes', greater freedom concerning any additions, deletions or alterations will be allowed" (Xia 498). Xia Yan believes that literary adaptations differ from one another because the nature of the original texts varies. He further points out, "How much of the original style of a literary text can be retained depends on the aesthetic and historical value of the literary text itself" (Yan 329).

After all, literature and film are of different artistic categories. If a film mimics the original text in a strict sense, such "translation," at best, is "stiff translation" or "dead translation." The dissemination of literary works from one language to another is considered a kind of "re-creation," while the transmission of literary works from one artistic form to another is undoubtedly a sort of artistic "re-creation" which, however, is subordinated to the original texts. As for film adaptations of literary classics, the moral, psychological and intellectual connotations of the original texts should also be conveyed to the audience. As a matter of fact, a great number of films adapted from literary classics, more often than not, have inspired the audience to read the original literary texts precisely because of the charm and power of literature, thus contributing enormously to the popularization and cross-cultural transmission of literary classics.

Conclusion

After a long period of time, the world literary classics have not only aesthetic value but also important cognitive value. "The process of the formation of literary classics is a process of cognition of human being to the nature and human society" (Wu 1). Throughout the course of history, literary classics have become the precious cultural heritage of all mankind. It is therefore of great significance to study the causes of formation and modes of dissemination of literary classics. Furthermore, it is undoubtedly an important interdisciplinary subject to study the cultural functions and cognitive values of literary classics in terms of the context of the source texts and their cross-media dissemination.

Works Cited

Aristotle. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Edited with critical notes and a translation by S. H. Butcher. London: Macmillan, 1898.

Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and Schools of the Ages.* New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994.

Brooks, Cleanth. *The Well Wrought Urn*: *Studies in the Structure of Poetry*. London: Dennis Dobson Ltd, 1960.

Chen, Linxia. *From Novel to Film: A Comprehensive Study of Film and Television Adaptations.* Beijing: China Social Science Press, 2011.

Easterling, P. E. ed. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1985.

Hawthorn, Jeremy. *A Glossary of Contemporary Literary Theory*. London: Anorld, 2000.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Ethics and Infinity.* Trans. Richard A. Cohen. Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP, 1985.

Lin, Huruoming. *Egyptological Studies: The Glorious Ancient Egyptian Civilization*. Changchun: Jilin UP, 2008.

Luo, Xinzhang ed. *On Translation*. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1984.

Makaryk, Irena. *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory Approaches, Scholars, Terms.* Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993.

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

—. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism.* Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.

Poetzsch, Markus. "Towards an Ethical Literary Criticism: The Lessons of Levinas." *Antigonish Review*. Issue 158 (Summer 2009): 127-134.

Wen, Yan ed. *Introduction to Literary Communication*. Shenyang: Liaoning People's Publishing House, 2006.

Wu, Di. *Studies in the Formation and Dissemination of Foreign Literary Classics*. vol. 2. Beijing: Peking UP, 2019.

Xia, Yan. "Miscellaneous Adaptations." *An Anthology of Chinese Film Theory*. vol. 1. Beijing: Culture and Arts Press, 1992.

Yan, Jingjuan. *Literary Canons Controversy in America*. Beijing: Social Science Literature Press, 2010.

Zhu, Guangqian. *Poetics*. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1984.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* and Its Ethical Values in South Korea

Eunbong Lee & Younghoon Kim

Abstract: After the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression broke out, the Japanese historical novelist Yoshikawa Eiji visited China several times as a member of the civil affairs unit attached to the Imperial Japanese Army. Upon his return, Yoshikawa serialized his version of the fourteenth century Chinese novel *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* in *Trade News from Home and Abroad*. His *Three Kingdoms* was almost simultaneously serialized in *Kyungsung Daily News* in Korea and became a huge success among Korean readers. More than faithfully translating the original, Yoshikawa incorporated the Confucian value of loyalty along with the colonial ethic of patriotism to the Japanese empire while retelling this Chinese classic in a modern style. When placed in its historical context, Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* could be read as an ethical text of the warmongering state. Despite its colonial origin, Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* was very popular in South Korea until the 1980s. Park's dictatorship inadvertently provided a timely nurturing backdrop for Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms.* In particular, the ethical values manifested in his novel, such as loyalty, self-sacrifice, and patriotism, were embraced and nurtured by Park Chung-hee's military regime. Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* is certainly not as widely read in Korea anymore. However, its long-lasting popularity in the twentieth century reminds us that the militaristic code of ethics is deeply rooted in Korean culture and society.
Keywords: Yoshikawa Eiji; *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*; Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression; ethics; Park Chung-hee

Authors: Eunbong Lee teaches Korean literature and Chinese classics at Incheon National University (South Korea). He is interested in Ethical Literary Criticism and modern Korean literature (Email: bong71@hanmail.net); **Younghoon Kim** is Assistant Professor in the Department of English Language and Literature at Dongguk University Gyeongju Campus (South Korea). His research interests are in modernity, globalization, and popular culture. He teaches popular literature and culture courses as well as conducts translation workshops (Email: saha.bluebook@gmail.com).

标题：吉川英治《三国志》在韩国的伦理价值

内容摘要：日本侵华战争爆发后，日本历史小说家、军属文员吉川英治访问了中国。归国后，他翻译并在日本报纸上连载了14世纪的中国小说《三国演义》。这部小说同时也在当时的韩国《京城日报》上连载，在朝鲜战争之后的韩国读者中十分受欢迎。吉川英治并非忠实、完整地翻译了《三国演义》，而是以现代方式对中国古典进行了"二次创作"，借此鼓吹自己的爱国之心，同时植入儒家哲学中的"忠"、"义"、"名誉"等价值观。纵观历史脉络，可将吉川英治的《三国志》看作战时体制下的伦理文献。即便如此，在20世纪80年代，这部小说在有被殖民经历的韩国仍旧颇具人气，这是因为吉川英治的《三国志》为维持当时朴正熙的独裁政权提供了多样的理念支持。尤其是这部作品所展现出的"忠诚"、"自我牺牲"、"爱国心"等价值观，成为了朴正熙维持军事政权的重要支撑。如今吉川英治的这部《三国志》并不像朴正熙独裁期间被广泛阅读，但它在20世纪时的长久人气使军国主义伦理纲领在韩国文化中根深蒂固。

关键词：吉川英治；《三国志》；日本侵华战争；伦理；朴正熙

作者简介：李殷奉，任教于韩国仁川大学，教授写作课程和汉字课程，研究文学伦理学批评和韩国古典文学；金永勋，韩国东国大学（庆州）英文学科助理教授，研究现代性、世界化和大众文学，在所教授的翻译学课程中融入了大众文学和文化教学。

Introduction: *Three Kingdoms* and Its Popularity in Korea

The fourteenth century Chinese historical novel *Romance of the Three Kingdoms* began to be widely read in Chosŏn Korea during the reign of King Sŏnjo (1567-1608). Diverse classes of people, from the King to the commoners, read and enjoyed it greatly. After the Japanese invasions of Korea (1592-98), vernacular Korean editions of *Three Kingdoms* became so popular that many Koreans, regardless of gender and age, could recite admired quotes from the novel from memory. For ordinary readers, *Three Kingdoms* might merely be an entertaining and pleasing literary work. However, its popularity might have been a product of political situations. For example, the Imjin War (1592-98) provided a momentum to the spread of *Three Kingdoms* in Chosŏn, as military officers from Ming China established and left behind many Guan Yu shrines. The worship of Guan Yu was alien to Chosŏn people. However, when commoners found Guan Yu to be a god of wealth, worshipping him as a folk deity became a popular practice. In addition, the kings of late Chosŏn promoted Guan Yu shrines in an attempt to strengthen their royal authority, which eventually contributed to *Three Kingdoms*' popularity. The

Manchu-led Qing invasion in 1636 left a deep psychological scar which the late Chosŏn society struggled to overcome. Grand Prince Bongmin, sent to Qing as a hostage, later became King Hyojong (1619-59) and insisted on taking revenge.

Loyal to the Ming Dynasty of the Han people, he was an avid reader of *Three Kingdoms*—one should be reminded that in the novel Shu Han is considered the legitimate successor of the Han Dynasty. The King's anti-Qing sentiment together with his patronage legitimatized the ethical implications of *Three Kingdoms*, such as the state ideology and Confucian values of loyalty and filial piety. With commercial publishing becoming more prevalent during the late Chosŏn period, Koreans also made their own versions of *Three Kingdoms* by adapting individual popular episodes or adding new episodes to the story. The most well-known examples are the "Seoul woodblock edition of *Three Kingdoms*, book 3" (which portrays Zhao Zilong as the protagonist) and the "Chŏnju woodblock edition of *Three Kingdoms*, book 2" (which features the ugly wife of Zhuge Liang as the protagonist). These kinds of rewritings gained lasting popularity and were in circulation until the early twentieth century.

In the early twentieth century, different versions of *Three Kingdoms* were available to the Korean public. It is a wonder that about 350 known versions have survived to this day, The way people consumed and understood *Three Kingdoms* in the early twentieth century varied greatly. Some enjoyed it in old movable-type editions passed on by previous generations, while others visited a local market to find a *pansori* [musical storytelling] singer of *Song of Red Cliffs*. But for modern educated Koreans it became customary to read *Three Kingdoms* in its serialized versions in newspapers. With serialized fiction surging in popularity during the Japanese colonial rule (1910-45), *Three Kingdoms* was serialized in multiple newspapers. The most popular version was the one written by Japanese historical novelist Yoshikawa Eiji. Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* was serialized in Japan's *Trade News from Home and Abroad* and almost simultaneously in *Kyungsung Daily News* (the official bulletin of the Government General of Korea) from September 20, 1939, to September 14, 1943. In spite of many available Korean versions of *Three Kingdoms* in the modern era, Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* was widely read and reproduced by Koreans even after the nation's independence from Japan.

The first complete Korean translation of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* by Sŏ In'guk's was published in 1952. Since then, about seventy-seven different versions of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* have been produced in Korea (Inha 4). As is well known, Yoshikawa Eiji retold the story in his own fashion, reflecting the wartime culture of the era in which it was written. Despite its colonial origin, until the late

1980s, many Koreans regarded Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* as the most authentic text, without actually knowing the author's name and understanding the revisions made by him. Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* was often abridged and adapted depending upon the target audience or for commercial purposes. In particular, the majority of Korean animated and manga versions of *Three Kingdoms* were based, in varying degrees, on Yoshikawa's retelling. Most Korean translators did not reveal that they referred to Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms*, and they probably did not even feel the need to do so, which is not surprising, given that Korea did not join the Universal Copyright Convention until 1987. The popularity of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* in Korea lasted for more than three decades. It was the most widely read version of *Three Kingdoms* in Korea until the Korean novelist Yi Mun-yol published his best-selling adaptation in 1988.

As the first modern adaptation for Korean readers, the popularity of Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* is not solely attributed to its modern style. While contextualizing Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* in its historical and cultural background, this paper argues that the ethical code in Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* strongly echoed Park Chung-hee's military regime. As John Lie points out "the conventional Chosŏn-Confucian attitude had slighted the military, but the Park regime exalted it. The military came to serve as something of a finishing school for South Korean masculinity" (79). Masculinity is constructed in the network of social and hierarchical power; in loyally serving the state, a man honors his parents, and proves his masculinity. Loyalty and filial piety are two fundamental ethical values in East Asian countries. Many absolute monarchies in East Asia promoted these core values to enhance their governance over people. Park's dictatorial government greatly emphasized loyalty over filial piety not only for political stability but also for military service and economic development. In addition, Park's regime was always in preparation for war against North Korea and communism. Given all of the above, it is no wonder that Yoshikawa's jingoistic rewriting of *Three Kingdoms* could reverberate favorably with Korean readers for such a long time.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* and Modern Korean Readers

In the late Chosŏn Dynasty, *Three Kingdoms* was translated and distributed through various media, most of which were based on the Mao Zonggang edition. After Korea's independence from Japan, Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* remained arguably the most popular version for more than three decades. It was (re)translated, abridged, adapted, and reinterpreted for various audiences. During the time in which Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* was being serialized in *Kyungsung Daily News*,

Han Yong-un, a Buddhist poet and religious leader, also serialized *Three Kingdoms* in *Chosŏn Daily News*, from November 1, 1939, to August 10, 1940. Han was at the forefront of Korea's independence movement, being one of the thirty-three national representatives of the March First Movement in 1919. *Chosŏn Daily News* was the national gazette of the Korean people when most of the press came under complete control of the Japanese colonial government that had just put forward the slogan, "Japan and Korea are one entity." Regardless of his high reputation as a national leader, Han's translation never enjoyed a wide readership in Korea.

Among many reasons for the success of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms*, the primary one might be its readability. Here, readability means the quality of being legible when difficult classical Chinese–style sentences are rewritten in easy-to-understand words. In a way, modern Korean readers with a certain level of modern education could no longer bear to read the Mao Zonggang edition. The newly established modern education system, which became popular among Koreans in the 1920s, and the breakdown of the traditional social classes, nurtured a new generation of readers with a different sensibility. In particular, their experience of modern western literature changed their expectations from the way in which a story is told, or a series of events are portrayed. In *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*, Karatani Kōjin argues:

> In premodern Japanese painting, somehow there is a deficiency in the "sense of depth." In other words, it lacks perspective. Perspective is not originally natural, though it appears to be natural because we have already become used to images with perspective…. The same can be said about literature—feeling "depth" is not due to reality, perception, or consciousness, but is due to the assemblage of perspective in modern literature. Because we do not realize the fact that modern literature's assemblage underwent transformations, we come to see perspective as a deepening of "life" or the "inside." Premodern literature's lack of depth does not mean that the authors in the past were not aware of depth. It simply reveals that they did not own the assemblage that makes readers feel "depth." (181)

Faithful to the original in terms of narrative construction, Han Yong-un successfully translated (and paraphrased) the difficult Chinese expressions in the Mao Zonggang edition. Nevertheless, in Han's *Three Kingdoms*, the continuity of time and space is hard to trace, even within a single chapter; one episode is often followed by another completely different one. The focus of the narrative switches suddenly with the use

of too many connecting words, such as *ch'asŏl* [besides] or *kaksŏl* [without further ado]—both of which signal a narrative change in Korean. All these problems add to the reader's confusion, or significantly reduce its readability for modern Koreans. No matter how well the battle scenes are described in Han's translation, readers would find the overall narrative hard to follow or concentrate upon. As Karatani Kōjin argues, premodern versions lack the "sense of depth" or "perspective" that are naturally granted in modern Western novels (181). Contemporary Western novelists, such as James Joyce and Marcel Proust, already challenged the rules of perspective with multiple perspectives: "the two most innovative novelists of the period transformed the stage of modern literature from a series of fixed settings in a homogeneous space into a multitude of qualitatively different spaces" (Kern 149). However, such modernist innovation was neither expected nor sought after yet by Korean readers and writers. For them, the primary concern was the realistic principle of narrative, or narrative realism.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* was written and meant to be read with perspective. As Stephen Kern argues in *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*, "T[t]he depiction of space in painting reflects the values and fundamental conceptual categories of a culture" (140). Paintings based on perspective create the illusion that one can enter into them. Such illusions can be impaired if the perspective is unstable. The rules of perspective have governed the Western world for more than four hundred years. For the modern reader, the Mao Zonggang edition was a painting without perspective. As if he was able to perceive this sensibility, Yoshikawa Eiji wrote in his preface to *Three Kingdoms*, "I[i]nstead of creating a simplified translation or an abridgment, I attempted to write it in the form of the newspaper novel that is suitable for a long narrative" (vol.1 4). Yoshikawa was very conscious of his modern medium. Unlike HanYong-un, he subdivided the chapters, and restructured the order of events to improve the novel's realism as well as enhance the reader's understanding and make reading pleasurable.

In this modern rendition, all the narrative events unfold with a focus on the principal characters. And through the use of the third-person omniscient viewpoint, the narrative bends itself around the characters and eventually merges with them. For example, the Mao Zonggang edition presents the Yellow Scarves as follows: "At last, people under the sky began to harbor rebellious thoughts, and thieves arose like swarms of bees. At this time in Julu Commandery, three brothers lived: the oldest was named Zhang Jue, the second Zhang Bao, and the youngest Zhang Liang" (2). This narration reads like a history book rather than a novel. In Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms*, the same scene is reconstructed in the form of a dialogue between two

characters. Ma Yuanyi, a member of the Yellow Scarves, captures Liu Bei and persuades him to join his gang:

> With the intent of inciting the hearts of the young men who are eager to achieve glory and honor, Ma Yuanyi began to explain at length the prospects of the times.
>
> "Men with narrow vision think that we are overly tormenting the commoners, but there is a considerable number of areas where people worship our great general-in-chief, Zhang Jue, as a god."
>
> After setting this forth as his premise, he first explained the origin of the Yellow Scarves. "About ten years before this time, there was an unknown scholar named Zhang Jue, who was a man from Julu Commandery." (vol.1 37-8)

Korean readers of the 1930s relentlessly criticized stereotypical characters, supernatural episodes, and moral teachings in fictional stories (Kwŏn 206). For them, modern novels had to be true to life in their depiction of an individual, mind, and action. Yoshikawa's characters share with us their ways of thinking and speaking. The narrative provides the perspective of the characters. Accordingly, this allows readers to identify with the characters and get involved in the reading process. Eventually, it creates the illusion for the readers that they are in the novel with the legendary characters.

Another reason for the popularity of Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* lies in the way it caters to the secular interests of the common readers. Yoshikawa invented the episodes of romance and adventure to please modern readers. One of the most representative examples is Liu Bei's romance with Hong Furong at the beginning of the novel:

> Before long, the beauty, the niece of Liu Hui, stood prettily beneath the moon. In the vicinity, there were no shadows of trees—only the night dew glistened like scattered jewels on the broad expanse of grass. Just then, another figure suddenly appeared on the pear blossom path. It was a young man who had been hiding among the blossoms.
>
> "Oh, Xuande (Liu Bei)."
> "Miss Furong."
> Both of them looked at the other's face, and they smiled together. Furong's white teeth were truly beautiful.

The two approached one another.

"So, you were able to come out here?"

Xuande said, "Yes."

Furong trembled as she bowed her head. (Yoshikawa, vol. 1 263)

This romantic episode cannot be found in any previous versions of *Three Kingdoms*. Such episodes made Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* more popular, while not interrupting the main narrative of *Three Kingdoms.*

Incidentally, Yoshikawa Eiji also removed superfluous or mysterious episodes, and provided his own explanations to maintain the logic of the narrative. At the Battle of Red Cliffs, also known as the Battle of Chibi, Zhuge Liang assures Zhou Yu that he will make the southeast wind blow. The Mao Zonggang edition does not provide any reasonable explanation for this, apart from the following mysterious comment: "For the disease, it is good to remove the wind. But now since the wind would cure the disease, three days of wind are better than seven-year-old mugwort" (1995 401). In order to rationalize Zhuge Liang's supernatural power, Yoshikawa added the following explanation:

But this was something that Zhuge Liang (Kongming) alone was confident about in his heart. During winter of each year, in December, due to the relationship between the tide and the southern temperatures, the south wind blows irregularly, and so people forget, for one or two days, that it is winter. This anomaly was called the trade winds in astronomical terms by later generations. However, this year, the trade winds had not yet arrived. Zhuge Liang had lived for a long time in Longzhong, and he paid careful attention to the weather each year. There had not yet been one year without the trade winds. Therefore, he was confident that, in a short while, this phenomenon would definitely occur as well. (vol.5 254)

The enlightened modern reader detested unrealistic stories that could be reasonably explained. Yoshikawa's explanation demystified the mysteriousness inherent in the premodern *Three Kingdoms*, and, in doing so, it heightened the reader's level of engagement with the story.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* and Wartime Ethics

Three Kingdoms illustrates important ethical values through numerous acts of bravery, cowardice, treachery, honor, and loyalty. In "Towards an Ethical Literary

Criticism" Nie Zhenzhao claims that "literature is fundamentally an expression of ethic" (85). Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms*, born in the era of the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression, strongly furthers the wartime ethics of the Japanese Empire through its portrayal of the main characters. Japan had presented its "theory of East Asian order" as soon as the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression (1937) broke out, and it constructed a system of general mobilization for itself and its colonial societies, such as Korea and Taiwan. As a part of these efforts, the Order for the General Mobilization of Citizen's Minds was issued. Japanese bookstores began to sell books printed to further this agenda. Chinese classics, such as *Journey to the West*, *Water Margin*, and *Three Kingdoms*, were used as a means to promote interest in China while also instilling war awareness. Upon the outbreak of the War, Yoshikawa Eiji followed soldiers into the field in North China as a special correspondent for Japan's *Daily News*. The following year, he received an order from Japan's Cabinet Intelligence Agency to visit China several times as a member of the civil affairs unit attached to the army. His war experiences permeated into his version of the *Three Kingdoms*.

In rewriting *Three Kingdoms*, the portrayal of Cao Cao is a controversial issue because it can greatly change the reader's understanding of the story. In his translation, Han Yong-un supported the Shu-Han dynasty since it continued the legitimate Han dynasty founded by the honorable Liu Bei. For colonial Korean readers, Han's sympathy towards Shu-Han was seen as an attempt to advance nationalism, as Cao Cao (who seized control of the country by manipulating the young emperor of the Han Dynasty) became a symbol of Japanese imperialism. For the subjugated people of the colony, Liu Bei was more than a legitimate heir to the dynasty. He was a virtuous and righteous hero who would save the nation from the grip of the cruel and merciless tyrant, Cao Cao. In this sense, Han Yong-un's *Three Kingdoms* not only brought comfort to oppressed Koreans but also contributed to instilling a national consciousness. However, unlike Han, Yoshikawa subtly rewrote the novel to present a more favorable depiction of Cao Cao. In his version, Cao Cao is not just a villain but as a magnificent anti-hero. For Yoshikawa, Cao Cao was not only an enlightened ruler with great scholarly interests, but a true leader who had to make difficult decisions during wartime. The positive depiction justified Cao Cao's usurping of the throne as a necessary act in a chaotic era. And if one contextualized Yoshikawa's portrayal of Cao Cao in the context of the War, his writing grants a strong sense of moral legitimacy to Japan's invasive war against China.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* has many commentaries that inspire and justify Japan's expansionist ambitions. In many places in the novel, he encouraged

Japanese or colonized Koreans under the wartime system to participate in the war by promoting interest in China:

> Our ancestors used to say, if you do not cry after reading this memorial for war, you are not a man. He [Zhuge Liang] was definitely an Asian…. I hope this book can be of any help for readers to have better understanding and interest in the Chinese people, suffering from war and political conflicts that are all rooted in the same origin. (Yoshikawa, vol.7 101)

More importantly, Yoshikawa created episodes that instill a sense of loyalty and patriotism. His version begins with a now famous tea episode. Liu Bei brings home a rare tea as a gift for his mother with the money he earns by selling straw shoes and mats. On his way home, he is attacked by the Yellow Scarves gang and is robbed of the tea and a treasured sword that has been passed down in his family for generations. However, with the help of Zhang Fei, Liu Bei is able to recover the stolen tea and sword. As a token of his gratitude, Liu Bei gives the sword to Zhang Fei and returns home. Liu Bei's mother is happy to receive the tea but becomes furious upon learning that Liu Bei has given the sword to Zhang Fei. She then throws the tea into the river and scolds Liu Bei:

> Have you already forgotten, Bei? Your father and grandfather made straw shoes and wove mats like you and ended their lives in vain while hiding among the native commoners. But if we trace back to your earlier ancestors, we have the very blood of Liu Sheng, Prince Jing of Zhongshan of the Han Dynasty. Beyond any doubt, you are the great-great-grandson of Emperor Jing. The blood of emperors and kings who once unified this China is flowing through your veins. The sword can serve as a fine proof of this. (89)

Here, the tea is a symbol of filial piety. Liu Bei risks his life to recover it for his mother. However, his mother, without considering the circumstances, throws it into the river and then tells him the history of the sword, a symbol of loyalty, and emphasizes that the blood of the emperor who unified China flows through his veins. Due to this event, Liu Bei realizes the future course of his life, and commits himself to rectifying a chaotic world.

The values of loyalty and patriotism run through Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms*. Another example is Yoshikawa's depiction of Diaochan. In previous versions of *Three Kingdoms*, Diaochan is usually described as a somewhat contradictory

character; on the one hand, she is a patriot who contributes to the killing of Dong Zhuo; on the other hand, she is a weak and selfish woman who tries to prevent Lü Bu from going to war after she becomes his concubine. Her resentment toward the Han royal family makes readers uncomfortable, and her eventual disappearance in the middle of the story raises unwelcome curiosity. In contrast, the Diaochan in Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* is a loyal war heroine. After Dong Zhuo dies, she moves to Chang'an with Lü Bu, and tragically commits suicide in a small pavilion in Lü Bu's house. In this scene, Yoshikawa added a monologue of Diaochan:

> They say that a woman's skin is delicate,
> But if she holds a sword instead of a mirror,
> The sword gives her a strong sense of justice.
> I thus willingly enter the briar patch.
> To repay the graces of my parents and forebears
> And to say that this is also done for the country,
> I set aside my musical instruments, and in my dancing hand I hide a dagger as I approach the king of the beasts.
> At last I present the cups of poison and drink to the left and right until the last cup makes me fall to the ground.
> I hear—even now in this dying ear—
> The joy of peace being sung by the people of Chang'an,
> The beautiful sound of a heavenly bird calling me. (Yoshikawa, vol.2 137-38)

This poem reveals Diaochan's ethical decision-making for the sake of her country. After passing through various upheavals, she finally makes the right decision. Her sacrifice embodies her loyalty for her country. For readers living in a wartime country, Diaochan could easily be an ethical role model to follow for the sake of the country.

While presenting the ethical conflicts between good and evil, Yoshikawa Eiji's version also inspired anti-communism, or hostility toward the Communist Party of China. Professor Sŏ Kyŏngsik, a second-generation Korean Japanese, confessed that in his reading of Yoshikawa's version he found the following implications:

> Due to the threat of Liu Bei's military forces, Liu Zhang of Shu faces a crisis over the existence of his state. He requests assistance from Zhang Lu of Hanzhong. Yoshikawa Eiji portrays this passage with expressions such as

"imploring the aggressionist state [Hanzhong] based on dangerous ideology…"
However, though I do not know how, it occurred to me after I became a
university student that these expressions felt odd compared to the dignified
writing style that runs like water through Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms.*
Of course, those expressions imply that Hanzhong is a country devoted to the
heretical teachings of the Way of the Five Pecks of Rice, and to Zhang Luis, the
leader of this sect. However, Japan was falling into an inescapable quagmire
from the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression to
the Pacific War, and if one examines those expressions in the context of the
period, it can be said that Yoshikawa Eiji had the "Soviet alliance" in mind.
If one begins to read Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* in this way, the entirety
of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* would naturally interlock with its historical
background. (96)

The "Soviet alliance" that Sŏ Kyŏngsik refers to is to the Chinese Soviet Republic
established in the Jiangxi area in 1931. The Chinese Soviet Republic expanded at
a rapid pace until 1934. However, as the Chinese Nationalist Party (also known
as the Kuomintang) launched a full-scale assault on the Communist Party, the
Red Army of the Communist Party of China was forced to take one of the longest
marches in the history of warfare, during which Mao Zedong emerged as the leader
of the party. As soon as the Japanese army's invasion of China became imminent,
anti-Japanese sentiment spread throughout China. In 1935, the Communist Party
presented its August 1 Declaration calling upon the people to resist Japan, and
proposed cooperation with the Chinese Nationalist Party. In declining this call for
collaboration, Chiang Kai-shek of the Chinese Nationalist Party showed himself
to be more dedicated toward the anticommunist civil war than on the Japanese
army invading China's northern region. This led to the Xi'an Incident of 1936;
Chiang was under house arrest by his subordinate generals Zhang Xueliang and
Yang Hucheng. After two weeks of negotiation, Chiang Kai-shek agreed to a
collaboration between the Chinese Nationalist Party and the Communist Party to
repel the Japanese invasion. And Mao Zedong's Red Army was reorganized into the
Eighth Route Army of the National Revolutionary Army within the structure of the
Chinese military forces headed by the Chinese Nationalist Party. Thus, the Second
United Front (1937-41) was formally established in 1937.

In light of these historical circumstances, Zhang Lu could easily be compared
to the Communist Party, and Liu Zhang to Chiang Kai-shek. Yoshikawa Eiji
spontaneously criticized Liu Zhang's idea to request assistance from Hanzhong's

Zhang Lu: "Just as one cannot substitute one's belly with one's back, if one cries out in appeal and requests assistance from a country that aims at a dangerous and ideological invasion, this comes from the worst-case policy of a distressed mind" (vol.6 233). People who read these remarks would not have missed the insinuation that the Chinese Nationalist Party joined hands with the Communist Party to fight against Japan.

Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* and Park Chung-hee's Military Regime

As discussed earlier, Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* reflects the warmongering culture that flourished during the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression. Under the rule of Japan, Korea was transformed into a barracks society. Japan's general mobilization, which aimed to reorganize the home front, forced Korean civilians to fully participate war preparations. The social system, culture, and economy of Korea had to undergo a radical military reorganization. Military culture, the organizational culture pertaining to the army during the wartime period, permeated everyday life to the degree it became a way of understanding the history and culture of Korean society. The influence of the colonial period persisted long after Korea's independence, because of the Korean War (1950-53) and subsequent Park Chunghee's military regime.

In Korea, the military culture, emphasizing loyalty, obedience, self-sacrifice, and patriotism, was greatly strengthened by anti-communism. As Shin pointed out, "South Korea has been in a paranoid condition because it has had to define the nation as an anticommunist country. Ferocious 'Red Hunting' has demonized the communist North, whilst also threatening South Koreans" (367). After the Korean War, three army generals served as presidents of Korea. Two of them came to power after a military coup. It is well known that former president Park Chung-hee was a commissioned officer of the Imperial Army of Manchukuo. In 1965, he signed the controversial treaty that normalized Korean relations with Japan. Park Chung-hee heavily relied on nationalism and anti-communism to justify his dictatorship and to hide his turncoat career. The Park Chung-hee government endeavored to build up strong armed forces to fight against North Korea. More importantly, it created its own unique version of the general mobilization, often dubbed as the New Community Movement. Given that Korea was bound by such a political landscape and history, it is no wonder the Korean Cold War culture tends to be jingoistic and authoritarian. In his retelling of *Three Kingdoms*, Yoshikawa Eiji emphasized loyalty, patriotism, and self-sacrifice. These values were also heavily promoted by Park's government for the nation's spiritual armament. In particular, the importance

of loyalty cannot be overstated. Along with repression, loyalty is an important instrument to produce power for a dictatorship. In the middle of the 1960s, the Park Chung-hee government launched a number of consecration programs for the famed Admiral Yi Sun-sin (1545-98) of the Chosŏn Dynasty, also known as the Lord of Loyalty and Chivalry.[1] His regime transformed Yi Sun-sin's shrine, Hyeonchungsa, into a national holy ground which government officials, military and naval officers, and students were required visit to show their respect. They also built Yi Sun-sin's statues and monuments all over the country. Among them, the most well-known is the one located at the Sejongno, Gwanghwamun plaza in Seoul, erected in 1968.

This seventeen-meter statue in the heart of Seoul symbolizes the military nature of the Park Chung-hee government well. The Korean historian Shin Chae-ho serialized his Yi Sun-sin biography in the *Daehan Maeil Sinbo* in 1908. Admiral Yi Sun-sin was already a well-known historic figure in the early twentieth-century Korea. He was a national hero embodying the ideal form of the nation, and President Park appropriated this iconic name in a number of ways. He emphasized the admiral's farsightedness that predicted Japan's invasions, arguing that Korea needed such sagacious talent for economic development. Yi Sun-sin was also a perfect example that the nation had to emulate in its fight against North Korea.

Park regime's military culture can be found in the realm of education as well. President Park Jung-hee announced the South Korean Charter of National Education in 1968. This charter described the duties and responsibilities of every Korean student as follows:

> We were born into this land charged with the historic mission to revitalize our nation. This is our moment to establish a self-reliant posture at home and contribute to the common prosperity of mankind globally by rekindling the illustrious spirit of our forefathers… Realizing that a nation grows through creativity and cooperation and that individual growth is grounded in the prosperity of the nation, we shall do our best to fulfill the responsibility and duty attendant upon our freedom and rights, and to raise the national consciousness to participate and serve in building our nation. The love of country and fellow countrymen, together with the spirit of democracy that resists communism, paves the way for our survival, and lays the ground for

---

1   For more details about the Park Chung-hee government's cultural policy on traditional cultural heritage, see Jeon, Jae Ho, "The Making of National Defense Heroes and Government Policy Towards Traditional Cultural Heritage during the Park Chung-hee Regime." *Critical Review of History*, vol. 5 (2012): 113-140.

realizing the ideals of the free world.[1]

The Charter was taken very seriously in Korean society. Students were forced to memorize it, and were often physically punished if they failed to answer correctly. As John P. Synott noted: "For a quarter of a century, the National Charter has embodied the central values of Korean education, and its text has been recited extensively and embedded in the memory of every child who has passed through a Korean school at any level" (35). The ways this Charter was put into practice in schools was shadowed by the Imperial Rescript on Education signed by Emperor Meiji of Japan in 1890, and a series of the Chosŏn educational ordinances released from 1911 to 1943. Despite its colonial nature, the Charter greatly affected Korean education: "Students were taught to place more value on the authority of the country than on individual rights" (Choi 175). Along with military drill education mandated in high schools and universities in 1969, the Charter relentlessly encouraged the Koreans to serve the nation-state. In doing so, it instilled the nation with an ideology justifying the dictatorship under the guise of loyalty to the state (Oh 208).

The Charter remained a crucial instrument for educational policies and philosophies until the early 1990s. It exemplified how Korean governments used education and the school system to mobilize the nation in its program of national militarization and economic modernization. During Park Chung-hee's reign between 1961 and 1979, twenty-five versions of Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* were published and widely circulated. Most Korean males encountered at least a version of Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms*. They joined the military, were discharged from their service, and then participated in President Park's projects of modern nation-building. The military culture of Imperial Japan is one of the most enduringly haunting aspects of the past, which flourished in Park's regime. Given these historical circumstances, it is not surprising to see that Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* thrived in Korean society for so long.

Conclusion: Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* and Its Disquieting Legacy in Korea

Three Kingdoms is embedded in Korea's day-to-day life. This is a country captivated by the story of legendary war heroes. All generations, from children to adults, enjoy *Three Kingdoms* through various media such as comics, games, novels, and movies. Even Koreans who have never read the work are familiar with the main characters, such as Liu Bei, Guan Yu, Zhang Fei, and Zhuge Liang. Until the late 1980s, many Koreans regarded Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms* as the most authentic version

---

1   Translation of the Charter was provided by the Park Chung Hee Presidential Museum.

of the text. For what reasons did Koreans become so engrossed in this Japanese rendition of *Three Kingdoms*? This paper highlights that Yoshikawa Eiji's version was the first modern retelling of this Chinese classic for modern Korean readers. More importantly, it strongly reflected the warmongering culture and values of Imperial Japan. Despite its colonial roots, Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* became a beloved classic for Koreans in the post-colonial period. In so many ways, Korea is still tied to its colonial past. Revisiting Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* to excavate its historical and cultural backgrounds ranging from the Chinese People's War of Resistance against Japanese Aggression to the Park Chung-hee regime unveils that a set of ethical values, such as loyalty, self-sacrifice, and patriotism, is deeply rooted in Korean culture and society. After Park Chung-hee's death, Korea witnessed a number of regime changes that often sparked a tectonic shift in culture and society, not to mention politics and the economy. However, despite all of these radical changes, the military culture of Korean society, dating back to the colonial era, has never disappeared from Korean history. In retrospect, these interpretations seem reductionistic to some extent. But, on the other hand, they reveal that we are often blind to the root causes of conservative Korean culture by fixating on the symptoms and constantly reacting to the latest outrage, and thus fail to correctly diagnose it.

Nowadays, many modern versions of *Three Kingdoms*, that not only have enhanced readability but also great entertainment value, are available to Koreans. Yoshikawa's *Three Kingdoms* is certainly not as widely read in Korea anymore. However, there is no doubt about the unfaltering influence of *Three Kingdoms* in Korea. Since 1988, Yi Mun-yol's *Three Kingdoms* alone has sold more than twenty-eight million copies. Yi's success inspired other famous Korean writers, such as novelists Hwang Sok-yong, Jang Jung-il, and Kim Hong-shin (to name a few), to translate and rewrite *Three Kingdoms*. And not surprisingly, their versions also became best-selling books of their era. *Three Kingdoms* connects generations across the country, while imbuing a strong ethical bond. While revisiting Yoshikawa Eiji's *Three Kingdoms*, one cannot but wonder at the ethical values of *Three Kingdoms* in a postmodern democratic society, in which individuals are more capable of shaping their own identities outside the boundaries prescribed for them by the state.

Works Cited

Choi, Jungsoon. "Educating Citizens in a Multicultural Society: The Case of South Korea." *The Social Studies* 101.4 (2010): 174-178.

Inha Taehakkyo Han'gukhak Yŏn'guso Kich'o Hangmun Yŏn'gudan [Inha University Center for Korean Studies]. *Samgukchi Han'gugŏ yŏkpon haeje* [*Annotated Bibliography of Versions of*

Three Kingdoms Translated into Korean]. Inch'ŏn: Tain At'ŭ, 2005.

Jeon, Jae Ho. "The Making of National Defense Heroes and Government Policy Towards Traditional Cultural Heritage during the Park Chung-hee Regime." *Critical Review of History* 5 (2012): 113-140.

Karatani, Kojin. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Trans. Brett de Bary. Durham: Duke UP, 1993.

Kern, Stephen. *The Culture of Time and Space 1880-1918*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1983.

Kwŏn, Bodŭrae. *Han'guk kŭndae sosŏl ŭi kiwŏn* [*The Origin of Korean Modern Novels*] Seoul: Somyŏng, 2002.

Lie, Joh. *K-Pop: Popular Music, Cultural Amnesia, and Economic Innovation in South Korea*. Oakland: U of California P, 2015.

Mao, Zonggang. *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms*. Hong Kong: Zhonghuashuju, 1995.

Nie, Zhenzhao. "Towards an Ethical Literary Criticism." *Arcadia* 50.1 (2015): 83-101.

Oh, He-Yeon. "Pyŏngyŏngsahoewa Kunsajuŭi Munhwa" [Barrack Society and Military Culture]. *Han'guk'yŏndaesaenghwalmunhwasa 1960Nyŏndae* [*History of Contemporary Korean Life and Culture*]. Paju: Changbi, 2016. 191-212.

Shin, Ji-Young. "The Construction of National Identity in South Korea and the Tradition of Masculinity in Korean Abstract Painting." *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies* 8.3 (2007): 367-389.

Sŏ, Kyŏngsik. *Sonyŏn ŭi nunmul* [*A Lad's Tears*]. Translated by Yi Mok P'aju. Tolbegae, 2004.

Synott, John P. "The German Origins of the South Korean National Charter of Education." *Journal of East and West Studies: Perspectives on East Asian Economics and Industries* 24.1 (1995): 35-47.

Yoshikawa, Eiji. *The Romance of the Three Kingdoms*. Vol.1-7. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1989.

The Ethics of Memory: Self-Reconstruction and Character Narration in *The Sense of an Ending*

Tang Yili

Abstract: In *The Sense of an Ending*, Julian Barnes explores self-reconstruction and its ethical implications in the dynamics of memory by use of character narration. This article examines the narrative rhetoric and ethics of character narration in *The Sense of an Ending* in the broader context of rhetorical theory. It argues that Barnes's experiment with character narration sets up interpretive and ethical traps for readers, encouraging them to initially bond with the unreliable narrator Tony but offering signs of estrangement. The indirect rhetorical mode continues Barnes's ethical and philosophical reflection on memory as well as his humanistic exploration of life and its meaning.

Key words: *The Sense of an Ending*; Julian Barnes; memory; ethics; character narration

Author: Tang Yili, Ph.D. in Literature, is Assistant Professor at Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai 200240, China). Her research interests in scholarship include narrative theory, contemporary Anglo-American fiction and Ethical Literary Criticism(Email: milkytang2008@sjtu.edu.cn).

标题：记忆的伦理：《终结的感觉》中的自我重建与人物叙述

内容摘要：在《终结的感觉》中，当代英国作家朱利安·巴恩斯运用人物叙述的手法呈现了记忆动态运作中的自我重建和伦理意蕴。本文基于修辞性叙事理论，探讨了小说人物叙述中涉及的各种修辞运动和所隐含的伦理意义。巴恩斯的叙事试验为读者设置了阐释以及伦理的陷阱，其行文策略在于由最初对人物叙述者托尼不可靠叙述契约的鼓励转变为对其疏远的暗示。这一叙事模式承载了巴恩斯对记忆的深层伦理和哲学思考，也体现了其深切的人文关怀。

关键词：《终结的感觉》；朱利安·巴恩斯；记忆；伦理；人物叙述

作者简介：汤轶丽，文学博士，上海交通大学长聘教轨助理教授，主要学术研究领域为叙事学、当代英美小说研究与文学伦理学批评。本文系国家社科基金重大招标项目"当代西方伦理批评文献的整理、翻译与研究"【项目编号：19ZDA292】以及浙江省哲学社会科学规划课题一般课题"朱利安·巴恩斯作品的叙事策略和伦理思想研究"【项目编号：21NDQN205YB】阶段性成果。

In an interview with Eleanor Wachtel, the British novelist Julian Barnes claims: "memory is closer to the imagination than it is to recorded newspaper fact" (qtd.in Wachtel). Barnesian readers who are familiar with his oeuvre will easily find that he regards the fallibility of memory as a human faculty. Just as Vanessa Guignery shrewdly notes, "among points of interest in Barnes's production which make it distinctive but also situate it within contemporary trends are his treatment of historiography and biography in fiction (and the blurring of the boundaries between them) and his focus on the fallibility of memory" (Guignery 153). In his memoir, *Nothing to Be Frightened of* (2008), Barnes admits that he and his brother often disagree about the basic facts of their childhood, and that his memories are often faulty when he talks about his own life. When faced with this kind of disagreement, his brother prefers imaginative truth and a coherent self-narrative to historical accuracy. Barnes highlights the fallible, elusive, and manipulative nature of memory in *The Sense of an Ending* (2011), which offers many reflections on the mechanics of memory.

The Sense of an Ending presents us a dual structure. In the first part of the novel, the character narrator Tony Webster, a cautious and divorced man in his 60s, is approaching the end of his relatively unexceptional life. He embarks on a personal journey to reflect on his life from the vantage point of late middle age, where he presents the importance of his adolescence spent with his clique and first girlfriend. For the most part, Tony unfolds his recounting in a linear fashion, moving chronologically and logically. However, Tony is skeptical about his personal memory and reminds readers that he is no longer certain of his narrative and memory. As Barnes notes in the interview, the novel's "first part takes place—unrolls—in the mode of memory, and then the second part, which is where the work starts now, as it were, then unrolls at the pace of life, and it quickens, and it quickens" (qtd.in Wachtel). The shattering "peripeteia" in part two that breaks the pace of part one, accompanies a series of dramatic disclosures wreaking havoc in Tony's perception of his memories, life, and self. The lack of correspondence between his memories and factual evidence reveals Tony's unreliability and culpability. It forces him to recognize his mistakes in the past and to re-evaluate his life by revisiting memories described in the first part. The novel thus transforms the monologic text in Part One into a dialogic text in Part Two. The handful of scattered recollections in the first part seems uneventful; almost none of them are notably important to him. However, the mediocrity of Tony and his youth makes his distorted memory and unreliable narration even more remarkable because it is relatable to anyone.

The crucial argument among critics is the reason behind Tony's fallibility. Critics such as Frederick Holmes, Chen Bo, Liu Zhihuan, and Yang Jincai draw attention to the construction and operation of memory. Holmes adopts a Kermodian perspective on the manipulation of time in the narrative construction, arguing that Tony's inability to truly grasp the nature of time is reflected in his imperfect memory (Holmes 27). To Liu and Yang, Tony's unreliable narration encapsulates the unreliability of the "imitation of forgetting". Tony's memory is distorted because he merely presents his evaluation and interpretation of events, rather than shaping the evidence (Liu and Yang 49-50). Chen argues that Tony's unreliability reveals the cognitive error of memory and hence the inherently constructive nature of memory (Chen 96). Rather than focusing on the mechanics of memory, other critics concentrate on Tony's self-construction. James Ramsey Wallen explains that it is Tony's need to construct his own fictionalized history by adopting a new life narrative while rejecting the old that causes his memory distortion (Wallen 332). Dhananjay Jagannathan states that Tony's unreliability does not stem, or certainly not entirely, from a failure of memory: his real problem is a failure of self-knowledge (Jagannathan 111-112).

Given the reasons for Tony's unreliability, the difference between these arguments lies in the problematic relationship between memory and the self. It should be stressed that neither memory nor identity can be eschewed in the analysis of Tony's unreliability. How, then, is identity constructed in the service of memory? Is there an ethics of memory, a duty of remembrance? How does Tony assume the responsibility of remembrance? To approach these questions, this article probes the techniques and ethics of character narration in *The Sense of an Ending* in the broader context of rhetorical theory. It argues that Barnes's use of character narration succeeds in alternating the distance between the authorial audience and the narrator, encouraging readers to reflect on the mechanics of memory and identity. Rather than being a victim of friendships and romantic relationships, Tony reconstructs himself and thus reconciles with the past in the process of narrating.

Estranging Unreliability and Bonding Unreliability:
A Rhetoric of Character Narration in *The Sense of an Ending*

In *The Sense of an Ending*, Tony plays the dual role of a character participating in the storyworld and a narrator in the discourse. James Phelan refers to this type of narration as character narration, in which an implied author uses a single text to address at least two different audiences (their own and the character narrator's narratee) to accomplish at least two different purposes (their own and the character

narrator's) (Phelan 2005, 1). Like character narration, unreliable narration is also a mode of indirect communication. Put another way, we have one text (*The Sense of an Ending*), two speakers (Tony is explicit, Barnes is implicit), two audiences (Barnes's and Tony's), and at least two purposes (Barnes's and Tony's). Phelan identifies six types of unreliability—misreporting, misreading, misregarding, underreporting, underreading, underregarding (Phelan 2007, 225), each of which may have bonding or estranging effects. In estranging unreliability, the authorial audience feels estranged from the narrator upon realizing that he/she cannot be taken at face value. In bonding unreliability, on the contrary, though the authorial audience reaches the conclusion that the narrator is unreliable, that unreliability actually reduces the distance between the narrator and the audience.

In the first reading of part one, Barnes allows the audience to interpret the text in the tradition of the memoir so that the audience can turn to the pattern of memoir as a map for reading Tony's story, closing the gap between unreliable narrator (Tony) and audience. At the beginning of the novel, the narrator warns the audience about his memory:

> We live in time—it holds us and moulds us—but I've never felt I understood it very well… No, I mean ordinary, everyday time, which clocks and watches assure us passes regularly: tick-tock, click-clock.... I'm not interested in my schooldays, and don't feel any nostalgia for them. But school is where it all began, so I need to return briefly to a few incidents that have grown into anecdotes, to some approximate memories which time has deformed into certainty. If I can't be sure of the actual events any more, I can at least be true to the impressions those facts left. That's the best I can manage. (Barnes 3-4)

The paragraph prefaces Tony's narration with a disclaimer, which from the beginning sets him out as an unreliable narrator. He is aware of the gap between factual events and their reconstruction. The reflection on the nature of time is theorized by Koermode's assertion that time is chaotic and disorganized. However, Tony's recollection attempts to impose order on the chaos of time, even though time which is expected to be fixed turns out to be disordered. The reliability of recollection is more likely foregrounded and told by the narrator himself. In the opening lines, Tony is constructed as an unreliable narrator but who is honest on the summary of his experience and representation of memory. Tony is a reliable reporter of his memory deficits here, but the question of reliability becomes more interesting if we consider his role as the memoirist and narrator. On the one hand, Tony is an

authority on the reporting of his memory deficits, and so as the authorial audiences we have a strong trust in taking his reporting and interpretation as reliable, since Tony is the only one who knows his past. On the other hand, if we perceive Tony as fully reliable, then the implied author (Barnes) will lead us to find some ethical deficiency in Tony's narration. The fiction opens at the point of depicting Tony as a qualified memoirist and a "reliable" narrator.

Even though readers are aware of his unreliable narration pertaining to facts, characters, and events that Tony warned about from the beginning, it seems that his unreliability is innately the nature of memory. In this way, Barnes's central technique of fusing fiction and memoir helps us to understand his unreliability. This technique shows that Barnes is more concerned with the subjective truth or the illusion of truth-telling. This approach to truth has consequences for understanding the narrative distance between the narrator and the authorial audience. Tony's recollection requires readers' cooperation to decipher this connection. Incorporating this type of interactive analysis draws the reader in with unreliable narration, and then feeds on the readers' curiosity. This fusion results in gaining readers' trust and shortening the distance between the narrator and the audience. Barnes's play with the relation between the mimetic and the synthetic components of Tony's role raises an amusing dilemma. For the authorial audience, Tony is as synthetic as any of the elements in Barnes's fiction, and so the distinction between truth and imagination that he makes within that synthetic fiction does not hold. The implied author, however, is inviting his authorial audience to go back to Tony's distorted memory and to search for the truth. Furthermore, we recognize that Barnes seems to license Tony's unreliability in his "memoir writing". Barnes allows himself to appear on the same diegetic level as Tony, transforming himself from the author of the fictional *The Sense of an Ending* to the historian who investigates Tony's life and then writes a book about it. It thus falls upon Barnes's audience to realize that as the creator of the diegetic level, he gives Tony a license to find fault in his "memoir writing". In this regard, it somehow fits Phelan's subtype of estranging/bonding unreliability, the playful comparison between implied author and narrator, in which the former playfully uses unreliable narration to call attention to both similarities and contrasts between himself as teller and the narrator as teller. It can be seen in Tony's narration of two suicides in the workplace.

Upon hearing of their schoolmate Robson's suicide, who hangs himself after having impregnated his girlfriend, Tony and his friends measure Robson's death by philosophical and aesthetic standards:

> After a long analysis of Robson's suicide, we concluded that it could only be considered philosophical in an arithmetical sense of the term: he, being about to cause an increase of one in the human population, had decided it was his ethical duty to keep the planet's numbers constant. But in all other respects we judged that Robson had let us—and serious thinking—down. His actions had been unphilosophical, self-indulgent and inartistic: in other words, wrong. As for his suicide note, which according to rumor (Brown again) read "Sorry, Mum," we felt that it had missed a powerful educative opportunity. (Barnes 15)

Their approach to analyzing Robson's suicide is intellectual rather than emotional. Their limitless intellectual snobbery and emotional standoffishness can be seen in their reaction to Robson's reason for the suicide. They conclude that Robson died in an arithmetical sense. Besides, these schoolboys are jealous of "his making a name for himself with an early death" and getting a girl pregnant, complaining "Why him and not us? Why had none of us even had the experience of *failing* to get a girlfriend?" (Barnes 15-16, italics in original). Apparently, the dispassionate and naïve voice or vision is located in the past. When Tony draws the conclusion on Robson's suicide and his failure, his fallacious value system results in the consideration that respect for another's life is inferior to the youth's envy of fame and sex. Here, Tony is misreading and misregarding. His disregard for respect denies the importance of human sympathy. It seems that the death only serves a higher philosophical or intellectual purpose.

As a self-centered young schoolboy, Tony seems to be unable to properly evaluate the suicide or death. It seems that he is more concerned about the educational value of Robson's note than his death. The emotional effects of the suicide become powerful, as the dismissal reaches its peak in Tony's jealousy of Robson's sexual relationship. The unreliability implies discrepancies between Tony as a narrator and as a character. The narrator seems to be honest in presenting his younger self by using a dispassionate voice without commenting on what he has done from the beginning. Tony tries to convey the essence of the past episode. It's more attentive to perception and understanding of narrating Tony than the impression of narrated one. This contrast is just a small glimpse at why he seems unreliable. The implied author emphasizes another essence of Tony's narration, namely self-reflexivity. Duly cognizant of the fickleness of memory, Tony's modest proclamation of being the narrator reflects the importance of reflection in memoir. Jane Taylor McDonnell emphasizes this: "The reflective voice is so important to memoir writing because self-revelation without reflection or understanding is

merely self-exposure. We want the author of a memoir to have grown up, to have learned from earlier mistakes or experiences, and to be the wiser for it. A writer who merely tells us (or even shows us) how awful life was will quickly lose our interest" (McDonnell 136). Based on the previous impression, Tony is a reflective memoirist who has already shown his reflection on his past and experiences. Therefore, the memoirist's audience will reject the character's words and reconstruct a more satisfactory account. They believe that the memoirist shares the same feelings with them and sees sorrow and loss in Robson's suicide emotionally rather than judging his death intellectually and unsentimentally. The emotional and ethical effects mostly depend on the genre element of memoir. That is, the awareness of reading memoir leads us to read with the tacit knowledge that the naïve, smug, and unkind young Tony has evolved into the sophisticated, honest, and compassionate narrator.

Before the second suicide, Tony and his school friends part ways. The narrative then shifts to the account of his relationship with his first girlfriend, Veronica, during his studying history at Bristol. In Tony's narration, Veronica is depicted as an arrogant and manipulative girl. She seems to belittle her boyfriend intellectually while Tony is more concerned with whether Veronica will sleep with him. We see this dynamic during an unpleasant encounter with her family. Instead of excitement or joy of bringing the boyfriend home, Veronica neglects and leaves Tony behind. He deems himself humiliated by her supercilious father and brother. Only Sarah, Veronica's mother, shows him kindness. Shortly after, they split up. Adrian later writes a letter to Tony asking permission to date Veronica. As far as Tony remembers, he sends a long letter to Adrian as such: "I also advised him to be prudent, because in my opinion Veronica had suffered damage a long way back. Then I wished him good luck, burnt his letter in an empty grate (melodramatic, I agree, but I plead youth as a mitigating circumstance), and decided that the two of them were now out of my life forever" (Barnes 46). It seems to be understandable for Tony to express his anger and hostile feelings. However, he appears to harbor a relatively tolerant attitude toward them. At this point, events become increasingly provocative. We learn that Adrian cuts his wrists, leaving a note about the philosophical decision to choose suicide. Compared with Robson's death, Tony's tone seems more emotional, but he soon restores enough mental balance to analyze Adrian's suicide.

Unlike the mundane explanation of Robson's youthful act, Adrian's suicide is more like a result of philosophical speculation on life:

But my mind kept returning to all those fervently innocent discussions we'd

gone in for when Robson hanged himself in the attic, back before our lives began. It had seemed to us philosophically self-evident that suicide was every free person's right: a logical act when faced with terminal illness or senility; a heroic one when faced with torture or the avoidable deaths of others… None of these categories had applied in the case of Robson's squalidly mediocre action. (Barnes 52)

This time, Tony and his friend draw the conclusion that Adrian only commits suicide for philosophical reasons; at least he has not killed himself for some mundane reason like getting a girl pregnant. Tony exalts Adrian's suicide, viewing it as a logical, heroic, and glamorous act. Unlike Robson's method, Tony perceives Adrian's method acceptably Roman and blames Veronica for failing to save Adrian. On the surface, Tony seems to be deeply touched by Adrian's death. However, his voice is still casual, and his speculation on his friend's death shows that he has no knowledge of the reason behind Adrian's act, and he is innocent in relation to it. He depicts himself as an onlooker and an outsider. Even though his audience will question Tony's conclusion, it probably won't doubt his innocence. In other words, the audience is not sure about Tony's reliability here. However, if the narrator gives an insufficient or wrong interpretation of the reason, it is most likely due to the lack of information about why Adrian ends his life. Tony is aware of the existence of his audience and of his position in the telling. Despite his own defects, partiality and unreliability, his straight confession of unreliable memory and employment of the specific narrative technique basically win audiences' trust.

Tony's narration of the past is full of ambiguities and conflicts when referring to Veronica and her family. For instance, in recounting the relationship with Veronica, Tony proposes his "damage theory". From his letter to Adrian, Tony warns him that Veronica could not be trusted, because in his opinion she had suffered damage a long way back, and then repeatedly stresses that he is not clear himself what he meant by "damage". He mimics Freud's theory of repressed memories, but he fails to figure out who is damaged and what are the consequences. Instead, he even implies that the damage will also result in the repression and distortion of his certain memories, like the sequence of having sex with Veronica and their breakup. In this sense, Tony is an unqualified memoirist, who confuses the audience's judgment of his past and increases the difficulty of decoding his unreliability.

Consequently, an effect of the playful comparison is to align Tony with the implied author along the axis of perception. However, there are some important warning signals against bonding too closely with Tony on the ethical axis. Tony's

evaluation of his memory raises the question of whether he distorts it unconsciously or consciously, and whether this is the result of memory or his own ethical deficiency. That is to say, the implied author uses playful comparison so that an element of the memoir's essence and nature which he allows Tony to present, allows the authorial audience to regard Tony as a reliable interpreter. However, this disposition changes as the narration proceeds to part two of the novel.

In the second part of the novel, the letter destroys our trust with "inadequacies of documentation". It opens with a riddle. Veronica's mother, Sarah, bequeaths Tony with a mysterious letter, including some money and Adrian's diary. When Tony hunts for the diary which Veronica withheld, he and the audience are forced to revisit and re-evaluate his distorted memory. The factual document that serves as the important evidence of Tony's unreliability is a copy of his original letter full of vitriol:

> Dear Adrian—or rather, Dear Adrian and Veronica (hello, Bitch, and welcome to this letter), Well you certainly deserve one another and I wish you much joy. I hope you get so involved that the mutual damage will be permanent. I hope you regret the day I introduced you. And I hope that when you break up, as you inevitably will... that you are left with a lifetime of bitterness that will poison your subsequent relationships. Part of me hopes you'll have a child, because I'm a great believer in time's revenge, yea unto the next generation... Even her own mother warned me against her. If I were you, I'd check things out with Mum... (Barnes 104-105)

At this point, reliability of Tony's memories and his authorial authority suffer the first major blow. This passage is a case of unreliable narration. Considering the mild letter in the first part, Tony misreports along the axis of characters, facts, and events. Instead of giving a kind warning and blessing, Tony's letter is explosively emotional. He and the audience both absorb the contents of the letter not expecting such depth of hatred. Tony has to concede that "indeed, I didn't recognize that part of myself from which the letter came" (Barnes 97). With the initial feeling of remorse and guilt, Tony realizes that he might fail to hold his position on moral high ground. However, he soon regains composure and offers a profound self-reflection by claiming that "[a]ll I could plead was that I had been its author then, but was not its author now" (Barnes 107). Tony tries to separate the younger self from the old one. He cannot deny the fact of having written the letter. However, it is the younger Tony who did it. His unreliable reporting of this event seems to be the consequence

of a vanishing memory. Nevertheless, it is the old Tony who distorts and deletes the memory to construct a kind and generous self. Tony's memory is strongly influenced by his then-current emotional and mental state after living a specific experience. Therefore, the image of the "generous and kind" young Tony is not only the reconstruction of the past self, but also a reflection of the present self who invents the story to escape the past. In this respect, Tony's unreliability also has to do with his intention of not being truthful. Furthermore, it also represents his feelings of remorse and guilt as he realizes that his past is not as noble as he rewrites it.

When Tony tries to use the philosophical meditation on changeability as the reason of misreporting, he is also misregarding. He misregards his memory of the letter, and his pseudo-moral self-reflection suggests that at some level of consciousness he is aware that it is untrue. In the audience's first reading, when Tony misregards Robson's death, although the authorial audience recognizes Tony's unreliability, they also move toward his growing maturity and honesty. Whereas in this case, the authorial audience begins to recognize that adopting the narrator's perspective is far away from that of the implied author. Having used the playful comparison to make us accept Tony's interpretation of memory, the implied author uses that disposition to his advantage. We have no trouble recognizing that Tony is literally unreliable, and the documents destroy his well-built image of self. Furthermore, the nature of memory reminds us that it is the present Tony who is emotionless towards Robin and Adrian's deaths, and he tries to construct his past self as a kind, generous boy. As a result, audiences become warier as they continue to read. Thus, the bonding unreliability in the first reading turns into the estranging unreliability when the authorial audience revisits Tony's narration.

To regain our trust and construct the new version of events, Tony is determined to research Adrian's diary, explaining that it is evidence. He also keeps exchanging emails with Veronica. After the investigation, he finally figures out a direct causal link between Adrian's suicide and the birth of his son. The philosophical perception of Adrian's death has withered, since it turned out to be another mundane suicide like Robson's. Furthermore, the rediscovery of his malicious letter makes him realize his curse was fulfilled, since Adrian's son is mentally disabled. Thus, Tony has to confront his misreading of Adrian's suicide. He cannot hide his disappointment claiming that:

> back then, if you got a girl pregnant, and if she didn't want to have an abortion, you married her: those were the rules. Yet Adrian couldn't even face this conventional solution… nothing to do with cleverness; and even less with

moral courage. He didn't grandly refuse an existential gift; he was afraid of the pram in the hall. (Barnes 154-155)

Under the misapprehension that the disabled child is Veronica's son, Tony draws a casual logical conclusion that the child's disability is attributed to Veronica's trauma from Adrian's suicide. The fulfillment of Tony's curse in his letter is the result of Adrian's evasion of obligation. He then goes back to the recollection and reflects that, "none of us had thought about the child, or the future. Now, for the first time, I wondered what had happened to Robson's girl, and to their child" (Barnes 154). It needs to be pointed out that in Part One even though we recognize Tony's misregarding and misreading of two suicides, we come to accept Tony's implication of the distance between the narrating-I and narrated-I. However, Tony now reveals that when he narrates Robson's suicide, the narrating-I still had not realized his misregarding. Furthermore, despite the standard remorse and guilt, Tony's casual logic is another way of self-justification. He tries to find excuses for his early misdeeds and rationalizes his unreliability. Barnes constructs the narration of Tony's memory process so that it is ultimately estranging rather than bonding. The more one reflects on Tony's claims upon the first reading of part one, the more they seem to realize the contrast between Barnes as teller and the narrator as teller. The implied author allows Tony's intermittent passages of bonding unreliability as the story proceeds. However, Tony's own engagement with the revisiting and revision of his memory leads us to see the irreparable harm he has done to Veronica and Adrian more clearly. As a result, he eventually cannot sustain his purpose of building up an imaginative self on the distorted memory. He starts to accept the responsibility of his past and to face the truth of memory. Accompanying these changes is Barnes's increased use of bonding unreliability through the reflection on memory and self.

Tony is a highly self-conscious narrator, who is very much aware of his agency and purpose as a memoirist and a narrator. Yet his purpose is sometimes different from Barnes's. As the authorial audiences, we appreciate Tony's honesty and remorse which strengthen our trust in him. However, Tony's self-delusion and evasion of responsibility make the authorial audience wary of his memory and confession. Tony offers warning signals against bonding too closely on the axis of events or perception, but the bonding effects on the ethical axis remain strong. As the narration proceeds, the narrator's reports, perceptions, and evaluations are questionable even if he makes effort to rationalize his unreliability and expresses remorse. Barnes's strategy is to encourage our initial bonding with Tony and to offer the signals of estrangement. Whereas Tony's continuous engagement with the task of reconstructing new version

of events and experience leads him to discern self-deception and the "damage" to others. Thus, he eventually cannot sustain his purpose.

It is a remarkable achievement for Barnes to change the authorial audience's distance to the narrator from beginning to end and to make us reflect on the mechanics of memory and identity. The division of the complex coding of Tony's unreliable narration into two parts largely rests on Barnes's use of genre and structure. It is not surprising that some readers who have picked up on the pattern of bonding unreliability in part one want to push the progress in the direction of estrangement, even when backtracking to the first part. In this way, Barnes's experiment with bonding and estranging unreliability brings into question our common understanding of memory. In the case of Tony's "memoir writing", imagination makes up for what is absent. Rather than being a way of escaping reality, imagination is a form of provocation, whereby Tony's illusions slide away to leave a space in which the truth and lies can coexist.

The Ethics of Tony's Memory: Reconstructing the Self in Character Narration

"Are we obligated to remember people and events from the past? If we are, what is the nature of this obligation? Are remembering and forgetting proper subjects of moral praise or blame?" (Margalit 7) These questions are asked by Avishai Margalit in his book *The Ethics of Memory* (2002). Is there an ethics of memory, a duty of remembrance? Margalit argues that if you are caught up in "thick" personal relations, family relations, or relations of love or friendship or community, then you do have obligations of memory (Margalit 7). Margalit weaves a wonderful account of how to relate memory to emotions, ethics, and forgiveness. If we follow Tony's memory as one of the effective tools of the past, the significant ethical question regards not only what he must remember, but also the role that his memory should play in the relationship between him and others, and between the young and the old selves. It explores the relationships between Tony and Veronica, Sarah, Adrian, and the authorial audience, which enables us to examine how Tony reconstructs the self in the process of narration. By taking the duty to remember, Tony is motivated to reach a reconciliation with the young self, and thus, to correct his relationships with others in his revision of memory. The unreliability of memory does not mean that the subject can evade the duty of remembrance. On the contrary, Tony can achieve the self-identification only by accepting the responsibility to remember. To explore the ethics of Tony's memory, the article will start with Tony's complicated relationships with Veronica and Adrian.

Every piece of Tony's explicit memory distortion is triggered by a set of

empirical documents including the letter from Veronica and Adrian, Mrs. Ford's will, Adrian's suicide note and diary, Tony's letter to Adrian, and the e-mail exchanges between Tony and Veronica. His first explicit memory distortion is his letter to Adrian. He does not recognize or remember consciously that his words are so "evil" until the document proves it. We see both his reporting and interpretation are opposing and inconsistent. The unreliable narration also further complicates the unstable relationship between his presentation and factual events. When reading Tony's distorted recollection, audiences' attitude towards his narration undergoes changes along with the progression of narration. Once the authorial audiences have identified Tony's self-justification and his lack of responsibility, they will make negative associative judgments of his inaccurate account. It needs to be pointed out that although the unreliability of Tony's memory has the potential to be the foundation of our strongly negative ethical effect, Barnes implicitly provides guidance for a more complex response, which continues to underline his distorted memory and errors while also mitigating our tension with him on the ethical axis.

In the process of reading, the authorial audiences will find that Tony's unreliability stems from his "cowardice" and instinct for self-preservation. In his relationship with Veronica, Tony seems to be uncomfortable, his tension growing in relation to his sense of inferiority to her. In Tony's memory, Veronica's well-tamed artistic taste for music and upper-middle-class upbringing make him feel subpar. Thus, when Veronica accuses Tony of cowardice, he replies:

"You're quite cowardly, aren't you, Tony?"
"I think it's more that I'm... peaceable."
"Well, I wouldn't want to disturb your self-image." (Barnes 38).

After a few years, Tony mentions again that "I'd never thought of myself as peaceable—or its opposite—until then" (Barnes 38). Tony's sense of inferiority and cowardice lead to their breakup. This theme of humiliation and failure is reflected in his first relationship as well as in the visit to Veronica's family. As a result, his recollection relating to her and her family has negative associations. He offers a subjective monologization of Veronica, transforming her from a subject to an object. He portrays her as a difficult, obstructive, and unpredictable ex-girlfriend. Tony's ambiguity in the sequence of sex and breaking up with Veronica is a compelling order of events. From the recollection, the two had sex shortly after their breakup, whereas Tony implies that the order of events is flipped. The inconsistency shows that Tony tries to evade his responsibility before and his "damage" to Veronica. We

see then that distortion in narration is paralleled with Tony's internal conflicting emotions.

In comparison, Tony heroizes his most admired friend Adrian. His worship of Adrian as a hero can be seen in his reaction to the friend's relationship with Veronica and his suicide. When receiving the letter from Adrian, Tony obviously feels betrayed. He peaceably suppresses his actual feelings and constructs a cliché tale of youthful heartbreak in which the innocent young man is dumped by the snobbish and cold ex-girlfriend for the enigmatic and highly intelligent friend. Tony blames Veronica, implying that she is not good enough to be Adrian's girlfriend. Tony believes that Veronica is undeserving, further bolstering Adrian. We see Tony's description of Adrian's suicide as "first-class degree, first-class suicide", which is a philosophical antipode to Robson's death. Tony views Adrian's short life and death as the "novel-worthy" and philosophical action. He comes to reflect on the sharp contrast between Adrian's heroic disposition with his own mediocrity. In this sense, I would suggest that Adrian is the construction of Tony's ideal self. As an idealized version of self, Adrian possesses qualities that Tony wants to have. He is most likely a combination of all the qualities and attributes that Tony most admires. This shows a psychological component of Tony's self, partially conscious and subconscious, composed of his desired future and the comprehensive sense of core identity. Therefore, it is not hard to understand that his protection of Adrian's image manifested as a way of self-defense. Thus, the role of fear and avoidance motivates Tony's recollection to arouse a strong personal vision.

However, with the revelations in the set of empirical documents, the memory of the "victor" becomes self-delusions of the "defeated". Tony begins to challenge the de-heroization of Adrian. Inconsistencies with Adrian's actions and Tony's ideal self start to surface. Adrian commits suicide because of his ethical-emotional entanglements with his girlfriend's mother, which breaks the well-constructed image of Tony's ideal self. By re-judging and re-evaluating Adrian and his suicide, Tony realizes that he is not the perfect embodiment of his ideal persona. Once his sense of purpose is crushed with factual events, the implied author explains that Tony is disillusioned to his self-narrative. However, if we regard Adrian's heroic story as one of the most "literary" or "novelistic" aspects of Tony's original self-narratives, the question arises: what can be uncovered by the mundane version of Adrian's story?

The ending of the novel finally reveals that the disabled man is the son of Adrian and Sarah. However, based on the insufficient information about Adrian and Sarah's communication, the authorial audiences must re-enact Tony's engagements with other characters to figure out the truth. Throughout the narration Sarah appears

in three guises. First, she is the mother of Tony's girlfriend, Veronica, when they visit her home. In Tony's recollection, Sarah is the only person in this family to treat him with kindness. This trait, however, is also excessive. Compared with other mothers, she seems to be overly protective of Tony rather than of her own daughter. Sarah is even uncomfortable with him being close to her daughter, warning him that: "Don't let Veronica get away with too much" (Barnes 31). The memory is more vivid in the episode of her cooking an egg for Tony's breakfast:

> She eased another egg onto my plate, despite my not asking for it or wanting it. The remnants of the broken one were still in the pan; she flipped them casually into the swing-bin, then half-threw the hot frying pan into the wet sink. Water fizzed and steam rose at the impact, and she laughed, as if she had enjoyed causing this small havoc." (Barnes 31)

After breaking one of the eggs in the pan, Sarah tosses the broken one casually in the garbage and makes another one without asking Tony's opinion. This act of cooking a new egg shows just how much she cares for Tony and it implies a closer relationship than initially narrated. Tony's portrayal of Sarah might also hint that she is not just the simple, middle-class homemaker who he thought her to be. It indicates a deeper relationship between them. It isn't until the second reading that these small details seem relevant since the authorial audiences know about Sarah and Adrian's affair. Given the retrospective scenes in the opening lines, Sarah's broken eggs could be associated with "gouts of sperm circling a plughole" (Barnes 3), which can take on a sexual connotation as a symbol of amorous relations. Therefore, Tony's memory implicitly suggests another possible scenario: Sarah and Tony have a sexual relationship during this visit.

When Sarah returns to the fiction in the guise of Mrs. Sarah Ford, Tony and readers are surprised that Mrs. Ford leaves the money and documents with Tony, not her daughter Veronica. Tony interprets it as a way of "maternal apology" to compensate for her daughter's "damage" caused to him. This is where Barnes signals the inadequacy of Tony's narration of Sarah due to his fragile and unreliable memory. Tony emphasizes his unfamiliarity with Sarah, whose name and handwriting is unrecognizable to him, while intentionally (perhaps subconsciously) omitting and covering his actual involvement with Adrian, Veronica, and Sarah. Tony disguises true relationships with false ones. In the end, Sarah shocks Tony and readers when she appears in the third guise, the disabled child's mother.

It is challenging for the authorial audiences to reconstruct the new version of

the story that is hidden beneath Tony's fictional depiction. Thus, if we refer to the meaning of the broken egg, the implication of the horizontal gesture, the legacy Sarah gave, the incomplete documents to construct the entire story, coupled with Tony's unreliable narration, new questions arise. At issue is whether Tony's remorse or confession only stems from his letter given to Adrian. What is his original sin? If Tony has had a sexual escapade with Sarah, then he is faced with a dilemma that mirrors Adrian's ethical dilemma. His paradoxical ethical identities are that: when loving Veronica, he is Sarah's future son-in-law; while when having sex with Sarah, he is Veronica's future father-in-law. To end this ethical dilemma, Adrian chooses to commit suicide. Tony, who cannot easily succumb to actual suicide, chooses another way to end his predicament. He achieves this during the process of remembering and narrating where he reconstructs an ordinary character who recognizes his mistakes. This character is Adrian who is a manifestation of Tony. Tony's remorse is actually a call to attention to the fact that his memory distortion or the revelation of his unreliability has been a way of psychological protection. He creates a fictitious narrative to avoid facing ethical dilemmas and assuming responsibility for his actions. However, his reflections on memory and truth, and revelations of his self-delusion imply how difficult and ambivalent it is for him to suppress the shameful memory. Hence, the self-justifying and compensatory ethical pattern he weaves into the fabric of fiction are both pitiable and repulsive. Barnes tacitly uses misidentification of our reading experience to lead the authorial audiences to reconstruct the "self" in Tony's narration within his fiction.

Given the interrelations among the implied author (Barnes), the character narrator (Tony), other characters, and the authorial audience, Tony's memory is ethically related to his personal relations. Rather than being a victim in friendships and romantic relationships, Tony reconstructs himself as the injurer in his relations with Adrian, Veronica, and Sarah. Tony's memory, in a sense, is knowledge from the past rather than knowledge about the past. The narrative techniques that Tony employs serve as the normative bridges connecting the past, the present, and the future. The call for remembrance and reconstruction helps Tony to show his care for others, and thus to achieve value in his life. The ethical concern in Tony's duty to remember underlines an important theme in Barnes's fiction: love is a source of redemption.

As the character narrator of the story, Tony edits, distorts, and deletes his past to remain peaceable and ordinary and to avoid further "damage" to other characters and to himself. Barnes's technical brilliance allows him to create the possibility for Tony to falsify, beautify, and symbolically imply the real self and cruel story. The

novel challenges us to find the clues to Tony's self-invention, and accordingly to reconstruct the past through multileveled communication. Barnes's experiment with unreliable narration sets up interpretive and ethical traps for readers, and challenges them to recognize and avoid those traps. By using different strategies of indirection, Barnes shows a deep trust in readers' ability to reconstruct their own version of events and memory. His communications with readers, in contrast with Tony's, are a generous offer to share his belief in the meaning of memory. Although not engaging in direct disclosure about himself, Barnes is concerned with the representation of memory on the present stage.

Works Cited

Barnes, Julian. *The Sense of an Ending.* London: Vintage Books, [2011]2012.

陈博：“论《终结的感觉》中的记忆叙事伦理”，《当代外国文学》1（2018）：96-103。

[Chen Bo. "Ethics of Memory Narrative in *The Sense of an Ending*." *Contemporary Foreign Literature* 1(2018): 96-103.]

Guignery, Vanessa. "Julian Barnes." *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Contemporary British and Irish literature*. Ed. Richard Bradford. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Ltd. 2021:149-158.

Holmes, Frederick M. "Divided Narratives, Unreliable Narrators, and *The Sense of an Ending*: Julian Barnes, Frank Kermode, and Ford Madox Ford." *Papers on Language & Literature* 51.1 (2015): 27-50.

Jagannathan, Dhananjay. "On Making Sense of Oneself: Reflections on Julian Barnes's *The Sense of an Ending*." *Philosophy and Literature* 1A.39 (2015):106-121.

刘智欢、杨金才：“论《终结的感觉》中的记忆书写特征”，《湖南科技大学学报》（社会科学版）6 （2016）：48-52。

[Liu Zhihuan and Yang Jincai. "The Writing of Memory in Julian Barnes's *The Sense of an Ending*." *Journal of Hunan University of Science & Technology (Social Science Edition)* 6 (2016): 48-52.]

Margalit, Avishai. *The Ethics of Memory*. Massachusetts: Harvard UP, 2002.

McDonnell, Jane Taylor. *Living to Tell the Tale: A Guide to Writing Memoir*. New York: Penguin, 1998.

Phelan, James. *Living to Tell About It: A Rhetoric and Ethics of Character Narration*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 2005.

—. "Estranging Unreliability, Bonding Unreliability, and the Ethics of Lolita." *Narrative* 15.2 (2007): 222-238.

Wachtel, Eleanor. "Julian Barnes Interview." *Writers and Company with Eleanor Wachtel*. CBC, 20 Nov. 2011. Web.12 Sept. 2012.

Wallen, James Ramsey. "The Evils of Banality: Shallowness, Self-Realization, and Closure in Julian Barnes's *The Sense* of an Ending and Oscar Wilde's *De Profundis*." *Critique: Studies in Contemporary Fiction* 58.4 (2017): 325-339.

自然科学与现实主义"写实"精神
Natural Science and the "Realist" Spirit of Realism

蒋承勇（**Jiang Chengyong**）

内容摘要：作为 19 世纪西方文学思潮的"现实主义"，因其"写实"精神又被称为"写实主义"。这种"写实"精神的形成主要得益于自然科学的深度影响。19 世纪自然科学的巨大成就给欧洲人以强有力的精神鼓舞，崇尚科学和理性成了这一时期的时代风尚和文化征候。科学精神与实证理性激发了现实主义作家以文学创作"分析"与"研究"社会及人的生存状况的浓厚兴趣，他们力图使文学文本所展示的艺术世界与现实生活世界达成同构关系。现实主义借助科学实证的观察、实验的方法，改造了传统的"摹仿说"，使文学"写实"从先验性抽象思辨走向了经验性、实证性分析，从而更新了文学的观念、叙述方式和文本的样式，进而从一种层面上促成了西方文学在创作理念与方法上的现代性转型，具有"先锋性"特质与意义。
关键词：自然科学；实证理性；现实主义；写实；现代性

Title: Natural Science and the "Realist" Spirit of Realism
Abstract: The formation of the "realistic" spirit of western literary realism mainly benefits from the profound influence of natural science in the 19th century, the great achievements of which strongly inspire the spirit of the Europeans and make the cult of science and rationality as the fashion and cultural characteristic of this period. In their literary creations, the realists stimulated by the scientific spirit and empirical rationality are keenly interested in "analyzing" and "studying" the society and the living status of human beings, endeavoring to achieve isomorphic relationship between the real world and the world of art described in literary texts. With the help of scientific observations and experiments, realism transforms the traditional theory of "Mimesis" and turns literary "realistic" writing from transcendentally abstract speculation to experiential and empirical analysis, updating literary concept, the way of narration and the style of texts, and thus contributing in a way to the transformation of modern western literature characteristic of "avant-garde" in terms of the idea of literary creations and methods.

Author: Jiang Chengyong is Senior Professor of liberal arts of Zhejiang Gongshang University (Hangzhou 310018, China), specializing in the humanistic tradition of western literature, western literary trends and comparative study between Chinese and Foreign literature (Email: jcy@zjgsu.edu.cn).

  "写实"精神是 19 世纪西方现实主义文学的基本特质之一，所以，作为文学思潮的"现实主义"常常又被称作"写实主义"。"文学中的现实主义指对生活的忠实描绘，它不关乎理想化和对事物的美化，一般说来，也不关乎表现异常或超验之物"（Cuddon 590）。当然，"写实"也是人类文学艺术的一个普泛化特征，不仅仅属于现实主义倾向的文学，也不仅仅属于 19 世纪现实主义文学思潮，即使是浪漫主义文学，也不无写实性成分。但是，对 19 世纪西方文学思潮意义上的"现实主义"而言，"写实"乃其基本的或根本性特质之一。在西方文学史上，"写实"可以追溯到古希腊的"摹仿说"以及稍后的"再现说"；"再现"之"写实"与"摹仿"之"写实"内涵有别，却有内在的联系。从"摹仿"现实到"再现"现实，是"写实"传统的发展与演变，其间不仅涉及不同时代人对"写实"之"写"的内涵的不同理解，而且对"实"的理解也有迥然有别。特别需要强调的是，"写实"之所以成为 19 世纪现实主义文学之基本特质，直接得益于现代自然科学之成就，尤其是现实主义在创作理念与方法追求中的"写实"，主要生发于 19 世纪的科学精神与实证理性，可以说，现实主义是自然科学在 19 世纪西方文学之树上结出的重要果实。因此，深入考辨现实主义文学"写实"精神之形成与自然科学之关系，有助于我们深化和更新我们对现实主义文学思潮和"现实主义"学术话语的理解与认识。

<div align="center">一</div>

  "19 世纪可以恰当地称为科学的世纪"（梅尔茨 89），自然科学的巨大成就催生了 19 世纪特定的时代风尚和文化征候。虽然，自然科学的发展及其对社会和人的影响是有一个漫长过程的，但是，从科学发展史的角度看，"同以往所有时期相比，1830 到 1914 年这段时期，标志着科学发展的顶峰"（伯恩斯、拉尔夫 282）。从科学对社会和人的影响的角度看，"一直到十八世纪将近末尾时为止，和科学学说相对而言的科学技术对人的见解没有重大影响。而随着工业主义的兴起，科学技术才开始影响了人们的思想"（罗素 273）。随着科学与技术影响的日益扩大和深入，科学精神、科学理性逐步成了 19 世纪西方文化的突出特征，崇尚科学和理性也成了 19 世纪的一种时代风尚。正是在这个史无前例的"科学的世纪"里，科学与理性及其造就的特定的时代风尚，促成了以"写实"为特质的现实主义文学思潮在欧洲的盛行。

当然，19 世纪科学的快速发展，是以 18 世纪的科学建树乃至更早时期的铺垫为基础的。从文艺复兴时期开始，西方自然科学就开始不断发展并日益加速。18 世纪启蒙运动的产生及其力量之源也基于科学成就和科学思维，在很大程度上是科学昌明了文化和思想，于是才谈得上"启蒙"——使人从宗教信仰的古老世界观中解放了出来。物理学之耗散结构理论的创立者伊里亚·普里戈金（Ilya Prigogine）说，"对于进步思想的最有力的支持就是知识的积累。〔……〕让我们回想一下十八世纪末和十九世纪初的那些惊人的发现：关于热、电、磁和光学的理论。毫不奇怪，十八世纪就已清楚地形成的科学进步的思想统治了十九世纪"（118）。历经启蒙时代，伴随着科学进步和人类知识的增长，"宗教不断放弃了长期以来反对科学的那种不可一世的专横态度"（Draper 367），科学也开始不断深入人心。在欧洲，"对于教士以及他们讲解的关于一个个神秘莫测的宇宙故事，人们曾经非常崇敬，但是现在，这些崇敬中的很大一部分已经转向天文学家、地质学家、医生和工程师"（Benn 198）。历史进步的观念随着科学的发展而不断成为人们关于社会发展的基本理念。实际的情况是，"对于文化的演进，一种常见的看法是，宗教代表着人类发展的原始阶段，注定要被一个更加开明的科学时代所取代"（哈里森 257-258）。在 20 世纪之前，这个"时代"就是 19 世纪。相对于 18 世纪，19 世纪的"'科学'再次呈现出一种形而上学的意义，这种意义远比聚集成科学的那些专业之事更加伟大和有条理。现在，'科学'成了社会自然进步所指向的目的或目标"（哈里森 258）。"因此在 19 世纪，社会声望和权力从宗教转向了科学"（哈里森 289）。而且，科学的成就不仅增强了人类对自我力量的信心和社会进步的乐观，并且使人的个体意识和理性精神得以进一步凸显和强化，尤其重要的是改变了人们的世界观和价值观，改变了人们观察、认识和研究世界的理念与方法，从而改变了整个时代和社会的风尚。"科学不仅大大影响我们的思想，而且还以其应用改变了我们生活于其中的世界的外貌"（梅尔茨 76）。英国著名的科学史家丹皮尔（W. C. Dampier）说：

如果我们有正当理由把十九世纪看作是科学时代的开始的话，那么，原因并不仅仅在于，甚至主要不在于，我们对自然的认识在十九世纪中有了迅速发展。〔……〕在最近一百年或一百五十年里（指 19 世纪初到 20 世纪中叶，引者注），人们对自然的宇宙的整个观念改变了，因为我们认识到人类与其周围的世界，一样服从相同的物理定律与过程，不能与世界分割开来考虑，而观察、归纳、演绎与实验的科学方法，不但可应用于纯科学原来的题材，而且人类思想与行为的各个不同领域里差不多都可应用。〔……〕总之，科学过去是躲在经验技术的隐蔽角落辛勤工作，当它走到前面而且高举火炬的时候，科学时代就已经开始了。（175-176）

　　这里，丹皮尔指出，19 世纪的"科学时代"，不仅仅是说科学取得了空前重大而迅速的发展，而主要是指科学的理念与方法越出了自身的领域，在"在理论思想与行为的各个不同领域"的广泛运用，科学成为一种普泛的文化现象流行于欧洲社会，改变着人们的世界观、价值观和方法论，并对人文社会科学和文学艺术都产生重大的影响。科学家埃尔温·薛定谔（Erwin Schrödinger）说过，"整个科学是与人类文化紧密相联的〔……〕科学发现，哪怕是那些在当时是最先进的、深奥的和难于掌握的发现，离开了它们在文化中的前因后果也都是毫无意义的"（qtd. in 普里戈金、斯唐热 20）。因此普里戈金指出，科学就是在整个社会关系中找到自己的，比如，"时间的再发现既有科学内部的历史根源，又有社会关系中的根源"；由于科学的发展，"整个人文学科今天正处于变迁的时期"（53）。"一个多世纪以来，科学活动的部分在其周围的文化空间内已增长到如此的程度，以致它好像正在代替整个文化本身"（65）。而"随着我们的文化本身变得更加具有科学性，艺术家的创作方法也可能变得更加具有理性和更加接近科学〔……〕在许多领域，艺术家从科学，特别是从形式的材料和技术那里得到了大量的帮助"（门罗 493）。

<h2 style="text-align:center">二</h2>

　　科学对时代风尚及精神文化的改造固然是 19 世纪欧洲社会之不可抗拒的必然趋势，但是，文学艺术到底在多大程度上接纳科学才实质性地影响了自身的演变与革新，同时又不至于被科学"异化"进而伤及自身，这是一个值得研究的问题。不过，在 19 世纪科学主义之风势头强劲的文化环境里，人们对这样的问题尚来不及深入思考和研究，即便去思考，也有可能被认为是不合时宜的。而且，相对于某一时段而言，"有创造性才华的艺术家和哲学家都是文明的开拓者，远远地走在科学的前面，探索文明进步的新道路"（门罗 493）。这里暂且不说文学家能否果真走在"科学的前面"或者在什么意义上理解"前面"这个词的内涵，却至少说明文学家也会借助科学理念与方法去思考和探索不属于科学家或者科学家无法涉足之领域的有关人类文明发展的问题，——何况，事实上"科学家永远不可能解决艺术家的全部问题"（门罗 493），因为这是专属于文学家自己关于文明与进步的探索。那么，返观 19 世纪这个特殊的年代我们可以发现，科学对整个欧洲乃至人类社会产生的变化是前所未有的，科学与时代风尚及文学艺术的关系之密切及影响之深刻，是一种无可否认的事实。法国史学家、作家欧内斯特·勒南（Ernest Renan）在《科学的未来》（1848-1849）中深刻阐述了新的科学精神对文学的重要意义：

　　　　科学揭示给我们的现实世界，比想象力创作的奇幻世界要优越得多。

〔……〕使我们的思想目空一切，或者只是为了我们写出的片段作品就牺牲万物的现实，都是轻浮的做法。〔……〕如果说虚构的奇迹经常是诗歌的必需品，那么，自然的奇迹，一旦在其全部光泽中露面，就将组成崇高一千倍的诗歌，这诗歌将是诗歌本身，同时是科学和哲学。（qtd. in 格兰特 45）

勒南同时在书信中进一步表达说，"除了科学，万物皆空"，"艺术本身也让人感到空洞了"（qtd. in 格兰特 45）。因此，19 世纪的文学——特别是现实主义文学——在科学的影响、渗透和鼓舞下，无疑有了自己的新气象。

在此，为了深度分析、研究 19 世纪现实主义之"写实"特质的成因，我们有必要重提在科学与文学之间有桥梁作用的文学社会学创始人之一、法国著名的文学批评家丹纳（H. Taine,1828-1893，又译"泰纳"）。丹纳对我国学人来说并不陌生，但是，以往我们对其理论的认可度不高，因而对他在 19 世纪现实主义的发生与发展中所起的作用也缺乏深度的认识和客观的评价。虽然丹纳的理论有其局限性，但时至今日，如果我们在研究现实主义文学思潮时依然忽略或者轻视他的理论，那无疑在研究的学术视野和逻辑理路上是大有缺憾的。事实上"丹纳在 19 世纪发挥着科学和文学之间的中间人角色。丹纳认为人类行为有三大主要决定因素：遗传、环境和历史决定的社会条件"（Ledger 70）。韦勒克指出，"文学作为某一社会文化的一部分，只能发生在某一社会的环境中"；"社会环境似乎决定了人们认识某些审美评价的可能性"（《文学原理》95）。当时"社会环境"的一个突出的乃至本质的特征就是科学主义的盛行以及科学对人的思维的主宰。丹纳是在实证哲学基础上成长起来的现实主义文学理论家，他的理论与现实主义文学几乎是在共同的时代风尚中诞生的，同时又深深地影响了现实主义文学之特质的生成；而且，在方法论上，丹纳的理论基础与当时的现实主义文学相仿——运用自然科学的观察与实验的方法来展开他的文学社会学研究与批评。正如德国美学家李斯托威尔（William Francis Hare Listowel）所说，"近代艺术科学论的先驱是丹纳，他的美学，不是关于美的哲学，而是关于艺术的哲学。和 19 世纪形而上学家们的演绎方法相反，他也是经验的、历史的和比较的方法的奠基者。这种方法是自然科学所特有的"（93）。尤其是，丹纳和巴尔扎克等现实主义大师一样，运用类比的方法研究文学和美学，认为"美学本身便是一种实用植物学"（"艺术品的本质"466）。丹纳关于"种族"、"环境"和"时代"这些深深影响了现实主义文学的概念，就是基于人、社会与植物、动物、环境的类比，他在这种类比中考察文学的发展与演变，探讨文学与美学的本质特征。他认为美学、文学的研究就应该和自然科学的研究一样，以大量具体的经验事实为前提，由个别上升到一般，从具体中推演出普遍性，打破传统的形而上的理论思辨的美学与文学研究，体现了科学时代美学与文学研究

的现代转型——科学化、实证化。但是，暂且不说这种理论的科学合理性达到了何种高度，笔者认为其研究理念与方法与那个科学的时代有密切联系，与现实主义作家们在认识世界与文学创作的理念与方法上基本一致。可以说，这种理论既深度地影响了那个时代写实倾向的现实主义文学，而且在很大程度上又是对同时代的现实主义文学创作实践的一种研究与总结。对此，我们不妨以丹纳的论断，并从他的视角去还原现实主义文学思潮产生的"时代"及其"风尚"。丹纳说：

> 的确，有一种"精神的"气候，就是风俗习惯与时代精神，和自然界的气候起着同样的作用。严格说来，精神气候并不产生艺术家；我们先有天才和高手，像先有植物的种子一样。在同一国家的两个不同时代，有才能的人和平庸的人数目很可能相同〔……〕必须有某种精神气候，某种才干才能发展；否则就流产。因此，气候改变，才干的种类也随之而变；倘若气候变成相反，才干的种类也变成相反。精神气候仿佛在各种才干中作着"选择"，只允许几类才干发展而多多少少排斥别的。由于这个作用，你们才看到某些时代某些国家的艺术宗派，忽而发展理想的精神，忽而发展写实的精神，有时以素描为主，有时以色彩为主。时代的趋向始终占统治地位。企图向别的方向发展的才干会发觉此路不通；群众思想和社会风气的压力，给艺术家定下一条发展的路，不是压制艺术家，就是逼他改弦易辙。（《艺术哲学》34-35）

在丹纳的"种族"、"环境"和"时代"三个概念中，"种族"和"环境"是相对稳定不变的，而"时代"既是指文学外部的社会"精神气候"，也是指文学内部的传统，这两者都是历史的概念，是变动不居的，会使不同国家的文学"忽而发展理想的精神"（如浪漫主义），"忽而发展写实的精神"（如现实主义），并产生不同的"艺术宗派"（如文学思潮的更迭）。因此，正如韦勒克所说，"时代表示的是一个时期的统一精神，或一种文艺传统的压力。时代的主要作用在于借以提醒人们，历史属于动态，而环境属于静态"（《近代文学批评史》45）从"时代"与文学的关系而言，可以说，正是 19 世纪欧洲那特定的科学精神与时代风尚，造就了西方文学史上为数空前的现实主义作家，并汇聚成了空前波澜壮阔、风格独居的现实主义文学思潮。

<div align="center">三</div>

由此可见，19 世纪的自然科学成就给欧洲人以强有力的精神鼓舞，于是科学理性与科学实证方法对社会科学研究产生了普遍的渗透，也催发了作家通过文学创作去"分析"与"研究"社会和人的生存状况的浓厚兴趣，强化了西方文学与文论史上"摹仿说""再现说"意义上的"写实"传统。不过，

19 世纪现实主义文学的这种"写实"，与传统"摹仿现实主义"或"古典现实主义"的"写实"在内涵与创作实践上是迥然不同的。17 世纪古典主义文学和 19 世纪现实主义文学都是崇尚理性的文学，所以，后者又被称为"新古典主义文学"。必须注意的是，虽然在崇尚理性这一点上，19 世纪现实主义与传统的"摹仿现实主义"或"古典现实主义"有内在的联系，然而，"摹仿现实主义"的理性精神侧重于形而上学意义上的古典理性主义精神，偏重于抽象的思辨性与先验性；而 19 世纪现实主义文学的理性精神则在此基础上更多地接受了科学精神的影响，强调经验主义的实证理性，从而导致其文学创作理念中明显的科学研究指向和科学实证精神；在对社会与人的分析、研究以及整个的艺术创作思维中所透出的智性的和实证的精神，在又一层面上凸显了 19 世纪现实主义文学之现代性和先锋性特征。"模仿说经历了超过 20 个世纪的演变，由于历时过久，以至于终究冲动全消。这种现实上的疲惫，在 19 世纪初，一切条件都对它不利，无论是在唯心论的哲学里或浪漫主义的艺术中，情形一概如此；不过，到了 19 世纪中叶，情形就正如蜡炬在将熄之前，火焰又重新突地闪亮那样，艺术家们又重新注意艺术对于实在的依赖"（塔塔尔凯维奇 286）。这里，让摹仿说（模仿说）焕发生机的，恰恰是 19 世纪欧洲的一种特别的时代因素——科学主义文化思潮，是实证主义、科学理性对文学之"写实"传统的激活。因此可以说，19 世纪现实主义之思维和审美的范式与表现方法及艺术技巧等，与传统的"摹仿现实主义"以及其他写实倾向的文学有迥然之异。正是 19 世纪现实主义文学在"写实"精神上的显著拓新，西方文学史上的写实传统也从此获得了崭新的内涵。

在具体的创作行为中，"现实主义文学喜欢视觉物、喜欢观察事物，通过视觉来记录它们的存在，并以此为中心的〔……〕现实主义比其他任何一种文学模式都更将视觉置于至高无上的位置，并将其作为理解世界及其与人的关系的主导性载体"（Brooks 3）。"视觉"以科学实证式的细致观察为前提，"视觉"之结果借助于语言载体的转达而成为文学文本内容，是一种"写实"式的"摹仿"与"再现"抑或"反映"，读者便可以通过文本"理解世界及其与人的关系"，这种写实性文学文本同时也就是作家生活现实展开研究、考据或者艺术化"实验"的"主导性载体"，其中"记录"了他们艺术实证的结果。确实，"现实主义小说家格外关注准确地记录，确保事实正确"（Cuddon 592），由此我们可以看到，科学的实证理念与方法对现实主义文学理论与创作的密切关系。在现实主义者看来，"物质世界不是笛卡尔式的梦幻而是真实存在的。在这方面，现实主义致力于记录外部现实然后（或同时）描写观察、扭曲或洞察外部现实的内在性"（Levine 16）。也就是说，现实主义的实证式观察并不仅仅停留于对生活和事物之外在"视觉"所得的"记录"上，而且要"洞察"其"内在性"之蕴含——也即社会之规律、本质、意义等等。因此，现实主义对社会和生活的这种"实验"式"摹仿"、"再现"或者"反映"，

在方法与形式上有科学式"实证"与"研究"的意味，——当然，这在本质上是一种审美式艺术创造，作家创作的结果不是关于社会和生活的科学化的实验报告，而是具有审美价值和社会认识价值的文学艺术作品。现实主义作家"对贫民窟、工厂、铁路运营公司和肉类包装厂的访问调查构成了他们艺术作品中的实证性研究"（Singley 334）。"一些现实主义作家通过进一步加强'物象具体化'来塑造真实氛围。这些物象包括真实的街道地址，当地企业名字和其他地标建筑，以及提及一些真实的名人、政客或明星"（Barrish 45）。在这方面，巴尔扎克是一个典型。

巴尔扎克在思想观念上可谓是文学领域的科学主义者，他崇尚实证哲学，并深受生物学、解剖学等自然科学的影响。他认为，"古往今来，如同有动物类别一样，也有社会类别"（巴尔扎克 59）他对生活的观察和感知方式带有实证式"实验"的特征。在日常生活中，他总是以实证的理念去观察和研究人与社会。巴尔扎克先生到每一个家庭，到每一个炉旁去寻找，在那些外表看来千篇一律、平稳安静的人物身上进行挖掘，挖掘出好些既如此复杂又如此自然的性格，以至大家都奇怪这些如此熟悉、如此真实的事，为什么一直没被人发现。巴尔扎克自己也说：他喜欢观察我所住的那一带郊区的各种风俗习惯，当地居民和他们的性格……他可以和他们混在一起，看他们做买卖，看他们工作完毕后怎样互相争吵。对他来说，这种观察已经成为一种直觉，他的观察既不忽略外表又能深入对方的心灵；或者也可以说就因为他能很好地抓住外表的细节，所以才能马上透过外表，深入内心。巴尔扎克作如此实证式观察的最终目的是客观冷静地"再现"生活。他的著名论断是：法国社会将成为它的历史，他只当它的书记，编制恶习和德行的清单、搜集情欲的主要事实、刻画性格、选择社会上主要事件、结合几个性质相同的性格的特点揉成典型人物，这样我也许可以写出许多历史家忘记写的那部历史，就是说风俗史。在巴尔扎克的小说中，精致的细节描写，使物质的形态具有客观的逼真性，从而有还原生活和历史的效果。"现实主义往往有着强烈的视觉性，关注看见和登记事物，并因此频繁地求助于描述〔……〕这些我们通常将它与现实主义联系起来"（Brooks 43）。叙事理论家罗兰·巴特（Roland Barthes）对巴尔扎克的这种细节叙述与描写给予了高度的评价。"巴特认为细节的具体内容虽然意义不大，但在巴尔扎克所谓的'现实感的表现'上有重要作用。真实本身就是由许多对我们而言不具有区别意义的具体细节构成；它们只是简单存在于我们的意识背景中。至少，这样的细节有助于我们感知周围的这个物质世界，而这个世界是独立于我们意识之外的"（Barrish 46）真实细致地描绘社会结构形态，广泛地展示生活的风俗史，是巴尔扎克的创作理想，同时也是他突出的文学成就。"的确可以说所有伟大的现实主义小说家在某种程度上都已经是历史主义的：巴尔扎克早已居于可查证的历史阶段，他也有具体的宗教信仰和生活空间，而其他人，即便严格地说与历史无关，

也凭借其现实主义实力——不能这么说吗？——逐渐成为历史档案"（Jameson 263）。后来的英国小说家康拉德（Joseph Conrad）在阐述关于小说与历史之关系的观点时，支持和发展了巴尔扎克的小说观念和创作实践。康拉德说，小说"通过想象的方法，创造出了比现实更有条理的一种生活世界，它有选择地描写许多与生活相关的片段，这种选择足以同历史的文献相媲美"（*A Personal Record* 15）。他认为，小说是历史，是人类的历史，不然，就不成其为小说。但是，小说又不是历史；它源于一种牢固的根基，也就是文学是通过语言形式进行对现实世界以及社会现象的观察的，而历史则仅仅是依赖于文献、书写或印刷品的阅读，总而言之，是通过第二手资料。因此，小说比历史更真实。

除了巴尔扎克之外，司汤达、狄更斯、福楼拜、托尔斯泰、陀思妥耶夫斯基等现实主义作家的创作行为，都不同程度地体现了科学实证式的"写实"特质。现实主义文学的"写实"承续着传统"摹仿说"的写实理念，同时又在科学精神与实证理性的催化下，现实主义作家们把文学创作视为对现实社会与人生的研究与历史性的真实"再现"；他们的作品在科学研究式的观察、实证的基础上努力达成对小说生活的准确体验与把握，并以客观写实的方式真实再现生活的本来的样子，并追求"科学研究的精确性"。概而言之，现实主义文学的"写实"理念，接纳了科学实证思维基础上的观察、实验的方法和经验论哲学内涵，并挤兑了传统"摹仿说"的形而上抽象思辨和先验论哲学内涵，力图使文学文本所展示和反映的艺术世界与现实中的生活世界达成同构关系。正因为如此，现实主义文学通常被认为是广泛地再现现实生活之面貌及其内在的本质与规律，从而使文学文本拥有了新的审美功能和社会功能。概而言之，现实主义让传统的先验性抽象思辨性写实走向了科学实证的分析性写实。19 世纪现实主义的独具特质的"写实"精神，是促成西方文学在创作理念与方法上现代性转型的重要原因之一。

历史是流动的，特定历史阶段的时代精神与文化征候也不是一成不变的，因此，这特定时代形成的现实主义文学思潮属于 19 世纪这个巨大变革的时代；反之，19 世纪现实主义也表征和铭刻了巨变时代的文化精神气象，于是，这种"现实主义"在当时便是一种极具"先锋"精神的文学样式：它挑战和反叛强调"主观"、"超验"、"情感"、"想象"的浪漫主义文学成规；它也不同于此前的所有摹仿、写实倾向的文学——如 18 世纪英国的现实主义小说——在科学理性的牵引下，刻意追求"客观"与"写实"。所以，当我们今天认为"现实主义"是一个再普通乃至"俗套"的术语时，殊不知，它在 19 世纪作为一种独立的文学思潮而出现时，正如法国批评家爱德蒙·杜朗蒂（Edmond Duranty）所说，"这个可怕的术语'现实主义'是它所代表的流派的颠覆者。说'现实主义'是荒谬的，因为现实主义标示着个人性的坦率而完美的表达；成规、模仿以及任何流派正是它所反对的东西"（qtd. in 格

兰特 29）。19 世纪现实主义之所以具有现代性，是因为它属于 19 世纪这个科学精神弥漫的特定时代，其科学理性、科学思维和"客观""写实"精神便是"现代性"的重要性标志之一。可以说，此前任何时期的西方文学都未曾拥有如此强烈的科学精神和科学化的"客观""写实"意识及其由此带来的文学－小说文本的独特审美样式。所以，韦勒克说，现实主义完全不同于浪漫主义和此前其他的文学样式：

> 它排斥了作品中那些异想天开的、神仙鬼怪式的、隐喻的和象征的、高度风格化的、纯抽象和装饰性的东西，它意味着我们摒弃神话、童话和们的世界。它还意味着拒绝接受完全不可能的、纯偶然的和极不寻常的事件和情节，因为尽管各地和作家个人的情况千差万别，"现实"在当时显然已经有了明确的含义，它代表着十九世纪科学的、井然有序的世界，一个因果关系分明的世界，一个没有奇迹和超验王国的世界，即使作家可以保留一种个人的宗教信念。"现实"（reality）这一术语同时也是一个包容性的术语：丑恶的、令人厌恶的、低贱的事物都是艺术的合法题材。像性和濒死时的极端痛苦这一类过去一直被禁忌的主题（爱情和死亡则是被允许的）现在完全可以进入艺术的殿堂。（"文学研究中现实主义的概念"235）

显然，犹如自然科学客观冷静地展开"研究"与"实验"，现实主义作家也以客观冷静的态度展开写实性文学创作，其审美的与创作的观念既不同于 17 世纪古典主义作家——这一点与浪漫主义文学站在了一起——也不同于 19 世纪初的浪漫主义作家，因为现实主义的作品所表现的题材既不是古典主义的古代英雄和宫廷生活，也不是浪漫主义式充满抒情与想象的理想世界和异国他乡，而是当下的现实生活，是真实的普通人和平凡的世界。在现实主义作家笔下，现实世界具有不加粉饰的本原性和有序性，他们的作品中容纳了古典主义作家所指责的"丑陋"而缺乏"崇高"的生活，它们体现出一种赤裸裸的"事实"。这种文学理念、叙述方法和审美趣味是超乎往常的，既和浪漫主义文学一样反叛古典主义，因而在这一个层面上与浪漫主义一起拥有了"现代性"禀赋，又在崇尚科学与理性的层面上有别于浪漫主义，从而在"现代性"的取向上与之有所错位。为此，韦勒克说，"司汤达和巴尔扎克代表的严肃的现实主义的出现就成了一种相当突然的现象"（《文学研究中现实主义的概念》235）。可以说，19 世纪现实主义文学通过"写实"之特质，更新了西方文学史上关于文学的观念，也改变了文学的叙述方式和文本样式，其先锋性是无可置疑并具有深远之文学史价值与意义的。

Works Cited

巴尔扎克："《人间喜剧》前言（1842）"，陈占元译。《巴尔扎克论文学》，王秋荣编。北京：中国社会科学出版社，1986 年，第 57-75 页。

[Balzac, Honoré-de. "Preface to *The Human Comedy* (1842)." Trans. Chen Zhanyuan. *Balzac on Literature*. Ed. Wang Qiurong. Beijing: China Social Sciences, 1986. 57-75.]

Barrish, Phillip J. *The Cambridge Introduction to American Literary Realism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Benn, A. W. *A History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century* (vol. I)*. London: Longmans, Green, and Todd, 1906.

Brooks, Peter. *Realist Vision*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005.

伯恩斯、拉尔夫：《世界文明史》（第三卷），罗经国等译。北京：商务印书馆，1995 年。

[Burns, Edward McNall and Philip Lee Ralph. *World Civilizations* (vol. III). Trans. Luo Jingguo et al. Beijing: Commercial, 1995.]

Conrad, Joseph. *A Personal Record.* New York: Harper, 1912.

Cuddon, J. A. ed. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (5th edition). Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.

丹皮尔：《科学史及其与哲学和宗教的关系》，李珩译。桂林：广西师范大学出版社，2001 年。

[Dampier, William Cecil. *A History of Science and Its Relations with Philosophy and Religion*. Trans. Li Heng. Guilin: Guangxi Normal UP, 2001.]

Draper, John William. *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*. New York: D. Appleton, 1875.

格兰特：《现实主义》，周发祥译。北京：昆仑出版社，1989 年。

[Grant, Damian. *Realism*. Trans. Zhou Faxiang. Beijing: Kunlun Publishing House, 1989.]

哈里森：《科学与宗教的领地》，张卜天译。北京：商务印书馆，2017 年。

[Harrison, Peter. *The Territories of Science and Religion*. Trans. Zhang Butian. Beijing: Commercial, 2017.]

Jameson, Fredric. "A Note on Literary Realism in Conclusion." *Adventures in Realism.* Ed. Matthew Beaumont. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2007. 261-271.

Ledger, Sally. "Naturalism: 'Dirt and horror pure and simple'." *Adventures in Realism.* 2007. 68-83.

Levine, George. "Literary Realism Reconsidered: 'The World in its length and breadth'." *Adventures in Realism.* 2007. 13-32.

李斯托威尔：《近代美学史评述》，蒋孔阳译。合肥：安徽教育出版社，2007 年。

[Listowel, William Francis Hare. *Modern Aesthetics: An Historical Introduction*. Trans. Jiang Kongyang. Hefei: Anhui Educational Publishing House, 2007.]

梅尔茨：《十九世纪欧洲思想史》（第一卷），周昌忠译。北京：商务印书馆，2016 年。

[Merz, John Theodore. *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* (Vol. I). Trans. Zhou Changzhong. Beijing: Commercial, 2016.]

门罗：《走向科学的美学》，石天曙、滕守尧译。北京：中国文联出版公司，1984 年。

[Monro, Thomas. *Toward Science in Aesthetics: Selected Essays by Thomas Munro*. Trans. Shi Tianshu

and Teng Shouyao. Beijing: China Federation of Literary and Art Circles Publishing House,
1984.]

罗素：《西方哲学史》（下册），马元德译。北京：商务印书馆，1997 年。

[Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy* (vol. II). Trans. Ma Yuande. Beijing: Commercial,
1997.]

普里戈金、斯唐热：《从混沌到有序——人与自然的新对话》，曾庆宏、沈小峰译。上海：上
海译文出版社，2005 年。

[Prigogine, Ilya and Isabelle Stenger. *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Trans.
Zeng Qinghong and Shen Xiaofeng. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation, 2005.]

Singley, Carol J. "American Literary Realism." *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism: The
Nineteenth Century*. Ed. M. A. R. Habib. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2013. 331-339.

丹纳："艺术品的本质"，傅雷译，《十九世纪西方美学名著选》（英法美卷），蒋孔阳编。上海：
复旦大学出版社，1990 年，第 461-475 页。

[Taine, Hippolyte Adolphe. "On the Nature of the Work of Art." Trans. Fu Lei. *Selections of the 19*[th]
Century Western Aesthetic Works (Vol. Br., Fr., & Am.). Ed. Jiang Kongyang. Shanghai: Fudan
UP, 1990. 461-475.]

——：《艺术哲学》，傅雷译。北京：人民文学出版社，1988 年。

[—. *The Philosophy of Art*. Trans. Fu Lei. Beijing: People's Literature, 1988.]

塔塔尔凯维奇：《西方六大美学观念史》，刘文谭译。上海：上海译文出版社，2006 年。

[Tatarkiewicz, Wladyslaw. *A History of Six Ideas*. Trans. Liu Wentan. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation,
2006.]

韦勒克：《近代文学批评史》（第四卷），杨自伍译。上海：上海译文出版社，2009 年。

[Wellek, René. *A History of Modern Criticism* (vol. IV). Trans. Yang Ziwu. Shanghai: Shanghai
Translation, 2009.]

——："文学研究中现实主义的概念"，高建为译，《文学思潮和文学运动的概念》，刘象愚编。
北京：中国社会科学出版社，1989 年，第 214-250 页。

[—. "The Concept of Realism in Literary Scholarship." Trans. Gao Jianwei. *The Concept of Literary
Trend of Thought and Literary Movement*. Ed. Liu Xiangyu. Beijing: China Social Sciences,
1989. 214-250.]

韦勒克、沃伦：《文学原理》，刘象愚等译。杭州：浙江人民出版社，2017 年。

[Wellek, René and Austin Warren. *Theory of Literature*. Trans. Liu Xiangyu et al. Hangzhou: Zhejiang
People's, 2017.]

重审嬉皮士运动：《雷切尔文件》中查尔斯伦理选择的"突转"

A Reexamination of the Hippie Movement: The Peripeteia of Charles' Ethical Choices in *The Rachel Papers*

郭国良（**Guo Guoliang**）　　杜兰兰（**Du Lanlan**）

内容摘要：20 世纪 60 年代末到 70 年代初，嬉皮士运动渐显颓态，英国作家马丁·艾米斯在小说《雷切尔文件》中从伦理角度对其进行了重新审视。小说以十九岁的查尔斯·海威在父子关系和恋爱关系中的伦理选择作为叙事线索，通过聚焦其伦理选择中的"突转"来透视青年一代在嬉皮士狂热消退之后的自我认识和道德反思，再现了青年一代在"自由"、"理想"和"反英雄"等问题上的觉悟历程。小说也由此肯定了伦理选择对于青年一代的特殊意义，以开放式结局暗示他们在"突转"之后仍将面临种种艰难的伦理选择，同时也对他们在伦理选择中能够获得的成长寄予期待。
关键词：马丁·艾米斯；《雷切尔文件》；伦理选择；突转；嬉皮士运动

作者简介：郭国良，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院教授、博士生导师，主要从事当代英国文学研究和文学翻译研究；杜兰兰，浙江大学外国语言文化与国际交流学院博士研究生，主要从事当代英国文学研究。

Title: A Reexamination of the Hippie Movement: The Peripeteia of Charles' Ethical Choices in *The Rachel Papers*
Abstract: In the late 1960s and early 1970s, the hippie movement began to show signs of decline, which Martin Amis reexamined from an ethical point of view in his novel *The Rachel Papers*. The novel takes 19-year-old Charles Highway's ethical choices in father-son relationship and love relationship as the narrative clues, and the "peripeteia" of his ethical choices as an indication of the young generation's progressive self-knowledge and moral reflection during the waning of the hippie craze. It depicts the young generation's gradual awareness of their ignorance of "freedom", "ideals" and "antiheros", and highlights the special significance of ethical choices to the youth. In its open ending, the novel anticipates more difficult ethical choices the young generation will inevitably face after the "peripeteia" and

also promising developments they can get by making these ethical choices.
Keywords: Martin Amis; *The Rachel Papers*; ethical choice; peripeteia; the Hippie Movement

Authors: Guo Guoliang is Professor and Ph.D. supervisor at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). His research interests are contemporary British literature and literary translation (Email: guoliangguo88@163.com); **Du Lanlan** is Ph.D. candidate at School of International Studies, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China). Her research interest is contemporary British literature (Email: dulanlan0309@163.com).

20 世纪 60 年代，嬉皮士运动作为战后青年文化的表现形式之一表达了年轻人打破现实束缚、追求理想生活的美好愿望。但是这场运动在中后期逐渐偏离了它的初衷，对自由的向往演变为混乱，对性爱的表达演变为纵欲，对精神的解放演变为滥用毒品，对主流文化的抗议演变为暴力冲突和内部分化。70 年代，这一运动进入尾声，一些青年知识分子开始以更加冷静的态度对其进行重新审视。英国当代作家马丁·艾米斯正是其中之一。在其处女作、毛姆文学奖获奖小说《雷切尔文件》（*The Rachel Papers*，1973）中他刻画了嬉皮士运动影响下的英国社会生活场景，塑造了一个在恋爱中历经激情、疯狂之后逐渐产生怀疑和失望、最终归于平淡的年轻人查尔斯·海威的形象，以此作为整个 60 年代及 70 年代早期社会状况和青年群体状态的缩影，正如有学者指出的那样，"艾米斯显然将查尔斯的状况定义为他这一代的通病，而不仅仅是个人的失败"（Brooks 10）。然而该小说的价值并不仅仅在于针砭时弊，还在于它为重审嬉皮士运动打开了一个独特的视角——伦理视角。小说以查尔斯的两个伦理选择作为贯穿始终的两条叙事线索，从伦理现象入手来解析文化问题，因而其思想深度得以超越社会批判而直达人类道德和灵魂层面。有鉴于此，使用文学伦理学批评的方法对该作品进行整体上的把握将有助于揭开其纷繁表象之下的深刻内涵。

一、历史的伦理现场：伦理选择的"突转"与自我的伦理"发现"

"伦理选择"作为文学伦理学批评的核心术语，"是人择善弃恶而做一个有道德的人的途径，这有助于我们理解人的伦理化过程"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》280）。更具体地说，它"指的是人类通过自然选择获得人的形式之后所要经历的获取人的本质的过程〔……〕经过伦理选择，人才有了善恶的观念，才有了人性，才最终成为伦理的人。因此，伦理选择是关于如何做人的选择，是人通过教诲和学习而做一个有道德的人的过程"（聂珍钊，"文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构"73）。因此，"伦理选择"

中天然蕴含着一种"方向性"和"变化性"。人类作为一个整体所经历的伦理化进程具有前进性，这是人类进化中不可阻挡的趋势。然而，每个具体的伦理选择过程因其选择主体和对象的特殊性、选择语境的复杂性，往往呈现出更多的不确定性和不稳定性。文学伦理学批评就是"从历史发展的观点考察文学，用伦理的观点解释处于不同时间段上的文学，从而解决在不同伦理环境和伦理语境中理解文学时可能出现的巨大差异性"（Nie, "Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory" 191），因此必须"回到历史的伦理现场"，"寻找文学产生的客观伦理原因并解释其何以成立"，而不是"从今天的道德立场简单地对历史的文学进行好与坏的道德价值判断"（聂珍钊，"文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语" 14），在很大程度上正是对伦理选择中的特殊性和复杂性的关照。

《雷切尔文件》正是关注到了这种特殊性和复杂性：查尔斯在与父亲戈登、与女友雷切尔关系中所做出的两个伦理选择先后发生了出人意料的"突转"。正如小说中所说，"转折点，cognitio 或者 anagnorisis 和所谓的'最低点'相比，其实也强不了多少"（马丁·艾米斯 143）[1]，这些"突转"使形势由盛转衰、急转直下，也使查尔斯暴露出他的道德缺陷。更重要的是，小说并未急于对这种"突转"行为进行批评，而是以查尔斯在二十岁生日即将到来的前夜回顾他在过去三个月所写下的日记的形式，还原了"突转"的伦理现场，回溯了"突转"从缘起到发生的整个过程中查尔斯自我认识的转变，探讨了"突转"行为背后潜在的伦理价值。

人如何认识自我是伦理学的基本议题之一。早在古希腊时期，德尔菲神庙上的箴言"认识你自己"（"Know thyself"）就被苏格拉底用于论证美德对于人的重要性。他在与雅典贵族青年阿尔基比亚德的对话中清晰地展现了从"认识你自己"到"认识你自己的灵魂"再到"培养你自己的美德"的逻辑推演。他首先设法使阿尔基比亚德领悟到人只有先认识自己，才能避免失败，又因为"人除了是他的灵魂，不是其他任何东西"（柏拉图 473），所以"我们应当认识我们自己，这条戒命的意思是：我们应当认识我们的灵魂"（柏拉图 474）。在取得共识之后，苏格拉底进一步指出"如果灵魂要认识它自己，它必须看着灵魂，尤其是看那个能使灵魂良好地产生智慧的区域，看其他与灵魂相同的东西"（柏拉图 477-478）。在此基础上，苏格拉底得出结论："认识你自己"的途径就是要看到"发生认识和理解"的神圣的地方（柏拉图 478），即通过审视自己对万事万物和他人的认识，人才能够辨别好坏并懂得"自制"（柏拉图 481），最终获得使自己更加成功的美德。苏格拉底对"认识你自己"的解读可以说开启了西方哲学对人与自我之间的关系进行伦理学探源和追问的传统。

1　本文有关《雷切尔文件》的引文均出自 马丁·艾米斯：《雷切尔文件》，李尧译（上海：上海译文出版社，2016 年），下文只标注页码，不再一一说明。

在《雷切尔文件》中，"认识你自己"这一古老命题被演绎为查尔斯的自我"发现"。苏格拉底根据人对自我的认识程度将"不懂的人"分为"知道自己不懂的人"、"不知道自己不懂的人"、"不知道自己不懂但认为自己懂的人"，其中最后一类人是"犯错误的人"，我们行动中的错误都是由这种无知所引起（柏拉图 453-454），因此这种无知是"一种最可耻的愚蠢"（柏拉图 454）。但是苏格拉底也承认人对自我的认识是一个从"不懂"到"懂"的渐进的过程："在过去某个时候，你不懂你现在懂得的事情"（柏拉图 435）。而获得自我认识的途径有两条：一是"有人教你"；二是"自己发现"（柏拉图 440）。在《雷切尔文件》中，第一条途径被暂时切断了：查尔斯在伦敦求学的经历被描绘成一出闹剧，唯一想要与他进行精神交流的教师贝拉米先生只得到查尔斯的讥讽和蔑视。因此，查尔斯的自我认识主要是通过"自己发现"。他和与苏格拉底对话的青年阿尔基比亚德一样，都是不知道自己不懂但认为自己懂的人，阿尔基比亚德在苏格拉底的精神助产术下终于发现自己对"公正"的无知，而查尔斯在与自我的对话中终于发现自己对"自由"、"理想"和"反英雄"的无知以及"自制"作为一种美德的意义所在。

正是这些内部的伦理"发现"最终促使查尔斯在进行伦理选择时发生"突转"。亚里士多德将戏剧中的"突转"定义为"行动按照我们所说的原则转向相反的方面"、将"发现"定义为"从不知到知的转变"（亚里士多德 43），并指出两者之间存在"此前彼后"或"互为因果"（亚里士多德 42）的关系。在《雷切尔文件》中，查尔斯伦理选择的"突转"发生于他的伦理"发现"之后，是他的伦理"发现"之果。从向内发现自我到向外重审嬉皮士运动，再到伦理选择的"突转"，小说将查尔斯伦理认知的渐变外化为戏剧性的伦理行动的突转，由此揭示了嬉皮士运动后期青年一代的道德反思和心灵震撼。

二、仇恨、反抗与"突转"：父子关系中查尔斯的伦理选择

小说中查尔斯面临的第一个伦理选择来自于岌岌可危的父子关系。查尔斯出生于中产阶级家庭，父亲戈登为他提供了优渥的生活条件。然而，查尔斯直言自己对父亲怀有仇恨，甚至"真想拿起手头任何东西打那个混蛋"（67），但他并未说明这种仇恨的具体原因，而是将其归结为"只是对枯燥无味的家庭环境做出的情绪上的反应"，因为"现如今，一个小伙子总得有点什么东西激发他的热情"（6）。事实上，查尔斯之所以选择将"仇恨"作为他与父亲之间伦理关系的感情基调，至少存在以下两个原因。

首先，父亲戈登在家庭中拥有绝对的威严。他对待查尔斯像对待自己的下属，仅允许查尔斯每周日下午四点到五点之间进入他的书房"商量事情、请求帮助或者鸣冤叫屈"（4）。即使在查尔斯动身前往伦敦的临别之际，他的言谈中也透露着"敌意"和"冷淡"，他奚落查尔斯的物品是"破烂玩意

儿"（4），对其考上牛津大学的理想也不屑一顾。这样的父子相处模式令查尔斯心生怨恨。他发现父亲尤其热衷于保养身体，"满脑子想的都是延年益寿的事"（7），因此他反抗父亲的方式就是选择被中产阶级认为"对身体有害"（7）的生活方式，参加嬉皮士派对，模仿"嬉皮士的吸法"（53）抽大麻烟、沉溺于致幻剂和性乱交组成的世界中。查尔斯的这种选择不乏幼稚荒唐之处，然而正如学者詹姆斯·迪德里克所说："查尔斯最私密的思想和行为从来都不完全是他自己的，因为它们是由一种文化逻辑所塑造的，这种文化逻辑甚至渗透到人们的潜意识中"（Diedrick 22），查尔斯对父亲的仇恨实际指向了战后英国社会不断涌现的青年文化潮流与中产阶级主流价值观之间的矛盾与对立。英国文化学者认为前者是"存在于某个更大的文化网络中的具有更小的、更本地化和差异化结构的子集"，因此又称其为"亚文化"或"次文化"（subculture），而其所属的文化被称为"父文化"或"家长文化"（parent culture）（Clarke, John, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson and Brian Roberts 6）。两种文化之间存在着一种"父与子"的伦理关系。一方面，如同查尔斯和父亲在血缘和生活空间上存在无可否认的联结，"亚文化"和"父文化"也产生于同一社会中，具有某些相同的物质环境和历史条件，并在一定程度上分享彼此的文化。另一方面，正如父亲和查尔斯在家庭秩序中居于不同地位，"父文化"和"亚文化"在文化权力的范围内也存在一种统治和从属的等级差异。这种差异带来的不平等促使亚文化的拥护者像查尔斯一样选择了反抗的道路。嬉皮士运动正是这种选择的极端表现，它选择通过抛弃中产阶级赖以生存的经济基础和价值观体系来瓦解"父文化"的专制地位，为此"它拒绝绝对真理和理性主义，拒绝接受各种形式的精神信仰，拒绝物质主义和资本主义，背离了人际关系和生活安排的文化规范"（MacFarlane 4）。嬉皮士的这种集体选择与查尔斯的个人选择一样，本质上都是对"父文化"伦理地位的挑战和对父权的争夺。

其次，正如学者柯克·克纳特（Kirk Curnutt）所观察到的那样："整个20世纪70年代，青少年对社会权威的反抗是一个普遍存在的主题。然而，在同时代小说中，年轻人的叛逆倾向并不是由于成人权威的压制，而是由于成人权威的缺乏"（Curnutt 95），查尔斯对父亲的仇恨还源于后者在家庭伦理责任中的缺席。父亲表面上与母亲相敬如宾，但是在外早已有了情妇，他与母亲的婚姻只不过是维持其良好名誉和形象的幌子。查尔斯目睹母亲为家庭所做出的牺牲、听闻母亲所受到的屈辱，同时不断感受到父亲伦理责任的缺失："为什么周末他本该和家人待在一起，却常常突然之间、义无反顾地去陪别的孩子"（8）。小说中的这些情节折射出西方传统社会在社区、教会、学校、家庭等机构和场所中树立的道德权威在战后暴露出种种缺陷，无法继续发挥有效的规范和表率作用，青年一代随之对整个社会道德体系产生质疑。因此有批评者认为"查尔斯体现了20世纪晚期个体发现自己正在超越性的道德权

威的缺失中挣扎的过程"（Brooks 21）。在这种挣扎中，查尔斯受到时代潮流的鼓舞，做出了揭发父亲不道德行为、向父亲宣战的伦理选择，例如他对父亲的情妇出言不逊，以教育弟弟为借口直指父亲中产阶级道德观的虚伪性，在日记中指控父亲为"背叛妻子"、"玩弄女性"的"老色鬼"（129），并暗中写下一封"声讨父亲的檄文"（122）。可以预料到的是，这极有可能导致他作为儿子的伦理身份的瓦解和他与父亲之间伦理关系的决裂。

然而小说中查尔斯最终却走上了截然相反的回归中产阶级家庭的道路。在小说的最后一部分，查尔斯带着已经完成的《致父亲的信》走进书房，却在与父亲短暂对峙后承认父亲的话"听起来很有道理"（221），并在离开后将信扔进了废纸篓。查尔斯所有的仇恨在这一刻"突然"烟消云散。这样一种看似陡然的"突转"显然不是仅凭最后父亲寥寥数语的说服力就能够产生的，小说引导读者返回到文本中对潜藏的细节进行挖掘：查尔斯这一伦理选择的"突转"背后究竟隐藏着他在自我认识上的怎样一种发现和改变？

这种自我的发现首先表现为查尔斯在思想上对青年文化运动所宣扬的关于"自由"的新理念产生了动摇。导火线是家庭聚会上牛津大学教授赫伯特和记者威利就青年问题所发生的一次争论。赫伯特对青年文化运动中的激进行为大加赞赏，查尔斯也随声附和，发表了一番自以为是的演讲。然而威利一语中的："你难道不认为人既需要自我表现，又需要自我克制，包括情感、欲望的自我压抑吗？"（131）威利指明了人在做出选择时所应考虑的道德义务和道德责任，这既让赫伯特无言以对，也让查尔斯陷入到自我的拷问中。小说通过描写查尔斯的身体反应使读者间接感受到这一事件对他造成的巨大冲击："又是一个无法安眠的夜晚。我的床像过山车，脑子就像线路混乱的接线总机〔……〕心灵之眼仿佛戴了一副隐形眼镜，看到的都是以密码形式出现的符号〔……〕我看书一直到早晨七点〔……〕浑身刺痛，像被人剥了皮"（131-132）。小说以这种隐晦的手法展现了查尔斯在思想上的"脱胎换骨"。因此，最后在书房中，当父亲谈及与母亲的婚姻时提到："任何长期的关系都需要相互妥协让步"（221），查尔斯并未和往常一样感觉到虚伪和愤怒，而是产生了某种程度上的认同，因为他已经开始觉察到"年轻人最容易癫癫狂狂做出的错事之一就是，总感觉到有一种力量压迫他去破坏，去颠覆，去嘲笑老年人瞻前顾后，自己做什么事情也不愿意妥协"（221）。小说借此展示了青年一代如何通过痛苦的自我否定完成自我认识上的升华，进而调整自我伦理选择方向的过程。

除此以外，查尔斯还发现自己无法真正摆脱对阶级上升的追求，因此无法摆脱对父亲所提供的物质和社会资源的依赖。他一心要考牛津大学，但正如父亲所说，这只是"蛋糕上面那层酥皮"（4），他真正的野心是有朝一日在批评界成为与利维斯、特里林等著名学者比肩的"查尔斯·海威爵士教授"（95）。"爵士"一说源于现代英国的授勋和嘉奖制度。自 1917 年乔治五世

时期开始，英国皇室每年会在平民中选拔对国家和社会或某一专业领域做出卓越贡献的人士，由国王颁发不列颠帝国勋章，其中的佼佼者更会被授予"爵士"头衔。在阶级社会中，勋章和头衔不仅代表着荣誉，还被看作是进入上流社会的标志。查尔斯视其为成功的象征，颇具讽刺意味的是，这一情节与1965年嬉皮士精神领袖、英国摇滚乐队"披头士"成员约翰·列侬为了反对英国政府干涉尼日利亚内政以及在越南问题上与美国沆瀣一气而公然退回勋章的举动形成了鲜明对比。小说对查尔斯受名利牵绊、无法获得自由的刻画还隐藏在一个意象之中。查尔斯常向父亲和他的情妇瓦妮莎居住的公寓打匿名电话，以捉弄他们为乐。在牛津大学面试之前，查尔斯又给父亲打去电话，但是这次的目的却是想从父亲那里打探他的考试成绩，并通过瓦妮莎了解面试官的情况。因此，查尔斯最终选择了将"电话"用作他谋求名利的工具而非反抗父亲的武器，这也预示着他在父子关系中的伦理选择将发生"突转"。当查尔斯最后在书房中对自己能否获得牛津大学奖学金表示担忧时，父亲许诺"可以给老赫伯特爵士打个电话"（220），他对父亲的仇恨情绪和反抗意志立刻土崩瓦解。此时查尔斯的伦理选择正是对嬉皮士运动后期大批青年认识到自己无法获得真正的自由、选择重返主流社会的真实写照。

由此，查尔斯发现了自己在"自由"理念上的无知：一方面，他对"自由"的理解是自私的；另一方面，他对"自由"的追求是虚假的。这种发现使得他在父子关系中的伦理选择发生突转：他对父亲的态度从长期的仇恨、对抗转向认同与和解。小说对这一"突转"并没有进行简单的"好"或"坏"的道德判断，而是将其视为一个充满不确定性的新的起点。小说结尾处，查尔斯陷入思考："我能成为一个什么样的人呢？"（224）查尔斯是否会在选择回归中产阶级家庭后再次选择逃离？小说并未给出明确的答案，只是用了一个查尔斯给钢笔灌满墨水、继续进行写作的意象来隐喻一种"待选择"的状态。这也预示着青年一代只有在不断的伦理选择以及相伴而生的伦理思考中才能更好地认识自我、获得成长。

三、理想主义与"突转"：恋爱关系中查尔斯的伦理选择

除了父子关系的演变以外，查尔斯与雷切尔之间恋情的发展也构成了一条完整的叙事线索。小说中，两人历经波折终于确立了稳定的恋爱关系，查尔斯也做出了不再到处寻欢作乐的伦理选择，因为那些都只是"随便玩儿"，只有雷切尔是他的"初恋"（175）。然而和父子关系中查尔斯的伦理选择发生了"突转"一样，查尔斯的这一选择随后也发生了"突然"的转变：他一边与旧情人格洛丽亚偷情，一边挑逗旧时伙伴科科，最终宁愿受到始乱终弃的道德指控、承认自己是"懦夫、臭狗屎、不诚实的人"，也要写下宣布分手的"给雷切尔的信"（217）。对此，艾米斯在小说中借查尔斯之口用现代喜剧的进化来加以解释："关于结构，自从莎士比亚时代，喜剧有了很大的

发展〔……〕最后的接吻不再有什么象征意义，其乐融融的婚礼也不再是终成眷属、心满意足的画面〔……〕我们已经形成了一种习惯，越来越超越了总是令人鼓舞的前景，看到的都是变坏了的关系、结果"（151）。然而事实上，这种"突转"并不仅仅只是一种创作手法上的革新，它还指向了后现代社会中人们在经验和认知上发生的改变。正如加文·基尔克斯所说，它是"一种复杂的混合形式，一种更有利于后现代不稳定性的修正主义模式"（Keulks 128），它将"皆大欢喜"的喜剧结尾突然逆转成"变坏了的关系、结果"，旨在打破读者的幻梦、使他们认识到艺术的虚构性以及现实的多变性和不可预料性，进而发现自己的无知。具体到《雷切尔文件》中，在嬉皮士运动的背景下，查尔斯与雷切尔爱情的"突转"指向的是嬉皮士运动后期理想主义的幻灭，以及由此引发的年轻一代对自我理想的检视。

学者蒂莫西·米勒曾对早期嬉皮士的理想主义进行详细论述。早期嬉皮士被称为"爱的一代，他们是和平、甜蜜、鲜花、光明、乐观一族"（Miller 88），然而米勒指出，尽管在他们看来，"爱是解决困扰世界的众多问题的唯一答案。实践爱是人类社会的唯一途径，是真正解决这个世界上看似棘手的疾病的唯一途径"，但实际上"嬉皮士很难实现完美的爱。毕竟他们也是人，是有缺陷的"（Miller 89）。嬉皮士"爱之夏"运动的衰落正印证了这一点。1967年夏天，大约十万名来自世界各地的年轻人涌入美国旧金山的海特阿什伯利和金门公园，开始了一场轰轰烈烈的艺术狂欢。他们高喊"爱与和平"，尽情享受摇滚乐队的演出，然而很快就暴露出过度商业化、高犯罪率、毒品交易等问题。两年后在美国加州奥塔蒙特举行的滚石乐队演唱会上，观众中不断出现打斗，随着一位年轻黑人被负责安保工作的"地狱天使"党刺死，"爱之夏"终于走到尽头。1973年，嬉皮士们以一场声势浩大的"爱之夏之死"游行宣告了运动的失败，也正是在这一年，《雷切尔文件》在英国出版。

与现实中嬉皮士理想主义的挫败相呼应，《雷切尔文件》也展现了青年人如何在成长过程中发现自我对"理想"的无知。雷切尔是查尔斯"理想"的化身。她举止稳重优雅，父亲是巴黎画家，还曾经参加过西班牙内战，她的美国男友的存在更使她显得高不可攀。然而，在与雷切尔的交往中，查尔斯逐渐发现雷切尔见解平庸、头脑愚钝，对布莱克诗作的奥妙一无所知却对格雷诗中"保守的陈词滥调"（75）兴致盎然，对女性解放和贫富差距等社会问题的认识也很浅薄，就连所谓的 "画家父亲"也只不过是雷切尔为了虚荣而编造出的谎言。查尔斯不得不承认她"看起来很迷人，只是没有内涵，没有重量"（180）。然而小说对这种失望情绪并没有进行过多渲染，查尔斯对雷切尔的心理落差只是隐隐散落在字里行间，直到两人关系到达顶峰——期盼中的同居的"美好的时光"（169），艾米斯才最终昭示出查尔斯爱情理想主义的幻灭，一如嬉皮士运动在发展时期已经显露出种种问题的迹象却不为人所察觉，最终在集体的狂欢高潮中戛然而止。

查尔斯声称他在与雷切尔同居的几天时间里发现了"三件重要的事情"（181）：雷切尔内裤上沾有污秽、雷切尔出于焦虑而尿床和雷切尔鼻子上长出了几个"小疙瘩"。这些发现使他无法忍受，进而选择与雷切尔分手。这种看似荒诞的"突转"只不过是查尔斯在前述一系列"发现"的累积之下产生的心理渐变的结果，是查尔斯爱情理想主义幻灭、觉悟到自我的无知的最终表现。与现实中具有表演性质的嬉皮士死亡大游行一样，艾米斯也采用了这种戏剧化的方式作为向理想主义和无知的自我告别的仪式。

与此同时，小说中的其他细节也隐含了对查尔斯理想主义幻灭的暗示，如查尔斯为了追求雷切尔而特意编写了一份详细的"雷切尔文件"作为行动指南，然而当他将文件中的方法付诸行践时，却发现总是事与愿违；又如查尔斯跟随雷切尔去探望里斯大妈，目睹了工人阶级生活环境的窘迫后，"心里充满清教徒式的内疚"，却又深感"对社会制度本身无能为力"（83）；再如查尔斯在家庭聚会结束后带雷切尔来到屋前的小树林，想要找寻"童年的时光"（133），却只发现灌木丛中充斥着不堪入目的垃圾，只得悻悻而归。事实上，小说从开头部分查尔斯的自我介绍开始就弥漫着一种"名不符实"的失望情绪。"形容憔悴的嬉皮士被查出过量吸毒；凶蛮的搭顺风车之流会揪下生活动荡不安的同性恋者的帽子、花冠，又十分凶残地踩在脚底"（2），艾米斯用戏谑的语言传达出嬉皮士运动后期理想主义的幻灭给人带来的痛苦和无力感，也讽刺了理想主义者永远无法抵达的乌托邦幻境。

小说中查尔斯最终选择与雷切尔分手，转而投向远在异国的科科。然而查尔斯对科科的认识仅仅停留在两年前的一次浪漫回忆，他对科科信中提到的关于未来的"也许之国"（60）产生好奇，寄希望于在科科这里延续他在雷切尔处破灭的理想主义，因此，查尔斯爱情的"突转"也转向了一种"悬而未决"。小说结尾处用查尔斯小说中人物"下巴上那个几乎看不见的小包"（225）暗示了多种可能性的存在。那到底是不祥的疾病前兆还是青春期的荷尔蒙使然？这种对确定性的搁置与拖延再一次发出了青年一代未来仍将面临诸多伦理选择并在其中经受磨炼的预言。

四、诺尔曼"反英雄"形象的倒塌与查尔斯伦理选择的"突转"

在查尔斯两次伦理选择的过程中还出现了一个关键性的诱因，即查尔斯通过对姐夫诺尔曼形象的建构、解构和重构认识到自己的无知，从而进一步冷却了自我对于青年文化运动的盲目冲动和热情。如果说父亲和雷切尔主要通过引发查尔斯对"自由"和"理想"等抽象概念的思考来促使他发现自我的伦理缺失，诺尔曼则为查尔斯提供了一双通过看见他人来照见自己的一双"瞳孔"。

"瞳孔"是苏格拉底向阿尔基比亚德解释如何"认识你自己"时所使用的一个比喻。苏格拉底指出："当一个人看着一只眼睛的时候，他的脸也在

眼睛中显现，就像看着一面镜子。我们称它为'瞳孔'，因为它是看着它的这个人的小模型"，因此，"如果一只眼睛要看它自身，它必须看一只眼睛"、"如果灵魂要认识它自己，它必须看着灵魂"（柏拉图 477）。"瞳孔"之喻指明了认识过程中他人对自我的映射作用：人对他人的判断和评价最终反映和投射出的是真实的自我，换言之，人对他人的认识可以帮助人形成对自我的认识。在《雷切尔文件》中，查尔斯对诺尔曼的认识就使他发现自我对"反英雄"的无知。

"反英雄"（anti-hero）与"英雄"（hero）相对，"标志着个人主义思想的张扬、传统道德价值体系的衰微和人们对理想信念的质疑"（王岚 46）。他们地位低下，"带有琐碎的生存焦虑"、"通常具有身体缺陷"，"日常生活充满怪诞和混乱"（Furst, Lilian R. and James D. Wilson 6），然而他们往往将反叛作为实现社会公平正义的手段，仍然具有令人钦佩的要素。"反英雄"崛起于现代社会，在遭受了两次世界大战的重创后，人们对"英雄理想"（the heroic ideal）丧失了信心，他们选择"反英雄"作为他们"对于 20 世纪的意识的中心"，认为它"推动了与这个世纪有关的激进的视野，以及反讽、秩序和极度的绝望"（Hassan 55）。其中，嬉皮士精神无疑是二十世纪"反英雄"气质的集中体现。嬉皮士离经叛道的生活方式与他们对民权的争取、对反战的呼吁、对资本主义的抵制等融合在一起，同时具备了不被当时主流承认和自身具有正当性这样两大"反英雄"特征。

在这种情况下，20 世纪 60 年代，宣扬英雄主义的文学形式被认为已经过时，"悲剧（在战后时代）成为一种不合时宜的体裁〔……〕，取而代之的是形而上学的闹剧，一种古典悲剧与喜剧的现代混合体，这种体裁无法使用英雄"（Furst, Lilian R. and James D. Wilson 7）。以黑色幽默小说闻名的艾米斯显然深谙此道，并且给出了更加具体的阐述："简而言之，文学的最初主人公是神；后来，他们成了半神；再后来，他们成了国王、将军、绝妙的情人，同时又是超人、凡人、大凡人；最终他们变成了普通人〔……〕如今，我们的主人公远低于他们的创造者：他们是反英雄、非英雄、次英雄"（Amis 17）。他在《雷切尔文件》中就首先假借查尔斯之手建构了诺尔曼这样一个极具时代气息的"反英雄"，进而对这一形象进行解构，最后在"利己主义者"的重构中完成了查尔斯自我认识的更新。

诺尔曼·恩特威斯尔来自下层阶级，他举止粗俗，缺少教育，因此受到戈登夫妇的鄙薄。查尔斯对其"反英雄"形象的建构主要基于自我对他者的不可靠想象。在查尔斯姐姐的婚礼上，父亲戈登羞辱了诺尔曼的家庭出身，查尔斯对诺尔曼的反应进行了听觉想象，先是"听见"诺尔曼"吓人的尖叫声"（39），继而"听见"诺尔曼反复朗诵一首粗俗的、充满挑衅之意的诗歌，间或"听见"稀稀拉拉的掌声，然后"听见"父亲愤而离席的脚步声和开门、关门声，最后"听见"诺尔曼哈哈大笑的胜利之声。此时在查尔斯的想象中，

诺尔曼俨然成为一个敢于反抗阶级偏见和主流价值观的斗士。再如查尔斯无意间"听"到姐姐怒斥诺尔曼为"刽子手"（54），他感到"很兴奋"（55），并据此对诺尔曼的政治立场做出种种揣测，将其想象为一个不惜采取极端行为表达政治观点的激进分子："这里肯定有什么很危险的东西，我觉得应该弄清楚那到底是什么东西"（63），诺尔曼的"反英雄"形象由此衍生出更多的面向。

然而极具讽刺意味的是，查尔斯很快就发现"刽子手"之说不过是指诺尔曼要求姐姐堕胎，但他仍未放弃对诺尔曼"反英雄"形象的建构。他极力寻找诺尔曼要求堕胎的原因，试图证明诺尔曼只是崇尚自由、不想受到约束。当他最终得知诺尔曼此举只是为了满足自己的性需求时，"反英雄"形象瞬间轰然倒塌，重构出来的是一个自私而又残忍的"利己主义者"。查尔斯投射在诺尔曼身上的"反英雄"情结被彻底粉碎，他感受到巨大的失落，同时也陷入到深深的自我怀疑中："难道这就是他不想要孩子的唯一理由吗？我一直认为倘若这样，真是太令人作呕了。我做梦也没有想到，这竟然是真的。诺尔曼，那么狂放无羁，充满激情。难道我们都是这样容易激动、粗鲁的人吗？"（212）事实上，查尔斯的种种举动早已透露出他的"伪嬉皮士"精神和"真利己主义者"倾向。如他为妈妈和姐姐受家庭所累、无法实现个人价值而感到惋惜，在和雷切尔讨论女性问题时也摆出一副女性主义者的姿态，但他对妈妈、姐姐身体充满肉欲的描述以及他关于"性玩具"雷切尔的梦境无不显示出他对女性的物化。再如他阅读大量文学作品、对各种经典侃侃而谈，然而他写下的评论文章不过是对"原材料"的抄袭、肢解和拼凑。正是诺尔曼"反英雄"形象的倒塌使他终于不再自欺欺人，接受自己作为利己主义者的"本来面目"（64），这也正是促使他在两次伦理选择中都进行"突转"的又一深层动因。

在小说最后，查尔斯参加了牛津大学的面试，面试官"真正的嬉皮士"诺德博士对他"为了达到自己的目的"，"粗暴地"（216）对待文学的功利性做法进行了严厉批评，但诺德仍然接收查尔斯进入牛津大学，因为"如果我不收，别人也会收，那只能更糟"（216）。与此同时诺德警告他不要再玩弄文学，"只去读诗，然后弄明白你是否喜欢，为什么喜欢"（216）。正如查尔斯在两次伦理选择中的"突转"都指向一种不确定性，艾米斯在这里再一次同时留下了希望和悬念。查尔斯未来在牛津大学的伦理选择将决定他的道德走向，一如嬉皮士运动失败后青年一代所做出的伦理选择将关系到他们的价值观形塑。伦理选择由此成为青年成长过程中必不可少的试金石、里程碑和转折点。

概而论之，艾米斯在《雷切尔文件》中回答了两个与伦理选择有关的问题，分别是"伦理选择突转的原因"和"伦理选择对于青年成长的意义"。

在第一个问题上，艾米斯以查尔斯在父子关系和恋爱关系中伦理选择的"突转"为叙事线索，以查尔斯对姐夫诺尔曼形象的建构、解构和重构为伦理选择"突转"的隐性进程，引导读者回到历史的伦理现场，对"突转"行为背后的原因进行挖掘，捕捉到查尔斯在认识自我的伦理进化过程中从"无知"到"知"、从"自以为懂"到"发现自己不懂"的变化轨迹。小说以此影射 20 世纪六、七十年代整个中产阶级青年群体的境遇，展示出青年一代在嬉皮士运动中逐渐产生的道德反思和思想波动。在第二个问题上，小说指出伦理选择是青年获得成长的必由之路。在经历自我否定、自我调整的"突转"之后，青年一代仍将必须面对更多艰难的伦理选择，小说在对此不免感到担忧的同时也抱以期待，开放式的结尾为青年的未来提供了广阔的空间和无限的可能，彰显了艾米斯作为一名严肃作家和知识分子的伦理关怀。在青年文化继续向多元化发展的今天，《雷切尔文件》中反映出来的青年的伦理选择问题仍然具有重要的现实意义和借鉴价值。

Works Cited

Amis, Martin. "Saul Bellow and the Moronic Inferno." *The Moronic Inferno and Other Visits to America*. New York: Penguin, 1987.17-24.

马丁·艾米斯：《雷切尔文件》，李尧译。上海：上海译文出版社，2016 年。

[Amis, Martin. *The Rachel Papers*. Trans. Li Yao. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House, 2016.]

亚里士多德：《诗学》，罗念生译。上海：上海人民出版社，2006 年。

[Aristotle. *The Poetics*. Trans. Luo Niansheng. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2006.]

Brooks, Neil. "'My Heart Really Goes Out to Me': The Self-indulgent Highway to Adulthood in The Rachel Papers." *Martin Amis: Postmodernism and Beyond*. Ed. Gavin Keulks. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. 9-21.

Clarke, John, Stuart Hall, Tony Jefferson and Brian Roberts. "Subcultures, Cultures and Class." *Resistance through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain*. Eds. Stuart Hall and Tony Jefferson. Oxon: Routledge, 2014. 3-59.

Curnutt, Kirk. "Teenage Wasteland: Coming of Age Novels in the 1980s and 1990s." *Critique*, 43.1 (Fall 2001): 93-112.

Diedrick, James. *Understanding Martin Amis*. Columbia, South Carolina: U of South Carolina P, 1995.

Furst, Lilian R. and James D. Wilson. "Editor's Comments." *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (Special Journal Issue) 9 (Spring 1976): 5-9.

Hassan, Ihab. "The Anti-Hero in Modern British and American Fiction." *Rumors of Change*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama P, 1995. 55-67.

Keulks, Gavin. *Father and Son: Kingsley Amis, Martin Amis, and the British Novel since 1950*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003.

MacFarlane, Scott. *The Hippie Narrative: A Literary Perspective on the Counterculture*. Jefferson, North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., 2007.

Miller, Timothy S. *The Hippies and American Values*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 2011.

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

聂珍钊："文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语"，《外国文学研究》 1（2010）：12-22.

[Nie Zhenzhao. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2010): 12-22.]

——：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年。

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

——："文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构"，《中国社会科学》10（2020）：71-92+205-206。

[—. "Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Social Sciences in China*10 (2020): 71-92+205-206.]

柏拉图："阿尔基比亚德上篇"，《柏拉图全集》（增订版）下卷，王晓朝译。北京：人民出版社，2018 年，431-482 页。

[Plato. "Alcibiades I." *Collections of Plato* (the Revised and Enlarged Edition) VolumeII.Trans. Wang Xiaochao. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2018: 431-482.]

王岚："反英雄"，《外国文学》4（2005）：46-51。

[Wang Lan. "Anti-hero." *Foreign Literature* 4 (2005): 46-51.]

托马斯·沃尔夫小说中南方流放者伦理身份建构：以《天使，望故乡》与《时间与河流》为例

The Construction of the Protagonist's Ethical Identity as a Southern Exile in Thomas Wolfe's Novels: A Case Study of *Look Homeward, Angel* and *Of Time and the River*

吴瑾瑾（**Wu Jinjin**）　　侯月华（**Hou Yuehua**）

内容摘要：作为一位美国南方文艺复兴时期的重要作家，沃尔夫的南方作家身份一直颇受争议，其作品的南方性值得考究。自青年时期离开南方，托马斯·沃尔夫一直行走在流放旅途，这种流放意识充分体现在他的两部自传式小说《天使，望故乡》和《时间与河流》中。将主人公尤金·甘特的成长历程置入 20 世纪初美国社会伦理环境下，返回文本发生的历史现场，审视尤金成长中经历的不同社会伦理环境，可以发现，美国南方的保守落后、日益疏离的社区关系以及尤金畸形扭曲的家庭伦理关系带来的伦理困境令尤金决心离乡远行，踏上自我流放旅程。在流放途中，尤金先后经历了美国北方主流文化和欧洲文化对他南方伦理身份的冲击。这些伦理困境带来的自我矛盾冲突导致尤金内在自我分裂，被迫在各种伦理困境中做出伦理选择，以整合分裂自我，继续其流放者伦理身份的建构旅程。沃尔夫的作品带有典型的南方文化烙印，尤金所代表的南方流放者形象蕴涵着重要的伦理价值和身份政治意义，对处于不同文化语境和历史场域的当代人伦理身份建构具有现实关照意义和有益启示。

关键词：托马斯·沃尔夫；文学伦理学批评；美国南方文学；流放者形象；伦理身份建构

Title: The Construction of the Protagonist's Ethical Identity as a Southern Exile in

Thomas Wolfe's Novels: A Case Study of *Look Homeward, Angel* and *Of Time and the River*

Abstract: As a Southern writer emerging from American Southern Renascence, Thomas Wolfe's identity as a Southern writer has always been controversial. The Southern characteristic of his literary works is worthy of further examination. Since leaving the South in his youth, Wolfe has embarked on a journey of exile. This consciousness of a Southern exile is fully reflected in his two autobiographical novels *Look Homeward, Angel* and *Of Time and the River*. Through positioning the growth of the protagonist Eugene Gant into the ethical environment of the American society in the early 20th and returning to the historical scene of the story to cast a close examination of the different social ethical environments, the authors discover that the ethical dilemmas brought about by the conservativeness and backwardness of the American South, the increasingly estranged community relations, and Eugene's distorted family relationship combine to lead to Eugene's determination to leave the South and embark on a journey of self-exile. During his exile, Eugene encounters cultural impact from American Northern culture and European culture on his Southern ethical identity. The inner conflicts brought about by these ethical dilemmas result in Eugene's self-division. Eugene is forced to make ethical choices to integrate his divided selves and continue his journey of constructing his ethical identity as an exile. Wolfe's literary creation is imprinted with distinctive features of Southern culture. The image of the Southern exile represented by Eugene entails significant ethical implications and identity politics. It also sheds light on the construction of ethical identities of the contemporary generation in different cultural contexts and historical scenes.

Key words: Thomas Wolfe; Ethical Literary Criticism; American Southern Literature; the image of exile; ethical identity

Author: Wu Jinjin is Professor at the School of Foreign Studies of Capital University of Economics and Business (Beijing 100070, China). Her academic research focuses on American Southern literature, literary translation and English education (Emaill: wujinjin@163.com); **Hou Yuehua** is a graduate student (MA) at the School of Foreign Studies of Capital University of Economics and Business (Beijing 100070, China). Her academic research focuses on American Southern literature.

　　托马斯·沃尔夫（Thomas Clayton Wolfe，1900-1938）是美国南方文艺复兴时期涌现出的作家。他以自身成长经历为蓝本撰写的自传体小说是美国文学史上重要的成长小说，奠定了他在美国南方文坛的地位，也为美国文学

留下一笔宝贵财富。自 20 岁离开南方直至 37 岁因病英年早逝，沃尔夫就一直行走在寻求理想生活和身份归属的自我流放旅途中。一方面，在流放途中的沃尔夫将南方抛却身后，难以将自己归于 20 世纪 30 年代兴起的"南方重农派"（"Southern Agrarians"）作家群体，这使得他的南方作家身份一直颇受争议，他作品的南方性也由此值得考究。另一方面，沃尔夫虽然受到美国北方现代主义影响，但他身上难以褪去的南方文化烙印使他难以成为一战后"迷惘的一代"现代主义作家群体的一员，即便他后来远行欧洲，在异国他乡最终也难找到他所渴求的理想生活和身份归属。因此，与同时期的许多南方作家一样，沃尔夫成为南方的流放者。

　　沃尔夫的这种流放意识充分体现在其文学作品中，如刘积源指出的，"在托马斯·沃尔夫的小说中，主人公始终处于流浪之中。他怀着美好的信念与渴望，不知疲倦地游走于各地"（99）。其作品《天使，望故乡》（*Look Homeward, Angel* 1929，以下简称《天使》）与《时间与河流》（*Of Time and the River*，1935，以下简称《时间》）以主人公尤金·甘特的身份寻求为主线展开叙述，揭示了尤金自青年时期远走他乡，在美国北方城市和欧洲国家寻求身份归属的人生历程。霍尔曼（C. Hugh Holman）指出，沃尔夫的小说在很大程度上是他人生经历的缩影，小说主题主要是他的个人成长和其为身份做斗争的经历[1]，尤金也由此被称为沃尔夫的"另一个自我"（Hobson 157）。因此，探讨沃尔夫小说主人公成长历程中所经历的不同伦理困境与伦理选择对揭示主人公流放者伦理身份的形成根源具有重要意义。

　　聂珍钊指出，"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，对文学的理解必须回归属于它的伦理环境或伦理语境中去"（《文学伦理学批评导论》256）。所谓伦理环境，是指"文学产生和存在的历史条件"（聂珍钊，"文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语"19）。本文将托马斯·沃尔夫的两部自传体小说《天使》和《时间》置入 20 世纪上半叶美国社会历史语境和伦理环境，以小说主人公尤金的成长历程为伦理线，其成长中经历的伦理困境为伦理结，来审视尤金伦理身份的建构过程。蒂莫西·韦斯将"流放"界定为"自我与他人之间的分离；是失去或摈弃与之一起生活或曾经生活的他人——家庭、社区、社会——的密切联系"（Weiss 5）。根据这一界定以及尤金成长所经历的不同层面的伦理困境，笔者将尤金成长的伦理环境划分为家庭伦理环境、社会伦理环境、分裂自我内在伦理环境，分别从这三重维度来剖析尤金成长中经历的各种伦理困境以及他如何整合分裂自我、进行伦理选择、建构起自己作为南方流放者的伦理身份，审视作家沃尔夫的南方身份对他文学创作难以抹去的影响，以正本清源，澄清人们对作

1　See C. Hugh Holman. "The View from the Regency-Hatt: Southern Social Issues and the Outer World." *Southern Fiction Today: Renascence and Beyond*. Ed. George Core (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1969) 25.

家沃尔夫南方身份的质疑，揭示出 20 世纪初处于美国南方社会转型期的年轻一代人所面临的生存困境和伦理选择。

一、家庭伦理身份构建：南方现代化转型期孤独迷惘的自我

原生家庭对一个人的成长和伦理身份建构起着不可替代的重要作用，"一个人性格的塑造、自我意识的形成、价值选择的标准、面对人生和情感的态度等等，都与其原生家庭有着千丝万缕的深远联系"（卢婧 曹莉莉71）。因此，欲分析尤金流放者伦理身份的形成根源离不开对他原生家庭的伦理环境的探讨。文学伦理学批评强调"对文学的理解必须回归到属于它的伦理环境和伦理语境"（Nie,"Ethical Literary Criticism: A Basic Theory" 191）[1]，即在特定的伦理环境中来展开文学批评实践。返回两部小说主人公尤金成长的伦理环境，可以发现，尤金的家庭伦理身份是在处于社会转型期的南方社会宏观伦理环境和错综复杂的家庭微观伦理环境共同作用下形成。面对这双重伦理环境为其成长带来的伦理困境，孤独困惑的尤金决心逃离令他窒息的家庭和南方社会环境，选择到美国北方求学和工作。

从宏观来看，尤金出生在 20 世纪初处于社会转型期的一个美国南方大家庭。传统的美国南方社会以家庭为单位，高度重视亲缘与家庭关系[2]，牢固的社区关系和家庭纽带成为维系南方社会伦理关系的根基。但在南北内战之后，尤其是第一次世界大战后，"北方工业文明迅速崛起并直驱南下，彻底瓦解了南方传统的农耕生活方式和价值观"（吴瑾瑾 116），南方社会制度的重大变革使南方人面临的不仅是家园重建，更为重要的是生活方式的选择、伦理价值观与伦理身份的重建。在此社会转型期，南方传统的社区观念和家庭伦理关系也发生着颠覆性变化，社区内人与人之间密切的情感纽带变得松弛；而且随着南方父权制的衰退，家庭关系也变得越来越弱。[3]南方族亲血脉关系的淡化使得家庭不再为个体存在提供坚实情感支撑，个体完整性首先在家庭中被消解。个体失去社区和家庭的稳定情感根基，处于支离破碎、漂泊动荡之中，这也是这一时期很多南方人感到失落迷惘、远走他乡的重要原因。生长于南方的尤金也难逃脱这一集体宿命，在南方社会伦理环境剧变的伦理困境中，尤金也面临着新一轮的伦理选择和身份重建，被迫踏上离家远行的流放旅程。

另一方面，尤金成长的南方小镇阿尔特蒙虽被卷入南方工业化进程，但却"不像典型的南方小镇那样深受战争和重建的折磨。尤金成长在一个同时展示了南方挫败和北方'进步'、南方贫穷和北方物质主义的环境中"（李伟 38）。一方面，尤金接受着南方传统教育，这种传统教育在本质上是南

1　引文译文均出自笔者拙译。
2　参见 陈永国：《美国南方文化》（长春：吉林大学出版社，1996 年）35。
3　参见 张琳：《＜时间与河流＞的历史书写与书写历史》（硕士论文，东北大学，2018 年）36。

方贵族文化，即"南方"作家笔下所创造的那个"南方神话"（Southern Myth），"所有的女士们都纯洁、温柔、美丽，所有的男士都富有骑士风度、英勇善战"（《天使》140）。然而在尤金看来，这种南方人书写的"南方神话"历史却是令人难以忍受的空洞、腐朽、虚伪；同时，南方保守落后的社会现实令尤金感到失望和窒息。虽然南北内战废除了奴隶制，将南方推入现代化转型的激流之中，但尤金所在的偏僻小山城依然保留着旧南方的传统，种族歧视依然根深蒂固，尤金在无形中也深受种族歧视影响，甚至他自己也曾一度讨厌、鄙视并欺负黑人，缺乏应有的平等意识和同情心。尤金的周围都是"污浊的黑人，愚蠢的犹太人，贫苦的白人家庭"（张燕婷 9），这种贫穷落后、种族歧视蔓延的社会环境使他对成长的小山城充满厌恶排斥感，难以找到对自己的南方身份的认同感，迫切地想逃离令他窒息的南方社会环境。

　　从微观上来看，尤金流放者伦理身份的建构离不开原生家庭的影响。"原生家庭对个体的影响，主要体现在原生家庭的亲子关系对个体人格的影响"（卢婧 曹莉莉 72）。与旧南方和谐稳定的家庭相比，尤金的家庭充斥着爱恨交织、错综复杂的伦理关系，这体现在尤金家中扭曲的母爱、缺失的父爱与冷漠失和的兄弟姐妹关系上。在尤金家里，"家庭关系是畸形的，兄弟姐妹互相埋怨，父母与子女之间互相憎恨，夫妻之间互相冷漠，这反映出美国南方社会在战争后畸形的家庭伦理观念"（马雯雯 57）。这种畸形的家庭伦理环境令尤金倍感孤独与绝望，为尤金流放者伦理身份的形成埋下了种子。

　　尤金的母亲伊丽莎是美国南方社会转型期新型女性和新兴工业经济的代表。"按南方传统观念，男人们外出工作，挣钱养家，谋求社会地位；女人则在家中相夫教子、固守贞操、吟诗抚琴、应酬社交"（张晓梅 吴瑾瑾 153）。与传统的南方淑女不同，伊丽莎将大量金钱精力倾注于投资房产和经营家庭旅馆，一心只顾置办家业、聚敛钱财，而忽略了对家人的关爱和对家庭关系的维护，导致了家庭关系的疏离冷漠，为孩子们成长留下创伤阴影。虽然尤金家庭富裕，母亲伊丽莎却对孩子们非常吝啬，孩子们自幼被迫外出挣钱。家里虽开旅馆，尤金却没有自己的独立房间和卧具，母亲总把客人利益置于尤金之上，抹杀了尤金的存在。"在这个家里，他们没有一块属于自己的空间，没有一间屋子留给自己做固定的起居，任何一间房子随时都会受到房客的干扰"（《天使》124）。另一方面，作为一位商界女强人，伊丽莎对尤金又有着极强的情感依赖和控制欲，她反对尤金与女孩过多接触，阻碍他与父亲频繁来往，这种扭曲的爱令尤金在家中倍感窒息。由于缺乏母爱，尤金长大后总是在其他年长女人身上寻找心灵慰籍，"他所期待的对象永远要比他本人年长很多"（《天使》134），这无疑是母爱错位造成的尤金性格缺陷。尤金成长过程中母爱的错位与缺失，使他在原生家庭缺乏建构独立伦理身份所需的安全感与存在感。

　　在传统南方父权制家庭中，男人是家中主要经济支柱，占据主导地位，

父亲形象对孩子成长有着重要影响。但由于尤金母亲的强势和掌握经济大权，父亲甘特在家中处于弱势地位，尤金缺失的母爱并未在父亲那里得到补偿。虽然甘特会给尤金讲故事，带他去剧院，为尤金成年后走向文学道路积淀下必要的文学素养，但在尤金大学专业选择上，甘特却忽视尤金个人志趣倾向，强行安排尤金去州立大学学习法律，希冀他能进入政界发展，出人头地，剥夺了尤金自主选择权，压制了尤金自我意识发展，导致尤金难以形成清晰自我认知、找到未来方向，在生活选择中处于"失语"状态。尽管尤金对父亲有着较深的情感依赖，但软弱无能的父亲却难以为他的身份构建提供一个集智慧和力量于一体的完美典范，使尤金在流放途中不断寻求父亲形象以建构自我伦理身份。在《一部小说的故事》中，沃尔夫阐明其作品中"寻父主题"的深层内涵："从某个方面看，那一切生命的最中心的东西乃是，人为找到一个父亲的努力，那不仅只是他的生命和肉体所由来的父亲，不仅是他在年幼时候失去的父亲，而是一个超出他的需要之外和他的饥饿之上的一种力量和智慧的形象"（53）。

在家里七个孩子中，尤金是年龄最小、学历最高、最有出息的孩子，理应受到家人悉心呵护，但除兄长本恩外，其他哥哥姐姐都对尤金漠不关心，甚至因嫉妒怨恨寻机捉弄和欺负他。尤金与哥哥本恩情感最为亲密，本恩不仅在生活上、经济上给予尤金关心与帮助，还在精神上指引尤金成长，努力弥补尤金在父母身上缺失的爱与关怀。本恩虽一生不得志，但他目光长远，鼓励尤金通过上学谋求光明前途。可惜本恩因肺炎英年早逝，令尤金跌入绝望深渊，尤金与家庭唯一的精神纽带也随之断裂，"从那一刻起原来那种古怪的家庭模式早已破碎，维系家庭团结的那一点约束也随着本恩的死去被毁掉了"（《天使》561）。在《天使》结尾处，沃尔夫采用超现实的叙事手法令尤金与本恩的灵魂展开对话，在对话中，本恩引导尤金听从内心的声音，寻求真实的自我，鼓励尤金勇于追寻理想生活。郑军指出："其实，尤金与本（恩）一直灵犀相通，同本（恩）灵魂的对话实际上是尤金自己对自由、理想、生活的思考独白"（86）。他们的对话既传达出尤金对本恩的深切思念，也表明本恩在尤金伦理身份构建中占据不可替代的重要位置。

从尤金成长的家庭伦理环境来看，随着北方工业经济入侵和南方农耕经济制度瓦解，传统和睦友爱的南方家庭关系在尤金家中已荡然无存，"在这样的家庭中，再也无法看到旧南方的'家庭罗曼司'了，从前在浪漫的光环下的老南方那一个个和睦、团结、温暖的家庭已经分崩离析，呈现出来的只是支离破碎、面目可憎的畸形家庭"（张燕婷 13）。随着尤金成长，这种畸形的家庭伦理环境已难以为尤金成长提供必要的情感和精神支撑。最终，尤金决心以逃离方式挣脱其家庭伦理困境，做出离家求学的伦理选择，踏上寻求理想生活、流放异乡的人生旅程。

二、社会伦理身份构建：美国南方永远的流放者

尤金离家后步入社会，其社会伦理身份的建构也随之开启。聂珍钊指出，"社会身份指的是人在社会上拥有的身份，即一个人在社会上被认可或接受的身份，因此社会身份的性质是伦理的性质，社会身份也就是伦理身份"（《文学伦理学批评导论》264）。因此，欲深入了解尤金社会伦理身份的构建则需深入审视尤金成长过程中不断更迭变换的社会伦理环境。在《天使》与《时间》这两部小说中，除前面分析的美国南方社会环境之外，尤金还先后经历了美国北方以及欧洲等不同社会伦理环境，尤金在这些社会环境带来的一系列伦理困境中做出的伦理选择对其流放者伦理身份的构成至关重要。

虽然沃尔夫生长于美国南方，但学界却对沃尔夫的南方作家身份及其作品的南方性一直充满争议。托马斯·安德伍德指出，"除沃伦之外，重农派作家认为他背弃了南方社会"（Underwood 37）；也有学者指出他的文学创作"缺乏南方作家所崇尚的艺术形式"（Watkins 411）。而沃尔夫则对"南方重农派"作家所倡导的捍卫旧南方农耕生活方式的"向后看"的保守态度难以苟同，他采用一种"向前看"的伦理立场，对旧南方奴隶主贵族制进行大胆批判，强烈"谴责重农派试图重建南方内战前天堂般的种植园和自然的贵族神话"（Underwood 38），主张"改革旧南方"（Hobson 157）。在他的第三部小说《网与石》（*The Web and the Rock*）中，沃尔夫对"南方重农派"（227）作家进行了公然嘲讽。这种伦理立场分歧使沃尔夫与同时期的"南方重农派"作家格格不入，难以将自己视为其中一员并在南方作家群体中找到身份归属和认同。这种孤独隔离感注定使他在社会伦理身份归属上成为故土南方的流放者。

但同时一些学者也注意到，虽然沃尔夫和南方重农派作家存在诸多分歧，但作为南方作家，他们又都具有令人难以否认的相似之处，这就是面对北方工业主义入侵，他们一致认识到工业化大生产带来的各种弊端及其造成的现代人的生存危机。[1] 赖丹琪也指出，"在对所谓的'进步'观念、机械化大规模生产、工业主义神话的批判上，沃尔夫的观点与重农派实际上有契合之处"（97）。

由此可见，无论沃尔夫身处何方，他都难以逃离自己的南方身份，即便流落到美国北方，深受现代主义思潮影响，沃尔夫也难以真正融入一战后"迷惘的一代"作家群体。其作品亦根植哺育他成长的南方故土，带有典型的南方色彩。与沃尔夫同时期的南方作家罗伯特·潘·沃伦曾谈到美国南方对沃尔夫文学创作根深蒂固的影响："沃尔夫先生的作品——甚至那些关于哈佛或巴黎的报道或关于美国的狂想曲——不断受到神话城市阿尔塔蒙特（以及

1　See Thomas A. Underwood, "Autobiography and Ideology in the South: Thomas Wolfe and the Vanderbilt Agrarians." *American Literature* 1 (1989): 41.

南方）和老甘特的史诗人物的影响"（qtd. in Watkins 413）。他笔下的尤金虽自青年时期离开南方，去北方求学、工作、甚至远游欧洲，但无论流放到哪里，他都难以褪去自身的南方文化印记，不断地寻求南方身份的认同，如张鲁宁指出："沃尔夫离开南方又回归的经历使其对南方产生强烈的归属感，因此南方身份追寻与认同是贯穿他多部作品的重要母题"（45）。在小说中，尤金南方文化身份也赋予他的伦理身份以深层的身份政治意义。

从家乡州立大学毕业后，尤金决心逃离那个带给他诸多悲伤记忆、令他孤独窒息的南方小镇和畸形扭曲的家庭环境，前往北方城市求学深造，寻求理想生活和身份归属。尤金自幼便对遥远的北方城市生活充满了憧憬与向往，在尤金心中，南方是"遥远、孤独、失落的"（《时间》22），北方是"充满活力、壮丽、古怪、神秘的"（22），他的内心对"北方所有灿烂的城市和各种各样的生活潮流形成了一幅幻景"（22）。然而进入心仪的哈佛大学，作为来自南方的乡下人，尤金却感到自己难以融入哈佛大学的精英文化氛围，面临着被边缘化的伦理困境，不得不时常忍受独在异乡的"苦涩而难耐的孤独感——这种孤独感如此强烈，如此苦恼，如此令人沮丧"（159），每逢此时，他都会去同在波士顿的巴斯科姆舅舅那里寻求精神慰籍——那与南方故乡唯一的联系。此外，来到憧憬已久的北方城市，他的南方文化身份遭到北方主流文化的剧烈冲击，喧嚣繁忙的城市生活使尤金感到渺小、无力与迷茫，他"就像一个遭受打击的原子，在一个喧嚣的世界里毫无任何防御能力"（102），如同城市中成千上万的陌生人，"踩着城市的石头、呼吸着城市的空气〔……〕却永远无法融入城市生活之中"（363）。在哈佛大学的求学生涯并未给尤金带来他所渴盼的理想生活和身份归属，对于未来他依然感到孤独迷惘，只有寄希望于寻求一份理想工作来改变生存境遇。

然而一俟从哈佛大学毕业，尤金又陷入工作两难的伦理困境。一方面，他心怀作家梦，期待自己的剧本能够得到出版商的赏识并被出版，然而这一梦想却在物质利益主宰一切的北方工业化环境中屡次碰壁、难以实现。无奈之下，尤金只好选择到纽约一所大学教书，在这个北方国际性大都会建立起大学教师这一社会伦理身份。这份教职虽为尤金生存提供了必要经济来源，却难以满足其精神需求，不能带给他渴求的身份稳定和职业满足感。为逃避生活的失意，尤金工作之余经常去酒吧消遣，借醉酒来弥补精神空虚和身份感缺失，因为"醉酒是对现实生活的逃避，当个体在现实生活中没有身份感而找不到存在的意义时，酒吧便成为人们集体放纵自己的欲望的聚集地"（张特 29）。

虽然成为一名大学老师，但置身美国工业化中心的大都市纽约，鳞次栉比的高楼大厦、纵横交错的街道桥梁都令尤金在钢筋与混凝土构建的世界中眼花缭乱、迷失自我，难以找到新的身份认同。尤金租住的利奥波德旅馆就是工业化经济下催生的代表性建筑，整齐紧凑、千篇一律的建筑风格使之毫

无美感，"好像是用巨型饼干统一切出来似的"（《时间》378），这种建筑结构只为容纳更多的房客。旅馆内部"光秃秃的墙壁"、"囚笼般的客房"（379）都使尤金感到极度沉闷与压抑。同时工业化经济割裂了人与土地的情感和联系，个体的人被机器大工业生产、流水线不断异化，最终沦陷为机械、麻木、缺乏情感认知能力的原子，在诺大的城市中机械谋生，"他们像徽章、像制服、像用机器统一制造出来的某个民族〔……〕是城市不可或缺、毫无人情味的部分，他们变成了城市的核心"（373）。作为这些原子中的一员，尤金飞蛾扑火般奔向他所憧憬的北方城市生活，疯狂寻求向往的城市生活体验，然而不停游走在工业化城市中，他却发现这一理想生活的幻景并不存在。虽然他选择了逃离南方和家庭，但却难以摆脱南方文化根深蒂固的影响，对于儿时的南方乡村生活，他依然怀有一种恋旧情怀，如霍尔曼指出，"沃尔夫一方面深陷现代工业化的城市的细节中，但他感情的核心仍然是古老，根本上是农村的城市"（Holman,"Thomas Wolfe and America" 59）。由此可见，南北文化的冲突与碰撞使尤金一直处于南方农耕文化与北方工业文化的断裂处，游走在二者边缘，在北方城市的遭遇使尤金再度陷入身份构建的伦理困境，难以在城市中实现身份认同。

　　工作的失意和身份的失落促使尤金决定利用假期前往欧洲旅游，继续他的流放旅程。他首先来到英国，在这里一些似曾相识的熟悉场景勾起他对故乡南方的回忆，"某些熟悉的表情不停在眼前浮现"（《时间》538）。这些熟悉的表情和生活场景令他置身他所神往的生活，他渴望融入这种生活，但却发现自己"无法进入那种生活"（541）。同时，他周围同住的房客进一步加剧了他的孤独流放感，"尤金与迷惘的一代的英国候选人莫里森、与山顶农舍的库尔森一家以及与获美国路德奖学金资助的美国学者的相遇，使他发现他们中多数人试图融入英国生活的努力都是徒劳的"（Idol 141），这些房客"身上全都具有某种毁灭、迷惘、破碎的意味"，他们同尤金一样都是生活的"幻灭者"（《时间》552）。英国这份熟悉但却无法融入的生活环境及由此带来的伦理困境令他依然脚步不停，选择继续踏上他的流放旅程。

　　离开英国，尤金前往法国。在这里尤金努力融入巴黎人慵懒、悠闲的生活，也学着他们整日流连在咖啡馆喝酒聊天，但随时光流逝，尤金却发现这种逃避现实的惬意生活并不属于他，也非他所向往和追求，他难以找到身份归属并对此深感内疚，"以前那种赤裸的漂泊感重又返回，在他心头搅起一份难以形容的羞愧和负罪感"（《时间》630）。沃尔夫在《一部小说的故事》中也详细描述了这份巴黎慵懒生活带来的异国他乡流放感："强烈的刺激和无所作为的懒散奇妙结合的巴黎生活，也使我极为不安〔……〕唤起了我旧日的那种无可掩饰的无家可归、漂泊无定和孤苦无依的感觉"（39）。这份漂泊感令尤金在旅途中时常萌生回家的念头，例如在法国第戎，那里熟悉的场景令尤金对家乡的记忆再次涌上心头，"比起他在极其崭新的美国，这里更

接近他自己的童年和他父亲孔武有力的生活"（《时间》801），但是北方工业经济的入侵早已使尤金记忆中二十年前的那个南方家园无迹可寻，在南方，"一切都早已死寂〔……〕淹没在随后轰鸣、汹涌的机器生活所带来的麻醉中"（801），他再也无法回到儿时记忆中的南方家园。

审视以上尤金社会伦理身份的建构过程，可以看出，尤金行走北方和欧洲所遇到的各种伦理困境使他无论流放何处都难以摆脱始终形影相随的身份失落感，尤金被迫不断做出伦理选择，一次次踏上身份寻求旅程。直至他从欧洲归来，游走世界的尤金并未找到一份梦寐以求的理想生活和身份归属感，这也注定了他的伦理身份始终是一个局外人，一个漫游者，一个故土南方的流放者。

三、伦理困境与选择：内在分裂自我的整合与重构

尤金在成长过程中所遭遇的伦理困境不仅来自以上家庭和社会伦理环境，同时也来自这些伦理环境造成的尤金内在自我矛盾冲突以及由此导致的自我分裂。南方文学评论家凡·伍德沃德指出，南方文艺复兴时期的主要作家将视角聚焦于"困顿、失败、邪恶和'人类内心的自我矛盾问题'的严峻现实"（Woodward 24），这种"人类内心的自我矛盾问题"也是沃尔夫两部小说聚焦的核心问题，主要体现在主人公尤金如何在各种伦理困境中克服内在自我矛盾、整合分裂自我、进行身份构建的过程中。所谓伦理困境，是"指文学文本中由于伦理混乱而给人物带来的难以解决的矛盾与冲突，例如伦理两难，就是伦理困境的主要表现形式之一"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》258）。尤金在成长中先后经历了各种伦理困境：其原生家庭畸形扭曲关系造成的伦理困境、南北文化与价值观冲突形成的伦理困境以及欧洲与美国文化冲突形成的伦理困境。正是尤金成长所经历的这些伦理两难困境使其内心一直处于痛苦挣扎、矛盾斗争而导致的自我分裂之中。帕梅拉·约翰逊也指出，沃尔夫的主要关注点在于他为"解决自身精神分歧所做的斗争"（Johnson 79）。为克服这些伦理困境，尤金被迫与生活现实妥协，通过对内在分裂自我进行整合，做出伦理选择，继续着他作为流放者的身份建构旅程。

在小说中，尤金的流放者身份在他一出生似乎就已命中注定。尤金在襁褓中就被赋予了生命主体意识，他以超人的感知能力预测到自己注定孤独、迷惘的一生，"他明白自己这一生将会永远悲伤〔……〕他的生命注定要沿着孤独的小道走下去，迷失方向。他明白，人与人之间永远都是陌生的，从来没有人能真正理解另一个人"（《天使》33）。这种魔幻现实主义的叙事手法，如一道神谕，为尤金的流放者身份埋下伏笔。在他年幼时，母亲也敏锐地预知他注定是一个漂泊无根的游荡灵魂，"他（尤金）这一生是一个无家可归的魂灵，永远找不到自己，找不到世界"（72）。但尤金并不甘于这种命运安排，依然执着于追求理想生活。他一方面对生活充满极度渴望，"并

因这种渴求和欲望而发狂"（《时间》84）；一方面又不得不接受不断被家庭和社会边缘化的残酷现实，处于失却根基、漂泊动荡之中。这种与命运抗争的矛盾挣扎是造成尤金内在自我分裂的根本原因，使他在人生不同阶段都必须面对不同的伦理困境做出伦理选择。

尤金自幼受原生家庭伦理困境影响形成内在分裂的自我，其分裂性格在父母截然相反的性格双重影响下逐渐形成。其父亲向往流浪生活的自由，却又安于生活现状，依赖家庭的稳定和秩序；母亲注重实际，追求财富，生活却杂乱无章，无心维护家庭和谐与秩序。父母的两极性格使得尤金一方面拥有父亲的流浪者情怀，另一方面又期冀来自家庭的支撑与关爱，这种自我分裂使其不断行走在寻求自我的流放途中，却又无时无刻不在渴盼着回家。

原生家庭缺乏个人尊严、毫无意义的生活令尤金感到窒息。他是如此憎恨这种生活，却又无力改变现状，难以逃脱家庭伦理困境，无法按照内心真实想法做出选择，只能向现实生活妥协。他讨厌南都旅馆，却要跟随母亲在旅馆生活；他不想卖报，却被迫去做报童赚钱。"他仇恨这种低贱的生活方式，他恨自己失去了尊严和隐私，恨自己只能面对四壁，无所作为〔……〕这种生活纯粹是虚度年华、稀里糊涂、漫无目标"（《天使》124）。面对这种伦理困境，尤金只能将不满积压在心底，内心感到无比痛苦绝望而导致自我分裂，最终在一次家庭聚会时爆发。尤金借醉酒嘲讽家人，倾诉内心的痛苦："我感谢童年时代你们每个人所给予的打骂〔……〕我感谢受过的所有残忍和冷漠的待遇"（466）。家人的冷漠抹杀了尤金的家庭归宿感，使其虽身处家中，内心却在流放，他感到"就在这个屋子里，我一直处于流放的状态"（455）。尤金自婴儿时期在潜意识里就一直在努力挣脱家庭束缚，如他在书中所述，"我离开摇篮后的第一个举动，就是要爬到门口，从那时起，我的每一个举动都在设法逃离家人"（466）。最终，为了整合内在分裂的自我，寻求独立的伦理身份，尤金被迫做出伦理选择，决心去北方城市寻求他渴望的自由生活，逃离这个令他窒息的家庭，正如理查德·肯尼迪所言："沃尔夫对家庭的逃离并非是对生活的彻底回避，而是对自由的向往，他渴望能够逃到一种可以自己做出完全选择的生活"（Kennedy 181）。

然而超出尤金预料的是，北方城市生活经历带给他的却是理想幻灭和自我迷失，使他陷入南北文化冲突导致的自我分裂及由此带来的伦理困境。初到城市，尤金对新生活充满无限期待，"强烈的希望和极度狂热的信念始终在他心里燃烧"（《时间》85）。他如浮士德博士一般如饥似渴探索着城市的大街小巷，尽情享受这份摆脱家庭束缚的自由，寻觅着只有他这个来自南方的外乡人才能体会到的北方城市的神秘之处。他经常在夜晚游荡于波士顿街头，"一次次狂热地穿越地下隧道，这强烈地预示着成功和发现——预示着一种前所未有的快乐、幸运、美好、圆满的生活"（136）。然而北方工业化的城市在满足尤金对未知生活好奇的同时，也给他带来巨大的心理反

差和文化冲击。在喧嚣冷漠的城市人群中，尤金发现自己只是一个渺小、机械的生存个体，"从小在深山幽谷长大、与山为伍"（《天使》 147）的尤金置身北方城市"震耳欲聋的列车呼啸声"、"甲虫般的汽车"（《时间》525）中永远觉得自己是个"陌生人、异乡人"（83）。尤金在北方城市所经历的身份失落与伦理困境使他内心始终处于分裂之中，难以在北方城市找到身份认同。

对美国主流文化深感失望的尤金在欧洲又遭遇到他的南方身份与欧洲文化之间的碰撞冲突，当尤金所代表的南方文化与欧洲文化发生碰撞冲突时，他的个体身份的政治意义就已超越南方地域而上升到国家层面，即新兴美国工业文明与欧洲传统文明之间的冲突，这也为他的伦理身份赋予了更高层面的身份政治意义。尤金对美国社会的排斥态度也在此发生根本转变，他开始理性审视自己的美国身份，并滋生了回家的强烈愿望。因为只有置身异国他乡，尤金才能更为清晰地审视自己的南方身份和美国身份特征，沃尔夫在《一部小说的故事》中谈道："认识自己的国家的办法是离开它"（42）。也有学者指出："旅欧不但让沃尔夫对自己的美国身份有着更清醒的认识，也让他换一种角度审视自己的南方地域身份"（张鲁宁 49）。

在英国，尤金一方面深受与他所熟悉的南方传统文化一脉相承的英国生活方式吸引，一方面却又清醒地认识到这份生活根本不属于他。"尤金认为英格兰排外、单调、傲慢，他既嫉妒、尊重英国传统，又鄙视英国文化"（Johnson 51），英国人的傲慢与排外令尤金难以找到身份归属，再度陷入身份构建的伦理困境。无奈之下，尤金起身前往法国，在卢浮宫、塞纳河等地体验着历史悠久、底蕴丰厚的法国文化，这与美国缺乏传统、崇尚物质的工商业文化以及尤金家乡封闭落后的小镇文化形成强烈对比。在欧洲与美国文化冲突下，尤金再度陷入身份构建的伦理困境，内心产生强烈的疏离感。这种异乡人漂泊流浪感令尤金内心强烈地渴望回家，对尤金来说"家是流浪者和被遗弃者狂热的渴望"（《时间》764）。尤金归家的渴望是如此强烈，"随着那种无家可归之感带来的强烈、难耐的痛苦，随着他苦闷心灵的每一次跳动，他只渴望一件事——回家"（585）。面对欧洲的伦理身份困境，为整合内在分裂自我，最终尤金选择踏上返美旅程，回归他的美国身份，他的南方之根。

在流放途中并未找到身份归属的尤金虽然十分渴望回家，因同时他也清醒意识到，随着旧南方农耕经济制度的解体，南方人的旧有家园早已遁迹无踪，他已无家可归，"在他想回归的那片永无居所的大陆上，他连一块巴掌大的神圣之地都没有"（《时间》764）。从他离开故乡的那一刻起，他就注定是一位无家可归的流放者，故乡就永远留在了记忆中，尤金在流放途中对失落身份的疯狂找寻只是加剧了他内心的孤独失落感，使他无论身处何地，都始终处于漂泊动荡之中，正如鲁迅笔下所描述的异乡人，"在故乡没有获得安宁感，在异乡也同样漂泊不安"（黎保荣 12）。正是这种异乡人在故乡

没有安宁、在异乡又漂泊不安的身份失落感使尤金始终走在流放的人生旅程。

    沃尔夫的《天使，望故乡》与《时间与河流》反映了 20 世纪上半叶美国工业化进程中南方社会伦理环境的变迁以及在此社会转型期南方人尤其是年轻一代伦理身份重建的困境，成为研究美国南方社会群体与个体伦理身份构建的重要文学文本。通过对尤金人物形象的塑造，沃尔夫传达出自己对深陷社会转型漩涡中的南方人命运的道德关怀以及对南方未来道路的深刻反思。美国南方在 20 世纪初的重大社会变革使南方人失去原有的生存根基，对南方人命运带来巨大冲击，使得流放者形象成为这一时期包括罗伯特·潘·沃伦作品在内的美国南方文学中的重要文学形象，这也是对欧洲流放文学传统的传承与发展，而尤金则作为美国南方文学中流放者的典型代表，在美国文学和世界文学史上具有一席重要位置。因此，将主人公尤金·甘特的成长历程置入 20 世纪初美国社会伦理环境中，返回文本发生的历史现场，从文学伦理学批评视角审视小说主人公尤金成长中经历的不同社会伦理环境，逐层剖析尤金经历的各种伦理困境和由此做出的伦理选择，不仅有助于我们深刻理解尤金作为南方流放者伦理身份形成的深层伦理根源，澄清人们对沃尔夫作品南方性的质疑，而且可以从更高层面揭示出尤金所代表的南方流放者形象蕴涵的深层伦理道德意义和身份政治意义，同时也希冀本研究对处于不同文化语境和历史场域的当代人伦理身份建构具有重要启示和现实关照意义。

Works Cited

陈永国：《美国南方文化》。长春：吉林大学出版社，1996 年。

[Chen Yongguo. *American Southern Culture*. Changchun: Jilin UP, 1996.]

Hobson Fred. "'To Talk, to tell': Southern Literature in the Twentieth Century." *The American South in the* 20*th Century*. eds. Craig S. Pascoe et al. Athens: U of Georgia P, 2005, 154-171.

Holman, C. Hugh. "The View from the Regency-Hatt: Southern Social Issues and the Outer World." *Southern Fiction Today: Renascence and Beyond.* Ed. George Core. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1969. 16-32.

—. "Thomas Wolfe and America." *The Southern Literary Journal* 10. 1 (1977): 56-74.

Idol, Jr, John L. *Thomas Wolfe*. Detroit: Gale Group, 2001.

Johnson, Pamela Hansford. *Thomas Wolfe: A Critical Study*. London: William Heinemann LTD, 1947.

Kennedy, Richard S. "Thomas Wolfe at Harvard, 1920-1923." *Harvard Library Bulletin* 4. 2 (1950): 172-190.

赖丹琪："城市漫游者的空间批判——论托马斯·沃尔夫的城市书写"，《南京师范大学文学院学报》2（2018）：93-100。

[Lai Danqi. "City Wanderer's Space Criticism: On Thomas Wolfe's City Writing." *Journal of School of Chinese Language and Culture Nanjing Normal University* 2 (2018): 93-100.]

黎保荣："鲁迅'异乡人'情结的成因、表现与转化"，《鲁迅研究月刊》4（2020）：10-20。

[Li Baorong. "The Cause, Manifestation and Transformation of Lu Xun's 'Alien' Complex." *Luxun Research Monthly* 4 (2020): 10-20.]

李伟："家庭创伤与身体创伤记忆——解读《天使，望故乡》中的创伤书写"，《长江大学学报》8（2015）：36-40。

[Li Wei. "The Memory of Family's Trauma and Physical Trauma: Interpretation of Trauma Writing in *Look Homeward, Angel*." *Journal of Yangtze University (Social Sciences)* 8 (2015): 36-40.]

刘积源：《托马斯·沃尔夫：迷惘的巨人》。北京：中央编译出版社，2013 年。

[Liu Jiyuan. *Thomas Wolfe: Lost Giant*. Beijing: Central Compilation & Translation Press, 2013.]

卢婧、曹莉莉："混沌理论视角下原生家庭影响力探析"，《齐齐哈尔大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）1（2011）：71-74。

[Lu Jing and Cao Lili. "Analysis of Influence of Family of Origin from the Perspective of Chaos Theory." *Journal of Qiqihar (Phi&Soc Sci)* 1 (2011): 71-74.]

马雯雯："《天使，望故乡》中的家庭伦理"，《绥化学院学报》5（2018）：57-59。

[Ma Wenwen. "Family Ethics in *Look Homeward, Angel*." *Journal of Suihua University* 5 (2018): 57-59.]

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

聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年。

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

——："文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语"，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。

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

Underwood, Thomas A. "Autobiography and Ideology in the South: Thomas Wolfe and the Vanderbilt Agrarians." *American Literature* 1 (1989): 31-45.

Watkins, Floyd C. "Thomas Wolfe and the Nashville Agrarians." *The Georgia Review* 4 (1953): 410-423.

Weiss, Timothy. *On the Margins: The Art of Exile in V. S. Naipaul*, Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1992.

托马斯·沃尔夫：《天使，望故乡》，雨凡、陈玉洪译。南京：江苏凤凰文艺出版社，2017 年。

[Wolfe, Thomas. *Look Homeward, Angel*. Trans. Yu Fan and Chen Yuhong. Nan Jing: Jiangsu Phoenix Literature and Art Publishing, Ltd, 2017.]

——：《时间与河流》，刘积源译。南京：江苏文艺出版社，2013 年。

[— . *Of Time and the River*. Trans. Liu Jiyuan. Nan Jing: Jiangsu Literature and Art Publishing House, 2013.]

——：《网与石》，刘积源译。南京：江苏文艺出版社，2013 年。

[—.*The Web and the Rock*. Trans. Liu Jiyuan. Nan Jing: Jiangsu Literature and Art Publishing House, 2013.]

——："一部小说的故事"，黄雨石译，《一位美国小说家的自传》，莱斯利·菲尔德编。上海：上海人民出版社，2008 年。

[—. "A Story of the Novel." Trans. Huang Yushi, *The Autobiography of an American Novelist*. Ed. Leslie Field, Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, 2008.]

Woodward, C. Vann. *The Burden of Southern History*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University. 1991.

吴瑾瑾："历史的沉疴——南北内战与罗伯特·潘·沃伦的文学创作"，《山东大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）3（2013）：114-121。

[Wu Jinjin. "The Heavy Burden of History: The Civil War and Robert Penn Warren's Literary Creation." *Journal of Shandong University(Philosophy and Social Sciences)* 3 (2013): 114-121.]

张琳：《＜时间与河流＞的历史书写与书写历史》，硕士论文，东北大学，2018 年。

[Zhang Lin. "The History Writing and Writing History of *Of Time and the River*." Diss. Northeastern University, 2018.]

张鲁宁："嗅觉景观：托马斯·沃尔夫南方身份书写研究"，《外国语文》6（2020）：45-50。

[Zhang Luning. "Smellscape: A Study of Thomas Wolfe's Writing of the Southern Identity." *Foreign Language and Literature* 6 (2020): 45-50.]

张特：《＜时间与河流＞中的景观与国家身份建构》，硕士论文，中国矿业大学，2019 年。

[Zhang Te. "Landscape and National Identity Construction in *Of Time and the River*." Diss. China University of Mining & Technology, 2019.]

张晓梅、吴瑾瑾："南方文学、地域特性与文化神话——美国南方'重农派'文学运动研究"，《东岳论丛》6（2013）：150-154。

[Zhang Xiaomei and Wu Jinjin. "Southern Literature, Regional Characteristics and Cultural Mythology: A Research on the 'Agrarian' Literary Movement in the South of the United States." *Dong Yue Tribune* 6 (2013): 150-154.]

张燕婷：《论新历史主义视野下的托马斯·沃尔夫长篇小说》，硕士论文，内蒙古大学，2013 年。

[Zhang Yanting. "The Study of Thomas Wolfe's Novel from the Aspects of New Criticism." Diss. Inner Mongolia University, 2013.]

郑军："迷茫的亲情——评成长小说《天使望故乡》"，《长春理工大学学报》7（2011）：66-67+86。

[Zheng Jun. "Confused Kinship: On Initiation Novel *Look Homeward, Angel*." *Journal of Changchun University of Science and Technology* 7 (2011): 66-67+86.]

从文学伦理学批评到史与诗的结合：当代华语文学与影视作品中南京大屠杀书写论析

From Ethical Literary Criticism to the Combination of History and Poetry: The Writing of Nanjing Massacre in Contemporary Chinese Literature and Film and Television Works

金　进（**Jin Jin**）

内容摘要："南京大屠杀"是中国近代历史上永恒的民族之痛，它造成了巨大的中华民族精神创伤，也是中国人民奋发图强的原动力之一。随着南京大屠杀死难者纪念日被确立为国家公祭日，《南京大屠杀档案》申报世界记忆遗产等事件，南京大屠杀已从中华民族惨痛的历史事件转型为国家记忆，而在文学领域则逐步成为集体性的文化创伤。近些年来关于南京大屠杀的大量实证性的日记、访谈一一出版，从而引发了文学界和影视界对这一创作题材的重新认识。这种文学再现是目前学术界的一个研究新方向，从民族精神创伤这一国族书写的层面看，非常有学术价值。本文着眼于这一事件从历史向文学升华的过程，旨在探究南京大屠杀的文学反映中所面临的诸如集体事件中的个体书写，接受者层面对文学改写的接受度等问题，以期寻求对南京大屠杀文学书写的文学批评理论体系及方法论。

关键词：文学伦理学批评；史与诗；华语文学；电影；南京大屠杀

作者简介：金进，文学博士，现任浙江大学文学院研究员，中国现当代文学专业博士生导师，研究方向中国现当代文学与东南亚华人文学。本文系国家社科基金项目"中国文学与东南亚华文文学的建构研究"【项目批号：18BZW154】阶段性成果。

Title: From Literary Ethical Criticism to the Combination of History and Poetry: The Writing of Nanjing Massacre in Contemporary Chinese Literature and Film and Television Works

Abstract: "Nanjing Massacre" is an eternal national pain in modern Chinese history. It has caused great spiritual trauma to the Chinese nation and is one of the driving forces for the Chinese people to strive for strength. With the establishment

of the memorial day of the victims of the Nanjing Massacre as the national public memorial day and the declaration of World Memory Heritage by T*he Archives of the Nanjing Massacre*. The Nanjing massacre has transformed from a painful historical event of the Chinese nation into a national memory, and has gradually become a collective cultural trauma in the field of literature. In recent years, a large number of empirical diaries and interviews about the Nanjing Massacre published one by one, which has triggered a new understanding of this creative theme in the literary and film circles. This kind of literary reproduction is a new research direction in the current academic circles. From the level of national spiritual trauma, it is of great academic value. This paper focuses on the process of the sublimation of this event which it from history to literature. It aims to explore the problems faced in the literary reflection of the Nanjing Massacre, such as the individual writing in the collective event and the acceptability of the receiver to the literary rewriting, in order to seek the theoretical system and methodology of literary criticism of the literary writing of the Nanjing Massacre.

Author: Jin Jin, Ph.D in literature, is Professor of School of Literature, Zhejiang University (Hangzhou 310058, China), Specializing in Modern Chinese Literature and Overseas Chinese Literature (Email: chsjj@zju.edu.cn).

20 世纪 80 年代，随着日本经济大国地位的确立，日本右翼势力愈发膨胀，日本政界不断传出聒噪的声音，大肆否定以南京大屠杀为代表的战争罪行。同时，随着对抗日战争历史和国民党历史研究的深入，南京大屠杀这个极具话题性的历史事件更多地进入了文学视野，以南京大屠杀为背景的各种文学茁壮成长。2014 年 2 月 27 日十二届全国人大常委会第七次会议以国家立法的形式通过决议确定每年 9 月 3 日为"中国人民抗日战争胜利纪念日"以及每年 12 月 13 日为"南京大屠杀死难者国家公祭日"，并于当年隆重举行两场纪念活动，习近平总书记亲自出席了 12 月 13 日的公祭仪式。2015 年，《南京大屠杀档案》申报世界记忆遗产项目取得重大成功。以上这些举措为恢复民族记忆、弘扬中华民族精神、铭记历史教训、保障世界和平等方面起到一定的作用。同时，也为以南京大屠杀为话题的文学发展创造了良好的条件。在文学上，有以张纯如所著《南京大屠杀——被遗忘的二战浩劫》（1997）为代表的纪实文学，有以哈金所著《南京安魂曲》（2011）为代表的小说；在影视上，有以丹·史度曼执导《南京大屠杀》（2002）为代表的纪录片；有以陆川执导《南京！南京！》（2009）为代表的故事片。以南京大屠杀为话题的文学及影视作品发展蔚为大观，在多个领域开拓着我们的视

野、震撼着我们的心灵。以南京大屠杀为话题的文学影视作品虽然发展迅速，且收获了不错的反响。但是实际上，关于这一文学领域的文学批评、文学理论研究与文学本身的发展却出现了脱节。简而言之，这一文学领域因其话题的特殊性而具有严肃性，因此如何写出符合时代要求、符合文学要求且不失严肃性的作品尤为关键。然而由于缺少相关理论的支撑和规范，极大多数以南京大屠杀为话题的文学影视作品展现出了不小的弊端。其中一部分在文学性的立意上出现偏差，过分地沉溺于宣扬民族仇恨等消极情绪；一部分在传播性的考量上出现失衡。更有甚者，以商业价值为出发点，用低俗、博人眼球的方式进行所谓文学创作。因此，通过对以南京大屠杀为话题的影视文学作品进行分析，从中总结出错误的教训以及成功的经验，最终形成一套关于"如何规范和梳理以南京大屠杀为创作主题的文学创作"的文学伦理学批评的范式，能为今后有关文学影视创作活动提供规范和指导，成为批评界的首当其冲的任务。

一、国家与民族之痛：文学伦理视野的灾难书写

1997 年华裔作家张纯如的英文历史著作 "The Rape of Nanjing: The Forgotten Holocaust of World WarII"（中文版书名为《南京大屠杀——被遗忘的二战浩劫》，或者《南京暴行：被遗忘的大屠杀》），引发了大量的关于南京大屠杀题材的创作，这些作品大都以张纯如挖掘的史料来重新建构南京大屠杀的历史。在张纯如之前（称之为"前张纯如时期"）的中国当代文学中，作家、导演、编剧们的视野都把南京大屠杀视为一场民族灾难，强调文学的教诲功能，同时尝试着在艺术表现的审美过程中去实现文学的教诲功能。哲学家、诗人乔治·桑塔亚纳曾经说过："那些不记得过去的人注定要重蹈覆辙"（Chang 16）。因此，在某种程度上，正如《华盛顿邮报》专栏作家乔治·威尔所说："由于张纯如的这本书，第二次南京大屠杀为之终结"（Chang 1）。张纯如的著作对于南京大屠杀的文学书写和影像建构而言，都具有划时代的意义。尤其当张纯如于 2004 年去世之后，每年的南京大屠杀纪念日，她的名字更是被一再提起。她的著作是对南京大屠杀的一次历史性的祛蔽，使这场第二次世界大战中被遗忘的大浩劫从被遮蔽的国族恩怨进入到世界性的视野，并将二战中发生在欧洲和亚洲的奥斯维辛与南京大屠杀联系在一起，探讨南京大屠杀本身及日本对大屠杀的掩饰，直接或间接地推动了此后的文学与影片的创作。

文学伦理学批评认为人的一生需要通过伦理选择解决人性与兽性的程度差异。"在伦理选择中，人需要通过理性约束动物本性，强化人的道德性，同时对动物性保持警觉，将其管控在伦理允许的范围之内。〔……〕自然选择是形式的选择，人长成什么模样不是由自己决定的，而是自然选择的结果。伦理选择是本质的选择、做人的选择。用什么样的规范要求自己，按

照什么标准塑造自己，做什么样的人，都不是由自然选择决定，而是由伦理选择决定。伦理选择按照某种社会要求和道德规范进行选择，按照做人的道德目标在特定的伦理环境和语境中选择，而且这种选择是在教诲和学习过程中进行的"（聂珍钊 75）。在前张纯如时代，南京大屠杀被遮蔽多年。1945年 11 月 25 日，上海《申报》上以《南京大屠杀罪行将公开》为题，第一次提出了"南京大屠杀"这一概念。在抗战胜利后，中国军事法庭和远东国际军事法庭对日本战犯进行审判时，就将"南京大屠杀"定为专案进行审理。远东国际军事法庭在其《判决书》中，还专门列有"南京大屠杀"一节。1985 年 8 月建立了"侵华日军南京大屠杀遇难同胞纪念馆"。1997 年 8 月于南京召开了首次以"南京大屠杀史"为专题的国际学术讨论会。出版了一批以"南京大屠杀"命名的学术专著、史料集、证言集、档案集、图片集。1997 年 12 月，在台湾和日本东京、大阪同时举行了纪念"南京大屠杀"60周年的学术研讨会。在美国，很早就成立了"纪念南京大屠杀受难同胞联合会"，并出版了世上第一部中英文对照的《南京大屠杀》画册。而文学创作界，除了抗战初期的拉贝日记、魏特琳日记以及郭歧《陷都血泪录》（1938年 8 月连载于西安《西京平报》）、黄谷柳《干妈》（1939 年 3 月发表在《文艺阵地》第 3 卷第 15 期）等亲历者的纪实文学，作为受害者的中方大部分时间处于沉默的状态，直到 20 世纪 80 年代日本文部省修改教科书，才不断引发争议。海笑的《燃烧的石头城》（1982）、林长生的《千古浩劫》（1986）、周而复的《南京的陷落》（1987），这些长篇小说都是从国族叙事的角度控诉日军的滔天罪行，但往往逃不出将南京大屠杀书写处理成非黑即白的本质性叙事以及勿忘国耻的座右铭话语的窠臼。20 世纪 90 年代，王久辛的长诗《狂雪》（1990）、白灵的《薹之复仇》（1991）、张烨的《世纪之屠》（1992）和须兰的《纪念乐师良宵——"南京大屠杀"惨案五十八年祭》（1995）都以私人化的笔触，借情感的宿命写出了历史的宿命，在文学表现手法上有了许多创新，扩大了南京大屠杀的文学艺术空间。而有关"南京大屠杀"的第一部电影是 1987 年罗冠群导演的故事片《屠城血证》，该片讲述了 1937 年南京大屠杀期间，中国医生展涛不顾个人安危千方百计将证明日军的屠城罪行的照片送出南京的故事。随后涌现出了牟敦芾执导的《黑太阳："南京大屠杀"》（1995）、吴子牛执导的《南京大屠杀》（1996）。《屠城血证》与《黑太阳："南京大屠杀"》都侧重展现血腥的场面，控诉日本人犯下的滔天罪行，正如《黑太阳：南京大屠杀》结尾部分所云："这不是战争。是有预谋、有计划、有组织的'大屠杀'。"《南京大屠杀》立足历史，循着历史的线索结构故事，展示着日军的无耻兽行和国军的无力抵抗。电影中真实地展示了留在南京的红十字会工作人员的历史贡献，其中由南京国际安全区救委会主席德国人约翰·雷博（John H.D. Robbins），安全会委员美国人魏特琳（Whitney Craft）。美国人圣公会牧师约翰·梅奇（John Bean）。整部

电影满怀历史想象性的虚构，甚至浪漫化的想象。在惨烈的战争中的人的情感故事铺陈了很多，除了邓天远和刘书琴的军民爱情、日本士兵塞到中国小孩手里的手榴弹之外，中国医生成贤娶了日本女人理慧子，因着妻子的身份引起一串事件，如成贤老友的误解到理解的过程，最后的结尾中山理慧子产下一子，似乎有着中日和解的隐喻。还有埋尸人将一些小孩送出南京城，似乎又成了民族希望和为中华民族保种的象征。电影中日军松井石根司令官的一句"全部消灭掉"，以及日本人闯入国际安全区强奸妇女，特别是女教师刘书琴一段，以及红十字区里引起的冲突的场面长达十分钟，成为影片抗日情绪的又一高潮。总体而言，在前张纯如时代，南京大屠杀的书写主要聚焦于国族恩怨的控诉与民族情绪的宣泄，而到了后张纯如时代，宏大的国族叙事渐渐式微，人性话语成了南京大屠杀的文学书写与影像建构的主要切入点。

二、史与诗的结合：南京大屠杀历史的再书写

张纯如的 *The Rape of Nanjing: The Forgotten Holocaust of World WarII* 是一部全方位介绍 1937 年 12 月 13 日到 1938 年 1 月日军肆虐南京的历史著作，"从三个不同角度讲述了南京大屠杀的故事。第一个是日本人视角。这是一个有计划的侵略的故事——日本军队被告知要做什么，怎么做，以及为什么。第二个是受害方中国人的视角，这是一个关于城市的命运的故事，这是一个政府不再能够保护其国民免受外部侵略者侮辱。这一部分包括中国人自己的个人故事，包括失败、绝望、背叛和生存的故事。第三个是美国人和欧洲人的视角。这些局外人，至少在中国历史的某一时刻，扮演了英雄的角色。现场的少数西方人冒着生命危险帮助中国平民，并用在他们眼前发生的暴行来警示世界其他国家。接下来的第二部分处理的是战后时期，我们将谈到美国人和欧洲人对自己的国民在现场所记录的暴行，是多么的漠不关心"（Chang 14-15）。

威廉·柯比评述张纯如作品时说："我们可能永远无法确切知道是什么原因促使日本指挥官和部队采取了这些野蛮行为。但是张纯如的分析，比过去任何人都要透彻清晰。为了更深入了解整个事件，她大量地利用各种资料，包括第三者不容怀疑的证词。所谓第三者是日本进入南京时，还留在这座毫无抵御能力之城的外国传教士与商人。张纯如从中发现一份真实的档案——拉贝（John Rabe）的日记。拉贝是德国商人兼国家社会主义者，他领导一场国际合作和努力，为南京的民众提供避难之所。透过拉贝的眼睛，我们看到手无寸铁的南京居民，在面临日本人猛烈的攻击时，是如何恐惧又勇敢。通过张纯如的诉说，我们感激拉贝与其他人的英勇事迹，他们在城市被摧毁，市民被攻击，医院纷纷关门，停尸房中装满了尸体〔……〕，在这种混乱的场面之中，他们仍试图有所作为。我们同时也读到，那些了解正在发生的事情并感到羞耻的日本人"（Chang 7）。

　　张纯如在"目击证人"一章中这样说："决定在南京市区成立安全区，是一种自动自发的行为，就在上海沦陷后几个星期内成立。一九三七年十一月，法国神父贝萨奇（Jacquinot de Bessage）在上海设立中立区，保护四十五万在日军入侵时家园被毁的中国难民。当长老教会米尔斯牧师（W. Plumer Mills）得知贝萨奇神奇的计划后，便向友人建议，在南京也设立一个同样的中立区。米尔斯和其他二十几个人（大多数是美国人，也有德国人、丹麦人、俄国人与中国人）最后指定一块在市中心西边的区域，作为安全区。金陵大学、金陵女子文理学院、美国大使馆，以及一些中国政府办公厅都坐落在这个安全区之内。委员会设立安全区主要是为中日部队交战下的平民提供避难所。外国人希望，等到南京平安地度到日本人手上之后，就把安全区关闭起来"（Chang 106）。

　　佛罗瑞·加仑伯格的电影《拉贝日记》（2009）是唯一一部得到中国官方授权的、由外国导演拍摄的南京题材影片，影片于 2009 年 4 月 29 日在中国内地上映。影片取材就是自拉贝撰写的战时日记《拉贝日记》，再现了南京那段惨烈记忆。影片从亲历者角度记录了"南京大屠杀"始末，是证实"南京大屠杀"事件信息最为完整详实的史料。曾对纳粹主义深信不疑的拉贝，在战争的残酷现实中挺身而出，在"南京大屠杀"期间组建起"国际安全区"，挽救了 20 万中国百姓的生命。拉贝是在南京沦陷前匆匆从秦皇岛结束休假赶回南京，他认为自己在中国工作了几十年，他对南京有着自己的感情，希望凭借自己的努力可以帮助南京。他以德国纳粹党员、西门子公司驻南京负责人等身份争取到粮食，建立安全区，他保护了 600 多中国难民。电影中，他自己因为战时物质短缺的影响，糖尿病发作，不断寻找救他性命的胰岛素。同时还冒着生命危险用照相机拍摄日军屠杀手无寸铁的军民的照片，并把这些重要的资料交到了德国驻日大使馆情报分析员佐尔格的手上，希望能够通过他的关系将这些文件交到德国政府高层以及日本朝野，希望两国政府可以制止这些残酷的暴行。1938 年 2 月，他被德国政府的调回德国。这部影片的结尾部分，着力在描绘拉贝回国之后的遭遇，回国不久，拉贝被德国纳粹党部调查，并封锁了他与外界的一切联系，最后被捕入狱。二战结束后，拉贝也没有因此而重获自由，因为他是纳粹党元老，最终借助来自中国方面的担保信件以及大量的证据后，拉贝才被暂时释放。不久，拉贝因眼中的糖尿病于 1950 年逝世。拉贝的晚年生活拮据处境艰难，逝世的时候，无人知晓，也没有任何形式的悼念活动，直到张纯如重新发现他的日记，为我们还原了这位国际友人形象以及这段德国友人眼中的屠杀灾难。

　　陆川导演的电影《南京！南京！》（2009）一方面延续着南京屠杀题材一贯的灾难叙事策略，电影开头国民政府的无能，国民党宋希濂部军官陆剑雄组织官兵留守，与南京城共存亡，片头突然开火的坦克、团结一心的五百名国军军民，以及被伏击的日军，让观众在电影开场的时候，对中国军队的

英雄行为感到兴奋，这部电影揭露着南京这段痛史中最大的现实，那就是国民政府的无能和中国军队的勇敢。另一方面以日本宪兵队长角川正雄的视角，展示一名日本普通士兵眼里的南京大屠杀。这个视角明显受启发于《东史郎日记》中东史郎忏悔的叙事角度。[1] 电影中，日本士兵角川对日本籍慰安妇百合子、中国籍慰安妇江香君，以及最后将可能被拉去充当慰安妇的红十字会女工作人员姜淑云一枪打死，篇末当得到百合子已经去世的消息的时候，角川嘴里不断重复"百合子，曾经是我的妻子"，此时的角川的精神已经到了崩溃的边缘，电影开始从日军内部建构反思人性的反战主题。电影中关于日军抢劫财物、任意枪杀居民、强暴妇女、满城的尸体和人头、在江边枪杀俘虏、城中活埋俘虏等场面不断出现。还有亡国之下国人的卑微无助，如几百国军被枪杀的一幕，在在宣告着国民政府力量的腐败无能。而这部电影的后半部分，以拉贝所建立的国际安全区为圆心，刻画了一些小人物。其中陆川渲染了大量的强奸场面，其中还涉及到日本籍女子百合子，当角川将糖果、羊羹、清酒带给百合子的时候，她说"还有家乡的味道"，这把南京大屠杀的反战主题升华到人类悲剧的层面。另外，电影中汉奸唐天祥被日本人枪毙，得到了应得的报应，延续着中国现代文学国民性批判的传统。

张艺谋的电影《金陵十三钗》（2011）一开场是长达二十分钟的中日军队的巷战场面。电影中，美国人约翰本是一个做殡葬的小混混，无意之中假冒被日军飞机炸死的英格曼神父，成为电影中的救世主。电影中一个彬彬有礼、会用钢琴弹奏日本童谣的长谷川大佐形象，还有那请柬上面"昭和十三年十二月二十日第一一四师团师团长中松茂雄"瞎编的一个日本军官，再加上从钓鱼巷来十三个妓女，被改编之后的张艺谋电影《金陵十三钗》绝不亚于电影版的《南京大屠杀》，但在揭示人物心理和构造人物形象等方面，张艺谋的电影少了严歌苓小说叙事的细腻。相比起电影版（严歌苓也参与了电影的剧本写作），严歌苓的中篇小说《金陵十三钗》写得充满人道主义精神。就小说而言，严歌苓的叙事节奏缓慢细腻，让我们读故事的同时，能够感受到文本的内在美。可以说，虽然在历史真实的追求上，严歌苓的这部小说不如张纯如所写的纪实性作品，但从文学艺术成就的角度，《金陵十三钗》堪为一部完美的史与诗结合的灾难题材的小说。

约翰·耶勒（John Ealer）和张浩合作导演的纪录片《南京之殇》（Scars of Nanking）由江苏省广播电视总台（集团）与 A+E 美国电视网络合作拍摄完成，

1　东史郎（1912- ），生于日本京都府竹野郡丹后町，1937 年 8 月，25 岁的东史郎应征入伍，系日军第十六师团步兵第二十联队上等兵，曾参加攻占天津、上海、南京、徐州、武汉、襄阳等战役，1939 年 9 月因病回国。1944 年 3 月，再次应召参加侵华战争。1945 年 8 月，他在上海向中国军队投降。1946 年 1 月回日本。东史郎有记笔记的习惯，在侵华战争期间，他的日记共有 37 万字。"我在战场上目睹了老百姓的一切悲惨的情景、战争的罪恶。由于我受过很深的触动，有过非同寻常的经历，因而如实地写下了善和恶。"参见东史郎："序"，《东史郎日记》（南京：江苏教育出版社，1999 年）1–3。

美国版于 2017 年 12 月 13 日上午在美国历史频道首播，是南京大屠杀题材的纪录片首次在西方主流媒体播出。导演用故事化的结构形式，讲述了一群外国友好人士，冒着生命危险救助南京受难时期的中国人的故事。这部影片《南京之殇》在美国历史频道的成功播出，在南京大屠杀惨案发生 80 周年这一重要的时刻，从国际层面向海外更广泛的传播这一历史惨案的真相，让更多的西方观众认识到二战期间发生在中国南京的这一人类浩劫。《南京之殇》导演耶勒曾执导过讲述两次世界大战的纪录片《世界大战》，被誉为"纪录片界的斯皮尔伯格"（吴乐珺 3）。在耶勒看来，"南京大屠杀是古罗马时期之后最为暴虐的屠杀惨案之一。尽管如此，在这段历史之中依然有一群外国人，勇于奉献自己救助他人，丝毫不担心自己的安危。他们在战乱之中所体现出的对受难者的同情，暴力危险之下所展现的勇气，都是人性中的闪光点，这段历史值得被人记住"（吴乐珺 3）。

三、超越国族与宗教：关于人类命运共同体的思考

哈金的《南京安魂曲》的故事背景是南京金陵女子大学，它不同于严歌苓小说《金陵十三钗》中女性牺牲精神的渲染，也不同于陆川电影《南京！南京！》里关于中日参战人员形象的塑造和精神状态的刻画，更接近于张纯如的 *The Rape of Nanjing: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II*。在接受《南方周末》采访的时候，哈金谈起张纯如对他的影响："张纯如的书算一个起因，但在她之前华人一直在纪念，从来没有停过，现在也是，在每年 12 月份和每年日本投降日。严歌苓也说非常吃惊。我出来以后接触到一些当地华人，对中国抗日战争历史的研究，他们还一直在做。每年都去看纪念会，慢慢地就成一块心病了，老想这些事。但是看张纯如的书以后知道有一批美国传教士也介入这个事情，又读了胡华玲女士写的一本魏特林传记。真正开始想小说怎么写，大概在 2007 年底，以后就真正地做研究。关于她（魏特林）的书、她的日记得读一些，动笔是 2008 年夏天"（哈金 9）。

《南京安魂曲》讲述的是美国女传教士明妮·魏特琳在南京大屠杀期间留守金陵女子学院，保护中国一万多妇女儿童的真实历史故事。魏特琳因为受战争创伤而精神崩溃，回到美国疗养时开枪自杀。因为她是美国人，中国这边极少有人关注她；因为基督徒不能自杀，否则违背教义，美国研究界对她也了解甚少。所以，无论在中国还是美国，她都是几乎被历史遗忘的人物。小说中的叙事者是"我"——高安玲，50 岁的武昌人，因为会英语，又受过良好的教育，受金陵女子文理学院吴校长之托，留下来协助魏特琳，她是小说的叙述者，通过她的视角讲述魏特琳在南京大屠杀前后的故事，赞扬着魏特琳这位用自己的生命来保护一万多名妇女和儿童的英雄行为。小说以第一人称的日记体结构全文，展示了以魏特琳为首的金陵女子文理学院教职员工们如何护校、如何保护安全区的妇孺的英雄行为。在小说里有大量学校工作

人员的形象塑造，大刘（魏特琳的中文秘书）、白路海（学校的后勤负责人）、老廖（园艺工）、本顺（送信员）、茹莲（家禽饲养员）等等，他们共同点燃了南京浩劫之下人性的光亮。小说从高安玲这一形象入手，涉及到与她相关的一系列故事，从各个侧面帮助塑造着魏特琳的形象。另外一方面，小说结尾部分展示的是陪同晚期魏特琳的美国护工艾丽斯的书信，小说讲述她看护晚年魏特琳，并且定期写信向南京金陵女校报告她的情况，小说的呈现方式是从每封信中摘录一段，通过这种方式来推动故事的发展，进一步丰满了我们对魏特琳这一人物形象的认知。

哈金《南京安魂曲》中的很多情节都是化用自张纯如的原著，如关于明魏特琳返回美国之后的遭遇，明显借鉴了原著中"迟来的受难者""心力交瘁，英年早逝""屠杀梦魇挥之不去"这几节，如"魏特琳则付出生命代价。南京大屠杀对她的精神打击，比安全区其他成员和难民当时所了解的情况，还要严重。很少人觉察到，在她神话色彩日增的传奇之下，是一个容易受伤、筋疲力尽的女性，每天暴露在日本人的暴力中，不论是在身体还是心灵上都永远无法复原。她在一九四〇年四月十四日最后的一则日记中，揭露了自己的心境：'我的精力即将枯告罄，不能再冲锋陷阵、计划工作，手上每件事似乎都有障碍。我多希望能够立刻休假，但是谁可以分担这些永远做不完的工作呢？'〔……〕她的侄女会议，魏特琳的同事送她回美国接受医疗照顾，但是在太平洋上的旅程，她竟数度尝试要自杀。陪同魏特琳的友人，几乎无法制止她从船上跳海。到了美国之后，魏特琳进了爱荷华州的精神病院，接受电击治疗。出院后，魏特琳又为美国基督教传教士协会到印第安那波利斯工作。〔……〕一九四一年五月十四日，在她离开南京一年后，魏特琳把家中门窗用胶带封紧，开瓦斯自杀"（张纯如 239-40）。

另外，哈金的《南京安魂曲》也参考了张纯如关于南京沦陷的一些史实考证，如唐生智留守及临阵撤军造成的悲剧，还有日军在南京的活埋、砍伤身体、活活烧死、冻死、狗咬、强暴等凌虐行为，特别是中国妇女被日军强暴怀孕这一敏感议题也被写入小说，还涉及到日本侵略军故意滋生事端，将外国人诱离难民营，以便轻而易举地绑架中国妇女的情节。可以说，《南京安魂曲》文学艺术上的成功是站在张纯如作品的坚实和丰富的史料基础上的，是一次完美的历史与文学、史与诗的结合。当有人问起哈金，为什么以"安魂曲"作为书名的时候？他这样回答："故事写出来，是对主人公和受难者灵魂上的安慰，这是直接的作用。魏特林也很冤屈，实际上美国传教士一直留到很晚，有的等中华人民共和国成立以后才走，这些人回去以后还得受审查。〔……〕《南京安魂曲》中宗教精神超过了个人恩怨，日本平民也受苦，他们的儿子孙子没了父亲爷爷，战争给人造成的无奈和损害太大了。我们到最后还是应该超越种族的经验。"（哈金 12）。而对于魏特琳这一人物形象，哈金从一个外国女传教士的观点来写《南京大屠杀》，力图"创造一个心灵"，他认为"创

造一个心灵对我来说很重要。我觉得我还没有完全做到，但是愿意努力去做。有些东西要靠想象，像写南京大屠杀，现在四处都是白骨了，最重要的是把一个早成骷髅的人的可信性、复杂性、心灵、甚至感情各方面都表现出来，整部小说就算成功了，这也是我觉得最难的事情"（哈金 59）。我们可以看到哈金在超越国族，共同记忆方面在警醒世人不忘过去的人类所经历的痛苦，《南京安魂曲》是一次在人类命运共同体层次上的文学超越。

Works Cited

哈金："历史事件中的个人故事"，《华文文学》2（2011）：55-64。

[Ha Jin. "Personal Stories in Historical Events." *Literatures in Chinese* 2 (2011): 55-64.]

Chang, Iris. *The Rape of Nanking: The Forgotten Holocaust of World War II.* New York: Penguin Books, 1997.

聂珍钊："文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构"，《中国社会科学》10（2020）：71-92+205-206。

[Nie Zhenzhao. "Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020): 71-92+205-206.]

吴乐珺："南京大屠杀题材纪录片首次在美国主流媒体播出 希望有更多人知道并铭记这段历史"，《人民日报》2017 年 12 月 16 日，第 3 版。

[Wu Lejun. "Nanjing Massacre Documentary was Broadcast in the Mainstream Media of the United States for the First Time. I Hope More People will Know and Remember this History." *People's Daily* 16 December. 2017, late ed.: C3.]

麦尔维尔小说宗教徒身份书写的政治伦理意蕴
The Implication of Political Ethics in the Religious Identity Narration of Melville's Novel

刘永清（**Liu Yongqing**）

内容摘要：麦尔维尔在他的小说中从宗教徒的身份视角对比书写基督教徒和异教徒的伦理选择，不仅仅是为满足小说人物刻画和故事情节发展的需要，还在于通过殖民地土著民族异教徒善良、朴实和亲爱他人之"善"的伦理选择，凸显美国基督教徒以德报怨、自私自利、践踏他人自由平等和人权之"恶"的伦理选择，揭露以基督教教义立国的美国和西方民主政治宣扬的"自由、平等、人权"的虚伪性，批判美国和西方政治的利己主义政治伦理道德，并借这种批判和揭露去改善美国的政治生态。

关键词：麦尔维尔；基督教徒；异教徒；政治伦理

Title: The Implication of Political Ethics in the Religious Identity Narration of Melville's Novel

Abstract: Melville contrasts the ethical choices between Heathens and Christians from the perspective of religious identity in his novels, the former choosing to be kind, simple and good while the latter selfish, savage, cruel and evil. What he did is not to shape the characters or develop the story, but to expose the hypocrisy of "freedom, equality and human rights" which were founded on Christian doctrine, and advocated by American and Western democratic politics, criticize the egomaniac and immorality of American and Western politics, and appeal for improving the political ecology of the United States.

Keywords: Melville; Christians; Heathens; political ethics

Author: Liu Yongqing, Associate Professor, School of Foreign Languages, Central-South University for Nationalities (Wuhan 430074, China). Her research interest is American literature and comparative literature (Email: brionyliu@126.com).

　　赫尔曼·麦尔维尔（1819-1891）是 19 世纪美国小说家、散文家和诗人，被誉为"美国的莎士比亚"（Hayes 45）。麦尔维尔曾经长期生活在美国的下层社会，做过水手、文书、店员、农场工人、小学教员、海军军士[1]，底层的生活经历让他看到了资本主义的丑恶，这些经历给他提供了主要的创作素材，也对他的民主、平等和人道主义思想的形成起了重要作用。他在创作中充分揭示政治、哲学、社会、历史和文化的同时，"反对进行种族优劣等级划分"（Levine 15），表现出他鲜明的伦理道德立场。

　　聂珍钊在《文学伦理学批评导论》中曾指出，"所有伦理问题的产生往往都同伦理身份相关"（257）。因此小说人物身份是解释人物伦理选择的关键。麦尔维尔借其小说人物宗教身份的交待与描写，基督教徒诸如《泰比》中的托莫、《白鲸》中的亚哈，异教徒如《泰比》中的科里克里、麦赫维和《白鲸》中的魁魁格、斯达巴克、比普等[2]，赋予异教徒更为善良、更具人道、人性和平等的品格；而在描写那些基督教徒时，虽然也对他们的进取、坚忍等方面予以肯定，却更多的描写了他们缺乏人道、人性以及平等意识的品格。聂珍钊指出，"文学伦理学批评从起源上把文学看成道德的产物，认为文学是特定历史阶段人类社会的伦理表达形式，文学在本质上是关于伦理的艺术"（聂珍钊 13）。因此从文学伦理学批评的视角看，麦尔维尔小说是从宗教身份的角度，突出基督教徒和异教徒在人道、人性以及平等意识方面的鲜明对比，目的在于对美国政治制度理论上强调人权、人道、自由、平等而实际上存在着严重的不人道、践踏人权及缺乏自由、平等的现实政治进行宗教伦理道德批判。这也印证了"宗教道德是长期以来形成的一种统治阶级道德观"（聂珍钊 197）。

一、异教徒之"善"

　　麦尔维尔选择书写异教徒之"善"的一面，源于他早年曾经作为水手游历过波里尼西亚和南太平洋群岛，与这些异教徒在海上共同捕鲸的经历有关。[3]这使得他对西方及美国文明社会之外的异教徒的生活、人格等都有了比较深入的了解，亲身体验了他们的人性之善，他虽然也对异教徒有一些歧视性书写，但更多是赞美他们人道、平等、友爱、生性善良等人性光辉。

　　首先，麦尔维尔笔下的土著异教徒社会是一个真正平等和谐的美好世界。麦尔维尔在《泰比》中，远离白人优越论的偏见，没有同其他美国人一样视异教土著民族为愚昧野蛮的异类，而对这没有法律、没有官吏的原始部族异教徒土著人社会作了热情洋溢的描绘："随着我在山谷各处的游历和对当地居民性格的了解，最令我印象深刻的还是他们无处不在的欢乐。这些野

1　参见 Hershel Parker, *Herman Melville: a biography* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996).

2　一般来说，基督教徒多为生活在文明社会的美国公民或欧洲白人，而异教徒则多为原始部落民族或殖民地土著居民。

3　See Kevin J.Hayes, *Herman Melville (Critical Lives)* (London: Reaktion Books Ltd, 2017) 42.

人们心灵纯朴，未经世故，他们能够捕捉到文明社会中不被人察觉的快乐火花。平常琐事中点燃的快乐火花聚集起来就构成了文明人难以体会得到的巨大幸福"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》163）。在他的笔下，这些异教徒泰比人生活无忧无虑："这里没有文明人自扰的万般烦恼。这里没有要取消的抵押赎回权，没有抗议声明，没有账单，没有债务，没有追要欠款的裁缝或鞋匠，没有地牢，没有强奸和辩护律师，没有人挑起事端，让客户争执不休，没有人漠视亲情，永无休止地争抢卧室和饭桌上的活动空间，没有带孩子在无情世界忍饥挨饿的寡妇，没有乞丐，没有债务监狱，没有目空一切、铁石心肠的有钱人"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》145）。对比文明人，麦尔维尔笔下的土著人思想单纯，不贪婪，所以能知足常乐，生活关系简单，心往一处想，劲往一处使，处理事件很少有分歧。"土著人都形同一家，强烈的爱心是将各个成员联系起来的纽带"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》228）。在麦尔维尔看来，异教土著社会充满爱，爱将他们凝聚在一起。这里的女人也受男士尊重，备受呵护。"像所有受到溺爱的美人一样，她们整日在林中游荡，在溪水中沐浴、舞蹈、嬉戏，玩着各种恶作剧，沉浸在无忧无虑的幸福之中"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》228）。这些土著居民如兄弟姐妹般的情义，充分显示出原始部落人人自由、平等的关系。即使是首领麦赫维，和其他土著人的区别也只表现在着装上，权力是很有限的，并不比山谷中其他的居民更优越。土著人这种平等原则还体现在食物的分配上。他们集结成群出海捕鱼，凯旋而归后，留下存放的鱼，余下的鱼"被分成小份，平均分配到各区的人家当中。在完成绝对公平公正的分配之前，鱼被严格地视为禁物。在这一系统的运作下，山里的每一个男人、女人和孩子都得以同时享用到这一美味的食物"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》233）。平均分配原则使得山谷中每个人都有食物，不像文明社会存在分配的严重不均。在麦尔维尔眼中，这里简直是人间天堂。异教徒选择做善良、不贪婪、没有私欲的人，不搞宗教迫害，不搞阶级斗争，社会一团和气，真正践行了美国政治有其言而无其实的平等和自由。

其次，土著异教徒对他人平等友善，富有人道精神。麦尔维尔笔下的土著异教徒，身上也有一些文明社会人的邪恶，但更多的是平等友善、乐于助人。《白鲸》中的异教徒魁魁格，他不慕权力，为使同胞过得比原来更幸福，主动放弃酋长继承权身份，选择到文明国度学一些技艺以便回去建设自己的部落。不再是酋长继承者的魁魁格，到了捕鲸船上很快适应了自己的新身份——船员，与船友打成一片。他对以实玛利关怀备至，甚至将自己的钱财无偿分给以实玛利。"他把他那只香料制的人头送给了我；又掏出那只大烟袋，在烟叶下面摸了一会，摸出三十来个银币；他把银币摊在桌上，笨拙地把它们分成相等的两份，推一份到我面前，说这是我的"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》67）。他的脑海里没有等级观念，还保留着在部落时"有饭同食，有钱同使"的大家庭观念，视自己的船友为同胞。虽然他长相粗野，满脸刺青，有点吓

人，但却非常善良。当白人以实玛利被他吓到时，他说"魁魁格不会伤害你一根汗毛的"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》32）。他的淳朴和善良使基督徒以实玛利感到，"与其跟个烂醉的基督徒同睡，不如跟个神志清醒的生番共榻。""我上了床，有生以来从没睡得这么香甜过"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》32-33）。很快以实玛利和这个异教徒成了推心置腹的知心朋友。而魁魁格不仅对室友以实玛利友善，也对其他船友诚心诚意。当大家被狂风刮得乱作一团，甚至还有人被刮进了海水里时，魁魁格不仅镇定地稳住了轮船的方向，保住了轮船和船上人员的平安无事，还奋勇救起了落水的船友。他冒着个人生命危险跳进大海救人，"赤裸着上身，真像个长弧形那么纵身一跳打穿侧冲了出去"，"在巨浪中多次潜进水里，一只手拖着一个毫无生气的人体"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》79-80）。而他救起落水者后不图回报，只是朴素地认为"普天之下，就是一个共同的、合股的世界。我们野人必须帮助这些文明人"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》80）。异教徒魁魁格做出善的伦理选择，是因为他认为人与人之间互帮互助是自然而然的，就像他的部落成员一样，大家在一起就是一个命运共同体。

异教徒不仅友善对待自己的朋友，就是对那些陌生的、闯进自己领地的人也非常友好。在《泰比》中，当托莫和托比闯进泰比人的领地时，泰比人不是驱赶他们，而是敞开大门欢迎，簇拥着他们的到来，"来到一座宽敞漂亮的竹屋前"，"示意我们进去"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》82），并为他们提供住处和美食。期间，忠诚友好的科里克里选择做托莫的贴身侍者，并给予他精心的照顾，给他喂水喂饭，背他爬山涉水。"他一直都那么精心地照顾着我。我永远也不会低估或忘记你对我的照料，哪怕是在我生命的最后一刻"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》97）；在托莫生病时，泰比人的首领麦赫维也前去探望，协助土著医生治疗托莫的伤腿，并派遣科里克里专门护理他；使托莫由衷地感到："他对我和同伴简直太友好太热情了。他将自己坚实的臂膀伸向我们，尽其所能地表达着他的善意"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》93）。土著异教徒表现出来的友善、淳朴和乐于助人正是他们身上人性因子战胜兽性因子的结果。

再次，土著异教徒反对复仇，充满人道主义意识。在文明社会人眼里，土著异教徒似乎都是杀人魔鬼。但在麦尔维尔的小说中，土著异教徒不仅对他人友好，甚至反对复仇。《白鲸》中的基督徒亚哈船长在一次捕鲸过程中，被凶残聪明的白鲸莫比·迪克咬掉了一条腿，为报复这"一腿"之仇，一心想杀死这条白鲸。船上的大副斯达巴克是一个南塔土著异教徒，面对亚哈船长失去理性的复仇行为，他非常理性地认识到人和动物的根本区别，对亚哈船长说："对一条哑口畜生报仇！它袭击你只不过是出自最盲目的本能罢了！发疯！去跟一条哑物赌气，亚哈船长，这似乎是亵渎神明了。"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》214）认为人应该是理性的动物，亚哈找白鲸复仇是失去理智的表现。即使被迫加入酒誓后，他仍然理性地从他们的信仰劝说亚哈放弃

杀鲸计划："天啊，上天也在反对你啦！"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》655）斯达巴克始终站在人的立场，清醒地认识到人和动物的本质不同，动物袭击人类只是出于本能，若人要跟"一条哑物赌气"，就是把自己降格到动物身份，成为没有理性的动物。再次，斯达巴克多次理性地提醒亚哈的宗教身份，告诫他杀生就是"亵渎神明"。"由于每一个人都是善恶并存的生物体，因此人实际上就是一个斯芬克斯因子。人性因子的表现形式是理性意志，兽性因子的表现形式是自然意志或自由意志或非理性意志"（聂珍钊 276）。斯达巴克从人的身份和宗教徒的身份反对亚哈对动物复仇，正是他身上的人性因子使他做出理性选择。

这些土著异教徒生活在近乎原始的社会，信仰原始的泛神宗教，对不同信仰的人有包容之心。他们的生存伦理环境使他们远离资本主义文明的侵蚀和阶级纷争，不像生活在工业文明社会中的人，有那么多欲望。"人性是伦理选择的结果"（聂珍钊 272）。世外桃源式的生活使他们保持人性的本真，通过人性因子控制兽性因子，做出善举。麦尔维尔从"人道、平等、友爱"选择"野蛮人之善"的一面，其目的是要对比建立在新教伦理精神上的美国文明，揭露美国政治伦理的伪善本质。

二、基督教徒之"恶"

《白鲸》中的船长亚哈、《泰比》中的托莫等都有基督教徒身份的交待。有些虽然没有字面交待其基督教徒的身份，但因美国和西方的白人都信奉基督教，故这种族和国度的交待，事实上隐含着小说中美国和欧洲白人的基督教徒身份交待。按理说，麦尔维尔是美国人和清教徒，应该努力去书写美国基督徒的自由、平等、人道、人权之美之善。因为他有"思想中的两重性因素"（杨金才 3），所以他在肯定西方文明和进步的同时，也批判他们的非人道和伪人权，"毫不含糊地批判传教士对波利尼西亚岛民的破坏影响"（Hayes 87）。在他的笔下，熟读《圣经》的基督教徒，并没有履行基督教"爱人如爱己"的诺言和美国政治宣扬的"平等、民主"契约，而更多的表现出凶残、狡诈和非人道的一面。

其一，基督教徒恩将仇报，以德报怨的罪行。在《圣经》中，耶和华在和百姓立约时就约定"除我以外，不可敬拜别的神"（俞萍 60），并认为其他宗教都是邪教。这一点也渗透到美国政治中，美国《独立宣言》宣称"人人生而平等，造物主赋予他们若干不可剥夺的权利，其中包括生命权、自由权和追求幸福的权利"（玛丽·莫斯特 114）。但是美国宪法修正案第一条却说明"美国的自由人总数包括必须在一定年限内服役的人，但不包括未被征税的印地安人"（理查德·毕曼 31）。由此表明《独立宣言》中的民主、自由、平等和人权只限定于基督教徒之间，其它宗教的信徒都被排除在外。因此在麦尔维尔笔下，《泰比》中的基督徒托莫天生的"白人优先"伦理意

识，使他视前来照顾自己的土著人科里克里为勤劳忠诚的男仆，低白人一等，把他的外貌描绘成怪物的样子，"上帝啊，他的模样实在难看。""这三道刺青总让我想起监牢里隔着铁窗向外张望的囚犯"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》96）。托莫的宗教伦理意识和基督徒的伦理身份使他对这些土著人的原始宗教发自内心的贬低和妖魔化，"异教崇拜的气氛静静地笼罩四周，向其中的一切物体都发出咒语〔……〕两端各通向一个巨大的祭坛，上面站着面目狰狞的偶像〔……〕空地的中间长着一棵参天大树，向下投出阴森的阴影"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》 104）。但托莫在生活上又依赖他们，并利用他们的善良和诚恳，享受他们提供的住处、美食和各种服务。尽管托莫一次又一次地得到了土著人友爱关照，但"白人优越"的伦理意识却使他高高在上，视土著人为奴仆，并怀疑土著人的动机，不信任他们，甚至鄙视、厌恶他们。"回想起当时山谷中的土著人真是给予了我无尽的友爱和关照，但不知为什么我依旧闷闷不乐，整日唉声叹气。实际上关于托比失踪的重重疑云足以让我产生对这些野人的不信任感，如今我完全落在他们手中，无论他们看上去多么和善可亲，说到底仍不过是一群食人之徒"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》136）。托莫基督徒的伦理身份使他始终视这些土著为异教徒，最终选择逃离泰比山谷。在逃离中，极端的"白人优先"伦理意识使他失去了理性，甚至为了成功出逃，狠心杀死了照顾他的泰比人。对此，他心中没有半点愧疚，却心系失联的白人伙伴托比。

泰比人对托莫、托比友好相待，嘘寒问暖，照顾无微不至。而作为基督教徒的托莫，从不曾平等地对待他们，将他们视为仆人，理所当然地接受他们的帮助而毫无感激之心，甚至视他们的生命如蝼蚁，恩将仇报，杀害他们，对异教徒毫无人权、人道之心，与那些异教土著人的善良、平等、人道形成鲜明对比。

其二，基督徒亚哈船长自私自利的行径。《白鲸》中的亚哈因为一次航海被一只名叫"莫比·迪克"的白鲸咬掉了一条腿，因此他誓杀此鲸。至此他放弃了人类社会伦理转而接受动物世界伦理，把自己的身份从人降格到动物。"身份的改变就容易导致伦理混乱，引起冲突"（聂珍钊 257）。因此亚哈遵从动物界的伦理法则——丛林法则，与白鲸进行生死较量。杀鲸使亚哈走火入魔，意识混乱，分辨不清自己的身份，他把自己看作是"王"或者"神"，并把自己即"裴廓德号"船长身份和上帝身份相提并论："主宰人间的只有一个上帝，主宰'裴廓德号'的是船长"（《白鲸》614）；"是亚哈，亚哈嘛？举起这只手臂的，是我，是上帝，还是谁？"（703）四十年的捕鲸生活使他性格孤僻和偏执，自由意志使他放弃了人的身份，而把自己幻想为神，陷入伦理身份混乱中，"所有伦理问题的产生往往都同伦理身份相关"（聂珍钊 263）。由人到神的身份转变使他公然违背"摩西十诫"的神人之约，敢于挑战上帝。"你这个真神呵，你用火把我造了出来，我就要象火

神的真正的孩子一样，把火给你吹回去""虽然你是火光，是从黑暗中跳出来的；我却是从火光中跳出来的黑暗，是从你那里面跳出来的黑暗！"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》654）；"别对我说什么亵渎神明，朋友，如果太阳侮辱我，我也要戳穿它。因为如果太阳会这样做，我也会那样做"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》214）。自视为神的亚哈目空一切，唯我独尊的伦理意识决定了他独断专行的行为，"他一向严格要求别人的只是绝对的、毫不犹豫的服从"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》190），通过"重赏之下必有勇夫"和杀鲸酒誓结盟等手段，命令其船员追随他捕杀白鲸复仇来实现他的君王梦和独裁。为巩固他在"裴阔德号"船上君主地位和独裁统治，他利用了宗教信仰。亚哈"虽然名义上是个基督教徒，他却又是个非基督教徒"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》145）的宗教伦理混乱使他抛弃自己的基督教徒伦理身份，继而招募了由一伙混血的背教者、光棍和生番组成的——也是道德薄弱的一群水手，"这样一群水手，这样配备的头目，似乎就是劫数难逃的天意特为帮助他完成他那偏热症的复仇而挑拣出来的一群出类拔萃的人物"（麦尔维尔，《白鲸》247）。他还选择和袄教徒费达拉结盟，并私自招募五个袄教徒作为自己的随从，暗中听从自己的调遣，专为追杀白鲸而参加航行。伦理身份的混乱使他既不遵循基督教信仰，也不顾全体船员的利益，不听取任何人的劝阻，丧失理性。在兽性因子的主导下，面临整体利益和一己私欲的伦理选择，他将全体船员利益抛之脑后，为报复心头之恨追杀白鲸，直至船毁人亡。这一伦理悲剧正是他伦理身份迷失，兽性因子主导人性因子，任由自由意志泛滥，在非理性意识下做出错误的伦理选择。

其三，基督徒入侵土著部落，大肆烧杀的反人类罪行。大肆烧杀表现出一种"兽性因子"，"兽性因子的表现形式是自然意志或自由意志"（聂珍钊263）。"自由意志指人的不受约束的意志，它的动力主要来自人的不同欲望"（聂珍钊282）。身为基督徒的士兵登上南海诸岛后，为满足自己的领土要求，兽性因子压制了人性因子，激发了他们的兽性，使他们彻底失去了理智——对那里手无寸铁的土著人进行的暴行几乎令人难以置信。"法国曾一度占领了马克萨斯〔……〕可以肯定，在一次改革中，他们屠杀了大约一百五十个惠提胡土著人"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》6）。"在那些相对来说不为人熟知的岛上登录时，船长这样残暴行为屡见不鲜〔……〕从事贸易的帆船在经过狭窄的海峡时，（船长）曾经多次向到海边去的岛民开火，而这对无赖们来说不过是为了取乐而已"（麦尔维尔，《奥穆》25）。在兽性因子的主导下，他们杀土著人仅仅是为了取乐，视这些异教徒的生命为草芥。在遭到土著的抵抗后，他们"一路撤退，为发泄怒气，他们点燃了沿途的所有房屋和庙宇，把整个山谷变成长长一片青烟滚滚的废区"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》30）。在丧失理性后，基督徒士兵用野蛮、灭绝人寰的方式向那里的异教徒宣泄自己的兽性。

在兽性因子的主导下，基督徒不仅对异教徒毫无人性可言，而且对他们的同伴也同样如此。麦尔维尔在《奥穆》中曾这样描写了他们对作为同伴的船员生死。"我们刚刚把一名船友扔给了鲨鱼"，"现在他不在了，更没人会为他着想。人们所谈论的不过是如何处置他的箱子〔……〕把里面的东西分了，不管是衣服还是什么别的东西"（46）。对于同伴的死，他们没有任何告别仪式，将其直接扔入大海喂鲨鱼。兽性因子主导他们沦为没有人性的动物，不辨善恶，冷酷无情，毫无人道。对生病的同伴，领事为了捕鲸的利益，不让他们去岸上治病，只有"那些他宣布离死不远的"，才会"把他送上岸去"（麦尔维尔，《奥穆》81）。相比《泰比》中托莫享受到土著人无微不至的照顾和他们的热情真诚，《奥穆》中基督徒对待死亡同伴的做法，正凸显了他们的反人道。

基督教徒视其他异教徒为奴的宗教伦理教义，为美国种族歧视和剥夺其他民族和国家的信仰自由的政治伦理选择埋下了种子。麦尔维尔小说中的基督教徒自视为"上帝的宠儿"，视其他宗教信仰教徒为异类，甚至劣等民族，为满足自己的私欲，放纵身上的兽性因子，做出非人性选择——杀入放火，表现出邪恶的一面。

三、异教徒与基督徒对比的政治伦理意蕴

麦尔维尔的这些小说并非宗教小说。作者在作品中交待人物的宗教身份，对小说人物刻画和故事情节的发展没有任何意义。而作者在作品中却反复交待这些人物的宗教身份，并将异教徒和基督徒在善、恶方面作对比描写，显然另有深意。

"不同历史时期的文学有其固定的属于它的伦理环境和伦理语境，对文学的理解必须让让文学回归属于它的伦理环境或伦理语境中去，这是理解文学的一个前提"（聂珍钊 256）。要了解麦尔维尔小说人物的宗教身份书写内涵，就要了解彼时美国社会的伦理环境，分析那些影响过他创作思想的人与事，才能准确判断他的宗教徒伦理身份书写的意义和价值。

首先，了解麦尔维尔时代美国社会的伦理环境和他的宗教伦理价值取向。麦尔维尔生活在美国超验主义时代，即"美国文艺复兴"时期。"超验主义"宣称理想的精神实体超越经验和科学，强调直觉对精神实体的把握，主张回归自然。超验主义的先驱爱默生指出，"超验主义基于上帝和世界必要整合体，因而每个人天生就具有神性，人们深深地信仰直觉，把它作为发现自我，世界和上帝基本真理的一种手段"（McQuade 25）。超验主义强调人可以通过直觉去感知自然，在感知自然的过程中获得真理。它否定了上帝统治整个宇宙的绝对权威，否定了基督教教义的唯一正确性，它认为人具有积极认知客观世界的能力，将人在世界中地位提高到一个全新的高度，几乎等同于上帝。

麦尔维尔曾与"超验主义运动"干将梭罗、爱默生及霍桑有深切的交往，是"超验主义"运动的积极参与者[1]。超验主义对于基督教地位的否定和对人的肯定，给了麦尔维尔观察社会和评判基督教的一个全新角度，也彻底动摇了他对基督教的信仰，导致了"他对基督教采取批判的态度"（Kelley, *A Companion to Herman Melville* 150）。因此，他不再视基督教为至高无上的存在，认为人和上帝一样具有对真理把握的能力。所以，同样作为自然之子的"人"——异教徒，也具有同基督教徒一样认知世界的能力；异教也和基督教一样具有同等的地位，完美地反映着世界秩序。因此，麦尔维尔笔下的异教徒，不再是吃人的恶魔，不再是"野蛮"的代名词。

此外，麦尔维尔的底层身份生活经验，尤其是作为水手在土著原始社会和殖民地的游历经验，使他深切地感受到，美国虽然有建立在基督教《圣经》教义自由、平等、人权基础上的制度，但是美国种族意识和殖民主义仍然盛行：有色人、土著人毫无平等、自由、人权可言；甚至"贫富使得美国白人分为高低等级"（Gunn 134），下层白人为了生存不得不受上层白人胁迫。他早年为生活所迫，以水手的底层身份，去了波里尼西亚的一些岛屿，看到了岛上原始土著民族"那里法律、宗教和风俗习惯全都一致"，"私下流传的似乎只有无拘无束的道德心。人们根据个人喜好，尽可信奉一个面目狰狞、鼻大如瓶、臃臂怀胸的神像，或崇拜一个天上人间都难得一见的古怪偶像"（麦尔维尔，《泰比》194）。看到了异教徒对宗教没有固定和明确的界定，不必遵循任何人为或神设的律法，也不受首领、神父、偶像级鬼怪的威慑，而可以根据个人喜好去信奉自己心中的偶像；他们有着美国文明社会所没有的生活怡然自得的那种自由、平等和人道。在异教世界，既没有美国民主社会的尔虞我诈，也没有西方文明社会白人对有色人种的歧视，上层白人对底层白人的压迫。他作为水手出海捕鲸，与异教徒相识相交，从他们身上看到的更多是善良纯朴。对照他长期社会底层生活的所见所闻，和他在波里尼西亚游历所见到的原始有色民族的自由、平等和人道以及超验主义思想叠加，使麦尔维尔看待基督教、异教和美国文明社会有了新的视角，使他发现了现实政治和生活中基督教徒与基督教《圣经》核心价值取向的背离，也使得他对以基督教教义为价值取向的美国和西方民主政治的自由、平等制度中的人道、人权持有强烈的怀疑态度，并从而形成了他人类之"人"，而非国家、种族之"人"的人权、自由、平等观；使他对种族、殖民主义、黑奴制度带来的非人道的生活和毫无人权可言的现象非常反感。所以，麦尔维尔对基督教徒和异教徒宗教伦理身份的书写目的不在歌颂异教而批判基督教，而是有着更为深刻的政治批判蕴涵。

从美国政治制度的建立与基督教的关系，"在美国，宗教和政治信仰的

1　参见 Kevin J.Hayes, *The Cambridge Introduction to Herman Melville* (Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2007) 5.

同源性，既赋予宗教以政治内涵，也赋予政治以宗教激情"（塞缪尔·亨廷顿 167）。我们就可清楚地看到美国政治的自由、民主、平等制度的确立源于基督教的清教教义，美国的政治制度的价值取向建立在基督教教义的基础之上；基督教"构成了美国国家和社会的本质"（于歌 15），美国政治的实践，"一直是基督教世界最具宗教性的国家之一"（董小川 6）。但是，美国的现实却受基督教契约精神和原罪背反的内在逻辑的支配，建国之后便开始将印地安人和非洲黑奴视为"上帝的弃民"；他们对外扩张，将其视为"天命"和荣耀上帝的表现，将建立基督化的社会视为选民的神圣"天命"。在这种思想指导下，美国产生了严重的种族歧视和殖民政策。这种岐视、殖民政策产生了美国种族之间不平等和对有色人种、尤其是黑奴非人道的压迫，致使自由、平等、人道、人权只是白人的权利，有色人种毫无人权可言，形成了制度层面的"美国白人主义"的狭隘人权观。这导致了基督教所宣扬的自由、平等、人道和人权都不过是写在《独立宣言》的纸上，现实中不仅其他种族，诸如印第安、非洲黑人等根本没有自由、平等、人权可言，而且那些生活在社会底层白人，也难享受到真正的民主、自由、平等和人权。就如麦尔维尔小说《水手比利·巴德》[1] 中的下层白人比利·巴德，一个弃儿，不曾受过任何教育，虽然天真而善良，但因为他受到克拉加特的诬陷而失手将其打死后，"被扔进了由权力关系编制的兜网里"（杨金才 165），最后被威尔船长以法律的名义判处绞刑。

所以，综合美国民主政治制度与基督教义的密切关系，麦尔维尔受超验主义影响而形成的政治观念及他多种社会底层身份经验，麦尔维尔在小说中为这些人物贴上基督教徒和异教徒身份的标签，正在于从宗教伦理身份的维度揭露建立在基督教义基础之上的美国政治制度，并没有赋予社会真正的民主、自由、平等以及人道和人权，基督教义并不足以使基督教徒去践行自由、平等以及人道和人权。人性之恶，在消解基督教义的基础上，也在严重地腐蚀美国和西方政治制度宣扬的"人人平等、民主、自由"。但是，麦尔维尔这种揭露和批判并非要否定美国及西方政治民主、自由、平等的制度，而是"希望通过小说引起读者的共鸣达到社会变革"（Kelley, *Herman Melville*: *An Introduction* 21），借这种批判和揭露去完善这一政治制度。

Works Cited

理查德·毕曼：《美国宪法导读》，刘艳译。北京：商务印书馆，2016 年。

[Beeman, Richard. *A Guide to the United States Constitution.* Trans. Liu Yan. Beijing: Commercial Press, 2016]

董小川：《20 世纪美国宗教与政治》。北京：人民出版社，2002 年。

[Dong Xiaochuan. *American Religion and Politics in the 20th Century.* Beijing: People's Publishing

---

1　参见 麦尔维尔：《水手比利·巴德》，许志强译（北京：人民文学出版社，2010 年）。

Press, 2002.]

Gunn, Giles. *Historical Guide to Herman Melville*. New York: Oxford UP, 2005.

塞缪尔·亨廷顿：《失衡的承诺》，周端译。北京：东方出版社，2005 年。

[Huntington, Samuel. *The Promise of Disharmony*. Trans. Zhou Duan. Beijing: Oriental Press, 2005.]

Hayes, Kevin J. *Herman Melville in Context (Literature in Context)*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2018.

Kelley, Wyn. *A Companion to Herman Melville*. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

—. *Herman Melville: An Introduction*. Hoboken: Blackwell Publishing House, 2008.

Levine. Robert S. *The Cambridge Companion to Herman Melville*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

McQuade, Donald. *Selected Writings of Emerson*. New York: Random House, Inc., 1981.

赫尔曼·麦尔维尔：《白鲸》，曹庸译。上海：上海译文出版社，2013 年。

[Melville, Herman: *Moby Dick*. Trans. Cao Yong. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing Press, 2013.]

——：《奥穆》，艾黎译。北京：文化艺术出版社，2006 年。

[—. *Omoo*. Trans. Ai Li. Beijing: Culture and Art Press, 2006.]

——：《泰比》，马惠琴、舒程译。北京：文化艺术出版社，2006 年。

[—. *Typee*. Trans. Ma Huiqin, Su Cheng. Beijing: Culture and Art Press, 2006.]

玛丽·莫斯特：《独立宣言——渴望自由的心声》，刘永艳等译。北京：中共党史出版社，2006 年。

[Most, Mary. *Declaration of Independence*: *Aspirations for Freedom*. Liu Yongyan. Beijing: The CPC Party History Publishing Press, 2006.]

聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年。

[Nie Zhenzhao. *An Introduction to the Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.]

杨金才：《赫尔曼·麦尔维尔的现代阐释》。南京：南京大学出版社，2017 年。

[Yang Jincai. *Modern Interpretation of Herman Melville*. Nanjing: Nanjing UP, 2017.]

于歌：《美国的本质》。北京：当代中国出版社，2006 年。

[Yu Ge. *The Nature of the United States*. Beijing: Contemporary China Press, 2006.]

俞萍：《圣经故事》。南京：译林出版社，2013 年。

[Yu Ping. *Bible Story*. Nanjing: Yi Lin publishing Press, 2013.]

斯托帕德广播剧《暗面》中伦理主题的声景表达
Tom Stoppard's *Darkside*: An Ethics-embedded Soundscape

陈　敏（**Chen Min**）

内容摘要：英国当代剧作家汤姆·斯托帕德的作品思想与艺术并行，其剧作高度关注伦理问题，同时又以新颖丰富的互文、跨学科、跨艺术、跨媒介而著称。然而，学界长期忽视其作品体系中不可或缺的广播剧。本文以斯托帕德基于平克·弗洛伊德摇滚专辑《月之暗面》（1973）创作的广播伦理喜剧《暗面》（2013）为例，揭示剧中探讨的伦理两难、伦理责任等伦理主题，剖析斯托帕德伦理含混文学风格的缘由及表现形式，并考察声景在广播媒介中的戏剧功能和应用。
关键词：斯托帕德；广播剧；伦理两难；伦理含混；声景

作者简介：陈敏，华中师范大学文学院比较文学与世界文学专业博士研究生，杭州师范大学外国语学院讲师，主要从事英国文学、文学伦理学批评及比较文学理论研究。本文受浙江省哲学社会科学重点研究基地"文艺批评研究院"资助。

Title: Tom Stoppard's *Darkside*: An Ethics-embedded Soundscape
Abstract: British contemporary playwright Tom Stoppard is known for his ethical concerns as well as innovative intertextual, interdisciplinary, interartistic and intermedial approaches. However, his radio plays, which are an indispensable component of his body of work, have been long neglected by Stoppard researchers. Taking *Darkside* (2013) as a case in point, this paper attempts to reveal and revisit its ethical themes such as ethical dilemma and ethical responsibility mystified by Stoppard's ambiguous style while enhanced by a complex soundscape incorporating but not limited to Pink Floyd's rock album *The Dark Side of the Moon* (1973).
Keywords: Tom Stoppard; radio play; ethical dilemma; ethical ambiguity; soundscape

Author: Chen Min is a Ph.D. candidate in Comparative Literature and World Literature at Central China Normal University (Wuhan 430079, China), and Lecturer of English at the School of Foreign Languages, Hangzhou Normal University (Hangzhou 311121, China). His main research interests are British

literature, Ethical Literary Criticism, and theories of comparative literature (Email: i@hznu.edu.cn).

　　英国当代戏剧巨擘汤姆·斯托帕德（Tom Stoppard, 1937- ）以其作品中"充盈视听感官的丰富题材、新颖概念和连珠妙语"（Purse xxiv）以及无处不在的互文性、跨学科性和跨媒介性著称于世。然而在其六十载文学创作生涯中应有一席之地的广播剧，却在国内外斯托帕德研究中长期受到忽视。实际上，斯托帕德一直十分热爱和珍视广播这一媒介，他曾盛赞英国广播公司（BBC）的广播剧为"国之瑰宝"（Lee 703）。从 1964 年为 BBC 午夜档写系列迷你剧 [1]，直到 2013 年脱胎于同名摇滚专辑的《暗面》（*Darkside*），斯托帕德一共创作并出版了 10 部广播剧。虽然数量无法与其舞台剧匹敌，但这些剧作既是其作品体系中的重要组成部分，也反映了作家一贯的伦理思想内涵和"集合艺术"特征。本文以《暗面》为例，透过斯托帕德精心架构的纷繁声景表象，揭示嬉闹背后严肃的哲学和伦理命题。

一、《暗面》中的伦理主题

　　英国戏剧中"伦理传统的清晰脉络"（刘茂生 241）不因剧作家迥异的主张与风格而迭，这不仅体现在从莎士比亚到王尔德和萧伯纳的各个历史时期中，也在受到这些前辈直接影响的斯托帕德身上得以印证。斯托帕德研究专家科恩哈伯（David Kornhaber）曾在论述尼采对英国戏剧和哲学两派阵营的影响时指出："和萧伯纳一样，斯托帕德同样将剧场——而非课堂——作为思考伦理与道德、认识论与形而上学等问题的绝佳场所"（"Nietzsche, Shaw，Stoppard"93）。费尔德曼（Alex Feldman）也注意到王尔德和斯托帕德"将思想剧和嬉闹剧相糅合"（54）的意图一脉相承，前者为后者不仅提供了一种戏剧范例，也展示了伦理表达的戏剧语言。用斯托帕德自己的话说，即其严肃和搞笑的性格两面性反映在剧作中，恰好呼应了王尔德《认真的重要性》（*The Importance of Being Earnest*, 1895）一剧的副标题"写给严肃人的平凡喜剧"（qtd. in Gussow 14）。用喜剧甚至闹剧的外衣包裹严肃的伦理议题，这一戏剧模式鲜活地体现在斯托帕德早期代表作《跳跃者》（*Jumpers*, 1972）中：伦理学教授乔治和歌舞演员多蒂的夫妻身份显然是哲学与戏剧相争与互补的隐喻。而《暗面》则是对这一经典模式的承继和延展。

　　2013 年，为纪念摇滚乐队平克·弗洛伊德（Pink Floyd）的传奇专辑《月之暗面》（*The Dark Side of the Moon*, 1973）发行四十周年，BBC 委托斯托帕德创作了长度一小时的独幕广播喜剧《暗面》。该剧在 8 月 26 日播送后立即

1　即被斯托帕德戏称为《布特／靴子》和《穆恩／月亮》的 15 分钟广播短剧 *The Dissolution of Dominic Boot* 和 *"M" Is for Moon Amongst Other Things*. 本文中"广播剧"指专为广播这一媒介创作的戏剧（plays originally written for radio），不包括舞台剧的广播版本及广播剧的其他媒介版本。

在世界范围收获了广泛好评。然而鲜为人知的是，早在这张唱片发行当年，就曾有人提议由斯托帕德将这部前卫摇滚乐作品改编成戏剧。牛津大学学者赫米奥娜·李（Hermione Lee）在最新出版的斯托帕德传记[1]中透露，斯托帕德谢绝的理由是他"既不是这个乐队的乐迷也对他们知之甚少"，同时对这种跨媒介和跨艺术的改编感到"无从下手"（643）。直到乐队过了巅峰期后多年，他才开始欣赏平克·弗洛伊德富有哲思的歌曲，并最终将全部音乐和乐队主唱沃特斯（Roger Waters）的词作都完整保留在该剧中。斯托帕德将台词嵌入音乐中，剧本结构基本建立在这张专辑所讨论的宽泛哲学主题和社会话题上。

《暗面》的故事以女主人公艾米丽（Emily McCoy）的经历为主线，串联起一系列探讨道德困境的小故事，这些所谓的"思想实验"（$\delta\epsilon i\kappa\nu\upsilon\mu\iota$, thought experiment）都曾出现在艾米丽修的哲学课上，而剧中人物也都不同程度地交织在这些高度凝练的伦理叙事中，或因个人不同的伦理选择而改变他人命运，或因直接卷入这些事件而深陷伦理两难之中。比如，该剧甫一开场就向听众呈现了伦理学公正原则中最知名的案例之一"电车难题"（Trolley Problem）[2]：当一辆载满旅客的列车正朝着被洪水冲塌的桥梁飞驰，而此刻只需转动铁轨扳手就能拯救一整车的人，但代价是改变行车方向的车子将撞死另一条铁轨上的一名无辜男孩。在众人的惊呼声中，"伦理人（Ethics Man）"现身转动道岔。随后，"伦理人"的"分身"哲学教授巴戈特先生（Mr. Baggott）在课堂上就此事件向学生们发问——伦理人到底是做对了还是做错了？但艾米丽并未直接回答这个伦理问题，反而质疑起故事的细节来——"谁在火车上？被撞的男孩又是谁？"（Stoppard, *Darkside* 7-9）接下来，听众跟随艾米丽进入思想实验的平行空间，陆续参与到"降落伞之争"、"热气球之辩"和"囚徒困境"[3]中。

这荒诞的一幕幕仿佛把听众带回到《跳跃者》中关于善与恶的辩论，抑或是斯托帕德成名作《罗森格兰兹与吉尔登斯顿已死》（*Rosencrantz and Guildenstein Are Dead,* 1966）开场暗示偶然与理性关系的掷硬币赌正反面的游戏。埃泽尔（Brice Ezell）从戏剧构作（dramaturgy）的角度将《暗面》与《跳跃者》《蓄意犯规》（*Professional Foul,* 1977）《艰难问题》（*The Hard Problem*，2015）等剧归类为斯托帕德的"分析剧"（analytic plays），认为这些剧均以相似的"思想实验或伦理概念为戏剧手段"考察分析哲学中某些关

1　Hermione Lee, *Tom Stoppard: A Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2021. 该书为斯托帕德唯一授权传记。

2　"电车难题"首先由英国伦理学家富特（Philippa Foot）于1967年提出。如今，这类思想实验已广泛应用于当代道德哲学，并正在成为一门被称为"电车难题学（Trolleyology）"的哲学分支。

3　这三项思想实验分别假设飞机即将坠毁、热气球在空中漏气、以及两名共谋犯被分开关押，这些当事人分别面临如何分配仅有的一个降落伞、牺牲谁来减轻热气球重量、该揭发对方还是保持沉默的难题。

键问题，同时将这一现象归因于斯托帕德长期对以罗素和维特根斯坦为代表的分析哲学的批判性思考以及从中发掘的戏剧价值（64-65）。从本质上讲，这些剧中"善或恶"、"对与错"、"存在还是灭亡"等核心问题均属于个体进行道德判断和伦理选择时常常不得不面对的伦理两难。在文学伦理学批评的语境中，"伦理两难"是指"由两个道德命题构成的伦理悖论"，两个选择（在"电车难题"中即是否改变轨道方向）在各自判断时都符合普遍道德原则，但一旦要从两者间做出抉择，就会产生违背伦理的情况（聂珍钊 262-263）。因而，是以一个人的生命换取一车人的生命，还是任由事态恶化而绝不伤及无辜，就成为一个典型的伦理两难选择命题，当事人无论选择哪个都会深陷自责和痛苦。这鲜明体现在人们发现火车即将撞向另一条铁轨上的男孩后瞬间喜极而悲的断崖式反应中：

> **众人**　看！他转动了道岔！
>
> 太及时了！
>
> 干得棒极了，伦理人！
>
> 他把火车引到另一条轨道上去了！
>
> 你救了他们的性命，伦理人！你是我的英雄！
>
> **伦理人**　我只是做了我该做的。
>
> **某小男孩**　等等！——另一条铁轨上站着个孩子！
>
> **众人**　你没错——！他还没看到火车！快躲开！快躲开！啊啊啊！
>
> **某小男孩**　（哭泣着说）火车直接从他身上碾过去了！——你难道没看见他在那儿吗，伦理人？（Stoppard, *Darkside* 8）

伦理选择完成的同时，从英雄到杀人犯的身份变化也在转瞬间发生。类似的问题和矛盾虽然也出现在现实生活中，但在戏剧和其他文学叙事中得到强化和升华。伦理主题在斯托帕德戏剧中频频以悖论形式呈现，是因为其所处语境是被戏剧化的哲学话语，而不是"试图明辨道德法则、文化规范、善本身（the Good-in-itself）"等纯粹问题的"传统哲学话语"（Adamczewski 160）。一些学者得出斯托帕德对分析哲学持批评讽刺甚或地毯式的保守主义态度的结论，或许正是因混淆哲学伦理语境与文学伦理语境而产生误读的结果。历史上，《跳跃者》的毁誉参半直接反映出受众对于斯托帕德戏剧中哲学和伦理主题理解的分野，其标志性事件便是哲学家贝内特（Jonathan Bennett）在顶级学术期刊《哲学》的五十周年纪念刊上发表文章指责"《跳跃者》中招摇过市的哲学显得如此单薄无趣"（5），这一跨界攻击在英国文学史上绝无仅有；而与之相反的，另一批哲学家则以轻松的心态接受斯托帕德的戏谑，甚至撰文大加赞赏[1]。对此，科恩哈伯指出斯托帕德的戏剧往往含有"难以理解和无法沟通的主题"（"Philosophy" 84），言下之意便是：假

1　如分析哲学家艾尔（A. J. Ayer），详见 Kornhaber, "Philosophy" 81.

如你看不懂或误解了他的戏，其实正中斯托帕德下怀，他的目的达到了——戏剧伦理悖论在现实生活中得到镜像实现。

二、斯托帕德的伦理含混及其在《暗面》中的表现

如果说斯托帕德意在用"无解／误解"的呈现方式让观众理解"无解／误解"的戏剧内涵，那实现这一目的的戏剧工具便是"伦理含混"（ethical ambiguity）。新批评派代表人物燕卜逊（William Empson）曾将作为文学策略和文学现象的"含混"（ambiguity）粗略地定义[1]为"表达的迟疑、有意的歧义、单义或双关、多义的陈述"（5-6）。探究词源，其拉丁动词词根为 *ambigere*（本义"四处漫游"，引申义"摇摆、迟疑"），而 *ambi-*（双）并非其真正前缀，因此所谓"ambiguity 含有'双／二'（duality, twoness）之义"只是附会之谈（Ossa-Richardson 18）。从词源可以看出，"含混"的本质特征即弥漫和延宕。与之对应，戏剧中的"伦理含混"包括环境和人物两个层面。第一代斯托帕德研究者德雷尼（Paul Delaney）早就指出，斯托帕德戏剧的含混性或多义性体现在他往往"将观众朝着复杂甚至费解的方向引导"（37），而不是简单地透露斯托帕德本人是或不是站在某个角色的立场上。

最早将"含混"纳入伦理进行系统性讨论的是法国存在主义哲学家波伏娃（Simone de Beauvoir），她在其重要哲学著作《含混的伦理》（*Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté,* 1947）中试图在海德格尔和萨特的存在主义学说基础上建构相应的伦理体系。而文学中的"伦理含混"则指作者故意将情节或人物的道德判断（对错、善恶等）模糊化或戏谑化，从而营造出戏剧性效果，迫使读者或观众对相关伦理问题进行批判性思考。因此，作为文学手段的"伦理含混"不是不辨是非的"非道德"（amorality），更不是混淆是非的"不道德"（immorality）。正因为莎士比亚在《哈姆雷特》中铺陈的不确定的伦理环境，人们才对哈姆雷特的延宕有了千百种解读；也正因为康拉德在《黑暗的心脏》中创造性地设置不可靠叙述者，读者对殖民者的伦理身份才有了更丰富深刻的认知。雷纳（Alice Rayner）在分析斯托帕德喜剧中蕴含的伦理悖论时指出，斯托帕德具有极强的"戏剧自觉"（theatrical self-consciousness），其伦理表达诉诸滑稽幽默。对于斯托帕德而言，"喜剧的一部分功能就是认识论的，或者说，喜剧向观众展示知识中的问题，从而引发怀疑。〔……〕归根结底，艺术虽是经验的沉淀和对现实的戏仿，但唯有通过艺术，我们才能看清现实"（137-144）。因此，斯托帕德运用"含混"有其明确的伦理目的，也是其艺术创作过程中的一种伦理选择。

含混的戏剧语言是斯托帕德戏仿现实的艺术表征之一，比如《暗面》一剧的标题"Darkside"虽然看似直接取自原唱片名"The Dark Side of the

---

1　该术语目前的主流中文译名有：含混、朦胧、复义、歧义，等。燕卜逊未对"含混"做出明确定义，此处引文是其书中最具概括性的一处描述。

Moon"，但词义已经发生变化。平克·弗洛伊德这张专辑由 10 首歌曲组成，最初定名为《月之暗面：写给一群疯子》（*Dark Side of the Moon: A Piece for Assorted Lunatics*），歌曲主题包括：情感冲突、贪婪（消费主义）、时间消逝、死亡、疯狂。"疯狂"（lunacy）不仅在语义上与标题里的"月亮"（luna/Moon）相关联，也暗指因精神问题而离开乐队的前主创巴雷特（Syd Barrett）[1]。同时，作为天文学术语的 "the dark side of the Moon"（月球背面）中的 "dark" 并非指没有光线漆黑一团，而是指它是一片永远背向地球的未知之地，因此又称为 "月球远端"（the far side of the Moon）。"月亮"是斯托帕德在戏剧创作中反复使用的意象之一，比如在这张专辑正式发行一年前上演的《跳跃者》中，斯托帕德就安排了假想的登月场景。然而，广播剧标题最终舍弃"月亮"而只使用 "Darkside" 这个被专有名词化的合成词，却别有一番"含混"的深意：其一是指黑暗、邪恶、未知之地——剧中展开思想实验的平行空间，与充满光明和善意、被人熟知的现实世界形成反差；二者，其原形短语"the dark side of…"本身也可以指人身上隐藏起来不予示人的消极、困惑、敌对的一面——剧中人们面对思想实验的种种状态；而对熟悉哲学的听众来说，这个标题甚至可能会形成海德格尔存在主义核心概念 "Dasein"（此在）的"空耳"；此外，"the dark side" 也是戏剧界的一个行话，指不在舞台灯光下的那些幕后技术部门（音响、灯光、舞美等），然而对这出广播剧来说，此处巧妙的悖论在于平常偏于一隅的音响声效部门却一下子被推至整出剧的核心位置。

在第三场中，艾米丽不知不觉中从课堂转移至虚设的室外空间，并遭遇在第一场的"电车难题"中已经死去的男孩。但荒诞的是，男孩知道自己是个思想实验品，无名无姓，然而却曾感受到心跳。他在向艾米丽说明哲学家康德会如何应对"电车难题"时指出，人是目的而非手段，因此任何以牺牲人的生命达到某种目的的行为都是对"先验"（the transcendental）的大不敬。他将"先验论"奉为圭臬并如是解释：

> **艾米丽** ……什么是先验？
> **男孩** 就是广播里的杂耍演员。
> **艾米丽** *广播里的杂耍演员？*
> **男孩** *广播里有个杂耍演员。他听上去就和没有杂耍演员是一模一样的。有许多人听广播，有一些说"我相信是有杂耍演员的"，而有一些说"根本没有杂耍演员"，有一些哲学家类型的人则说"你看不到听不到闻不到摸不到的杂耍演员，和没有杂耍演员，两者间有何区别？"但这些人中没有一个能告诉其他人杂耍演员到底是否存在。*

1　巴雷特是斯托帕德《摇滚》（*Rock 'n' Roll*, 2006）一剧的灵感和原型之一，也是他欣然接受《暗面》广播剧创作委约的主要原因之一。参见 Hermione Lee. *Tom Stoppard: A Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2021. 643.

艾米丽 那你又是怎么知道广播里有杂耍演员？

　男孩 我在广播里听到他耍杂耍了。（Stoppard, *Darkside* 13）

　　我们不妨把男孩所描述的人们对"广播里的杂耍演员是否存在"这个问题的"无解"理解为"多解"，"广播里的杂耍演员"实际上含有多重伦理隐喻。首先，关于杂耍演员是否存在于广播里的问答本身就击中了海德格尔存在主义哲学所揭示的"存在"问题的致命弱点——人们在探讨存在时只关心存在者（杂耍演员）却忽视了存在本身。其次，杂耍演员的存在悖论也是男孩自身存在的荒诞性的投射，如前面所说，已经去世的男孩[1]却仍有意识仍可以与艾米丽进行对话，我们无从得知男孩到底是否存在。再次，人们对这个问题始终不能得出一致的结论，似乎也暗指"gnoramus et ignorabimus（我们现在不知道，将来也不知道）"这句用以说明科学的有限性的谚语。此外，"广播里的杂耍演员"也可以看作是斯托帕德的自嘲——作为热衷于含混表达的剧作家，他本身就是一名不折不扣的"文字杂耍者"（word juggler），而听众在欣赏这出广播剧的时候，不正是在"听"他的"杂耍"吗？

　　另一个以含混面貌出现在艾米丽和男孩对话中的伦理概念是 "the Good"（善）。当艾米丽问 "What is the Good?（何谓善）"[2]时，如果从哲学角度理解，这是从柏拉图到亚里士多德都曾回答过的最基本伦理问题，同时也是多次出现在斯托帕德戏剧中的辩题。又由于"goodness"本身就意味着需要在善恶对错间做出取舍和选择，因此在受困于伦理两难时，这个问题往往还伴随着 "What is the Right?"（什么是对的？）叩问和纠缠人的心灵。然而，由于戏剧以声音表现文字，这个问题有时也可以听成表达消极颓废态度的 "What is the good?"（有什么用？）。这一伦理含混也曾出现在《跳跃者》中："What, in short, is so good about *good*?（简言之，善有何用？）"（Stoppard, *Jumpers* 55）。的确，还在大学读书的艾米丽的愤世嫉俗一如当年那群摇滚青年平克·弗洛伊德，而这样的诘问也势必在听众心中引起共鸣，从而引发自觉的伦理思考。

三、《暗面》中的声景及其伦理暗示

　　作为一出广播剧，《暗面》诚然无法给予听众视觉体验，但不妨碍其以"整体艺术"（Gesamtkunstwerk）的形式有效完成伦理表达，这不仅仅是因为广播"脱离演员身体的非剧场体验"（Kornhaber, "Philosophy" 86）和该剧中思想实验的抽象化高度吻合，也得益于广播剧自身的"剧场焦虑"（theatrical angst）激发了听众的空间想象——斯托帕德在转场描述时只需加上"户外"

1　男孩在对话中对自我的描述均使用过去时态，如 "I didn't have a name, I was a thought experiment. Except I felt my heart beating."（"我不曾有过姓名，我只是一个思想实验品，不过我曾经感受到心跳。"）

2　此问在全剧中出现达 8 次之多，参见 Tom Stoppard. Jumpers. London: Faber and Faber, 1979. 12, 28, 47, 49, 50.

（Exterior）"室内"（Interior）[1] 的记号便足以替代繁复的剧场布景。以听觉的声景取代（甚至超越）视觉的舞台，这种联觉（synesthesia）设计在他早期受杜尚画作启发的荒诞广播剧《坠楼的艺术家》（*Artist Descending a Staircase*, 1972）中已有显露。斯科尔尼科夫（Hanna Scolnicov）在分析此剧时指出，广播剧让斯托帕德有机会考察由听觉感官产生画面感的一些方法，比如纯声音（包括拟音和录音素材）、语言（台词），甚至是像"偶然音乐"大师约翰·凯奇（John Cage）所采用的噪音和静音，最后将所有这些声音（包括无声）拼贴组合起来。因此，"斯托帕德的戏剧艺术也可以被视作'集合艺术'（assemblage art），他挪用现成的艺术品和艺术运动概念并在这些能指素材（signifiers）基础上创作出属于他自己的有趣的剧作"（75）。笔者认为，这里的"集合艺术"行为所产生的便是以广播为媒介输出的"声景"（soundscape）。"声景"（或"音景"）这一最初产生于音乐领域的术语早已进入文学批评视野，但不同于程虹教授在将其运用于自然文学研究时所限定的"是自然的声景，而不是人为制造的声音"（29），戏剧中的"声景"（Truax 374）是指包括录音、声音表演、来源于音响环境的各类声音素材（found sounds）在内的综合，有时亦可和音乐（表演）相结合。

　　"斯托帕德的伦理世界从未远离其艺术和美学世界"，斯托帕德的作品处处体现他对艺术的热爱，而在所有被他"挪用戏仿的艺术形式当中，没有哪个像音乐这样发挥了如此强大的作用"（Leohlin xxiv-xxv）。因此，《暗面》的开头便自然而然斯托帕德式地直接以平克·弗洛伊德的《对我说》（"Speak to Me"）向听众呈现了一幅"具象音乐"（musique concrète）[2] 的嘈杂声景：渐强的心跳、时钟的滴答、金属的敲击、收银机的开关声、直升飞机的盘旋声，乃至人们关于疯狂生活状态的此起彼伏的抱怨、嬉笑和尖叫，紧接着便以火车呼啸迫近的声音开启关于"电车难题"的讨论。一方面，这些声音元素是对这张音乐专辑中各个主题的引领式提示——生命、时间、存在、金钱、疯狂；另一方面，斯托帕德也借此暗示了接下来各个思想实验对话的核心内容。如果说斯托帕德"在《阿卡狄亚》（*Arcadia*, 1993）中以华尔兹舞为视觉代理（visual proxy）表现混沌学理论"（Purse xxix），那么他在《暗面》中则通过一系列"听觉代理"为伦理问题的讨论画上着重号。另外，值得注意的是，斯托帕德在剧本的这段声景和台词旁提示"美国漫画风格"（American comic-book style），同样的提示也出现在第三场。当艾米丽指着天空中的坠落物（即"降落伞之争"中的降落伞）问是什么时，一个神秘嗓音响起："那是只鸟？那是架飞机？那是超人！"这不仅是对根据同名美国漫画改编的动

1　本独幕剧共 15 场，场景只在"户外"和"室内"之间切换。
2　具象音乐也称其具体音乐，是将来源各异的录音片段以创造性的后期制作技术调变出传统乐器无法表现的音乐。

画电影《超人》（*Superman*，1941）开场白的幽默戏仿 [1]，同时也是对哲学的戏仿，因为剧中有意将流行文化中的"超人"（Superman）替换为尼采哲学思想中的重要概念"超人"（Übermensch）。通过这一含混手法，斯托帕德同时实现了联觉（听觉—视觉）、艺格符换（音—画）和学科跨越（艺术—哲学）。

斯托帕德在《暗面》中的声景设置不仅使听众产生丰富联想，也是剧中人物塑造的逻辑需要。比如，艾米丽既是一名道德哲学的学生，同时也是在精神病院治疗幻听的病人。如此一来，听众可以很自然地代入到艾米丽身上，和她一起听到这些声音，和她一起追问伦理问题，广播剧的长处也因此得到无限放大。加之剧中的各种碎片化声音以及平克·弗洛伊德的开放性音乐，《暗面》无疑具有德里达"幽灵学"（hauntology）所描述的"'幽灵在场'（spectral presence）的音效特征"（Adamczewski 158）。笔者认为，听众所感受的声景的复杂性与剧中的伦理含混是一致的，并且通过幽灵式的声音呈现，《暗面》唤醒了听众的伦理意识。法国哲学家利科（Paul Ricoeur）对"责任"这一伦理概念的经典阐释可以在本剧中得到印证。利科指出"责任"（responsibility）的含混性在于，一方面人们把它视作"义务"——"履行职责，承担任务，执行承诺"，但根据动词"respond"本身的歧义，也可以理解为"对某个问题、诉求、指令的回答或反应"（12）听众对《暗面》中由对话、演唱、音乐及各种实景杂音构成的声景及其淡入淡出的反应（response）恰与贯穿全剧的关于人类自身伦理责任的辩论（该不该救火车上的人，该不该让胖子跳下热气球，等等）相耦合。在剧中，艾米丽逐渐意识到"回答"这些思想实验中被抽象化的伦理两难问题是无意义的，她对老师巴戈特先生说：

> 在正常生活中，人们不会仅仅为了自己，世上有千千万万你不知道的人和事，但你那些火柴棍人以为可以像做数独题一样为这些问题算出答案。我倒是觉得，你没法算出来什么是善，你就是知道什么是善，妙就妙在这儿。（Stoppard, *Darkside* 32）

在这段反驳中，我们发现主人公觉醒了，她终于对思想实验做出了回应而非回答。艾米丽所谓不可言说的"妙处"一如文学能在潜移默化中"实现伦理建构"，使受众"感受人物，理解人物，理解作品，并从作品中获得教诲"（聂珍钊 261）。而声景在此处的作用在于，它能以一种仿真的在场感激发听众及剧中人物的情绪，从而使人们以更人性化的视角看待伦理问题。我们可以假设，在声景缺失的情况下，这些伦理问题将只能以单一的对话形式呈现，那么这出剧将停留在抽象的哲学层面，而无法与听众形成心灵的共鸣。

《暗面》并不是平克·弗洛伊德的歌曲串烧，也非台词与音乐的简单叠加，

---

1 电影开场，人们望向天空惊呼"那是只鸟！那是架飞机！那是超人！"（"That's a bird! That's a plane! That's Superman!"）这几句话一直以来是流行文化的戏仿对象。

而是"依循原专辑的思想内涵而重新设计的一个小故事",斯托帕德坦言"自己远不是音乐人,但还是通过提取情绪元素让专辑音乐和戏剧产生了有效互动"[1]。比如,当巴戈特先生解释"幸福是一种好好活着的状态,所以首先要活着而不是死了"(Stoppard, *Darkside* 9),此时背景切入平克·弗洛伊德专辑中的一首《呼吸》("Breathe")。不过,剧中更多也更高明的是,当歌曲和故事内核发生直接关联时,音乐与伦理叙事融为一体。比如,在世界经济危机之后来谈论银行家的道德问题,没有比脍炙人口的《金钱》("Money")更合适对物质主义者的描摹:"钱啊钱,滚远点〔……〕钱啊钱,一场空〔……〕钱啊钱,回来吧〔……〕钱啊钱,人人爱〔……〕钱啊钱,是罪恶〔……〕"(Stoppard, *Darkside* 38,44)由此,作为声景一部分的音乐专辑在被戏剧化的同时得到了升华。

综上所述,作为一种听觉沉浸式的戏剧体验,广播剧的伦理叙事主要依赖氛围的营造,而把对场景空间和演员肢体动作的想象交给听众。《暗面》的"广播剧媒介特征与剧中展示的哲学焦虑相吻合"(Ezell 76):艾米丽对思想实验及其中人物命运的思考促使她行动,却又受限于广播剧的声波传递形式。斯托帕德在《暗面》中并非简单地罗列伦理问题,而是巧妙地将这些问题嵌入复杂的声景之中;该剧也绝非对分析哲学乃至哲学的讽刺,而是以斯托帕德一贯的含混伦理表达方式引发听众对基本伦理问题的严肃思考。珀斯(Nigel Purse)曾评价,斯托帕德的戏剧"或让人发笑,或令人困惑,或使人受到教诲,或往往三者皆有之"(xxvii)。笔者认为,《暗面》正是这样一出"三者皆有之"的广播伦理喜剧。

Works Cited

Adamczewski, Tymon. "Hauntology of Responsibility: Tom Stoppard's *Darkside*." *Avant* 2 (2017): 157-166.

Bennett, Jonathan. "Philosophy and Mr. Stoppard." *Philosophy* 191 (1975): 5-18.

程虹:"自然文学的三维景观:风景、声景、心景",《外国文学》1(2015):28-34。

[Cheng Hong. "Landscape, Soundscape, and Soulscape", *Foreign Literature* 6(2015): 28-34.]

Delaney,Paul. *Tom Stoppard*:*The Moral Vision of the Major Plays*. London:Palgrave Macmillan, 1990.

Empson, William. *Seven Types of Ambiguity*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1963.

Ezell, Brice. "Tom Stoppard and the Darkside of Drama, Theatre, and Philosophy." *Modern Drama* 1 (2020): 63-82.

Feldman, Alex. "Oscar Wilde." *Tom Stoppard in Context*. Eds. David Kornhaber and James N.

---

1 据斯托帕德的广播采访,参见 Tom Stoppard, "An Interview with Mark Lawson", *Front Row*, BBC Radio 4, 19 August 2013. [Retrieved 2021-08-25: http://bbc.co.uk/programmes/b038c0fg]

Loehlin. Cambridge：Cambridge UP, 2021. 53-61.

Gussow, Mel. *Conversations with Stoppard*. New York：Grove Press, 1996.

Kornhaber, David. "Nietzsche, Shaw, Stoppard: Theater and Philosophy in the British Tradition." *Philosophy and Literature* 1（2012）: 79-95.

—. "Philosophy." *Tom Stoppard in Context*. Eds. David Kornhaber and James N. Loehlin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2021. 81-88.

Lee, Hermione. *Tom Stoppard: A Life*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2021.

Leohlin, James N. and David Kornhaber. "Introduction." *Tom Stoppard in Context.* Eds. David Kornhaber and James N. Loehlin. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2021. xxi-xxvi.

刘茂生：《社会与政治的伦理表达：萧伯纳戏剧研究》。北京：人民出版社，2019 年。

［Liu Maosheng. *The Ethical Expressions of Society and Politics: A Study on George Bernard Shaw's Plays.* Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2019.］

Morra, Irene. "Music." *Tom Stoppard in Context.* Eds. David Kornhaber and James N. Loehlin. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2021. 147-156.

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.］

Ossa-Richardson, Anthony. *A History of Ambiguity*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2019.

Rayner, Alice. *Comic Persuasion: Moral Structure in British Comedy from Shakespeare to Stoppard.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.

Ricoeur, Paul. *The Just. Trans.* D. Pellauer. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2000.

Rossiter, Kate. "Bearing Response-Ability: Theater, Ethics and Medical Education." *Journal of Medical Humanities* 33 (2012): 1-14.

Scolnicov, Hanna. "Making ears serve for eyes: Stoppard's visual radio play." *Word & Image* 1 (2004): 63-83.

Stoppard, Tom. *Jumpers*. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

—. *Darkside*. London: Faber and Faber, 2013.

Truax, Barry. "Electroacoustic Music and the Soundscape: The Inner and the Outer World." *Companion to Contemporary Musical Thought*. Ed. John Paynter. New York: Routledge, 1992. 374-398.

From Classics to Canon Formation: British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture

Chen Lizhen

Abstract: The canonical debate has always been a vital subject. Chinese scholars have participated in this debate and achieved a series of important accomplishments. *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* is the culmination of a great tradition of canon making in China. It analyzes the role that culture plays in the process of canon formation. By adopting the ways of universal relations and development in dialectical materialism, it makes a systematic survey on the reciprocal relationships between the idea of culture and canon making. British literature evolves with the transformation of the society. Classics are made into canons midst changes in the idea of culture. This new finding reveals an undercurrent in the historical texture of British literature.

Keywords: canon formation; classics; culture; *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture*

Author: Chen Lizhen is Professor of English at the School of International Studies, Hangzhou Normal University (Hangzhou 311100, China). His current research interests include ethical literary criticism, circulation of literary discourse and narrative theory (Email: lizhenchen@hznu.edu.cn).

标题：文化观念流变中的英国文学经典化历程

内容摘要：文学的"经典化"问题一直都是学界的重要议题，中国学者也在此领域持续发声，取得重要研究成果。《文化观念流变中的英国文学典籍研究》是近年此领域研究的集大成者，它辨析了文化观念在文学作品经典化过程中所起到的重要作用，运用普遍联系和发展的唯物辩证法观点，独辟蹊径地对不同历史时期文学经典作品中和文化观念的互动做出系统分析。英国文学伴随着近代社会的转型而演变，在文化的观念流变中大浪淘沙成为经典，这个要旨为我们指明了英国文学历史进程中的一条新脉络。

关键词：经典化；典籍；文化；《文化观念流变中的英国文学典籍研究》

作者简介：陈礼珍，杭州师范大学外国语学院教授，文艺批评研究院研究员，主要研究文学伦理学批评、文学话语传播和叙事学理论。本文系浙江省哲学社会科学规划项目"英国18世纪女性作家情感叙事中的自我形塑研究"【项目批号：18NDJC062YB】和国家社科基金青年项目"英国摄政时期历史小说

The issue of "classics" and "canons" has stirred a critical debate all over the world. "Classics" originally referred to the great works in Greek and Roman literature. It gradually developed a broader sense to be more inclusive for literary works in different cultures. Classics are generally considered as works of high artistic quality and achievement which deserve to go down to posterity. David Damrosch, in his *What is World Literature* (2003), proposes that "there never has been a single set canon of world literature" (Damrosch 5) and that "world literature has often been seen in one or more of three ways: as an established body of classics, as an evolving canon of masterpieces, or as multiple windows on the world" (Damrosch 15). In this light, classics and the canon belong to different categories, even though they do share the same nature of "classic-ness."

The past seven decades or so have witnessed a rising interest in the concept of canon in the intellectual community. Many critics are dedicated to the research on the formation of literary canons. Eminent scholars like Ernst Gombrich, Northrop Frye, Frank Kermode, Edward Said, Robert Alter, Geoffrey Hartman and Harold Bloom approached the issue of canonical debate with their separate interpretations of the concept of canon (Gorak v; Ungureanu 87). Chinese scholars participated in the canonical debate, too. They approached the debate from the perspectives of Chinese culture and stance. With theoretical innovation, interdisciplinary vision and pioneering spirit, they blazed new trails in this field.

The Canonical Debate and Advancement in China

There are many problematic complexities and subtleties in the process of canon formation, giving rise to the emergence of the canonical debate. Different critics adopt different perspectives to address the idea of canon and its relationship with classics. Suzanna E. Henshon points out: "Classics are difficult to define, except as works of lasting and great quality, classics present universal truths about human nature, the best voices and visions available in the literary tradition. The established canon of literary works represents different historical periods and is a constantly changing and evolving entity" (Henshon 138). Canon formation is an academic, historical and ideological process that evolves and changes over history. Canonicity involves criteria that we take to select, choose and preserve for the world and for posterity. "The well-known core meaning of the Greek 'Kanon' is 'rule' or 'measure' and, by extrapolation, 'correct' or 'authoritative'" (Harris 110). Eugene Ulrich points out that the word "meant a 'rod' or 'measuring stick' and acquired

the figurative senses of 'norm' or 'ideal'" (Ulrich 266). The original meaning of "canon" is closely related to the Bible. It is used as a contrast to "apocrypha," which means something outside of the canon. The notion of canon, however, was not a functionally important existence in English literature in the beginning. Ross holds, in *The Making of the English Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century*, that the institutionalized process of modern canon-formation "can be rightly said to have begun, in England at least, during the eighteenth century" (5). The content of "The Canon" or canons undergoes an expansion with the accumulation of more and more classics in different periods of the history of literature. Canon making is an action of choice that is made with the authority and taste of the person who proposes to make a canon.

Silvia Maria Teresa Villa makes a good survey of the situation of this debate in her monograph *The Concept of Canon in Literary Studies: Critical Debates 1970-2000*. Whenever the concept of literary canon is involved in contemporary criticism, Harold Bloom's *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages* (1994) is always mentioned as a famous landmark. Harold Bloom chooses 26 writers, including Shakespeare, Chaucer, Milton, Dr. Johnson, Wordsworth, Austen, Dickens, George Eliot, Joyce and Woolf in British literature, as canonical and authoritative authors. In Bloom's mind they are crucial figures in the national literature of the United Kingdom. He takes "strangeness" as the reason for their greatness and canonicity: "The answer, more often than not, has turned out to be strangeness, a mode of originality that either cannot be assimilated, or that so assimilates us that we cease to see it as strange" (Bloom 3). Bloom emphasizes the canonical centrality of Shakespeare and Dante and takes them as "the center of the Canon because they excel all other Western writers in cognitive acuity, linguistic energy, and power of invention" (Bloom 46). Bloom's conception of the canon is a hierarchical structure that has a center and different degrees of importance and greatness. Bloom divides the past centuries into a cycle of three phases, which is borrowed from Giambattista Vico: the aristocratic age, the democratic age and the Catholic age. The general tone of *The Western Canon* is rather pessimistic, which is evident in the title of Chapter One "An Elegy for the Canon." Bloom exerts a great influence on other critics in the research field of literary canons. Bloom's concept of a rigid and fixed canon is debatable. We need a more flexible and optimistic vision towards the formation and evolution of canon over history.

Put in historical context, *The Western Canon* can be looked upon as an important part of, as well as a reaction to, the canonical debate in the last decades of the 20th century. Alastair Fowle's *Kinds of Literature* (1982) addresses the

relationship between literary genres and canon formation, while *The Western Canon* puts emphasis on elements of stylistic, aesthetic and intellectual excellence. Culture is mentioned many times in this book but only dealt with in an abstract and broad sense. Apart from the "anti-multiculturalist view [that] asserts an aesthetic value-centered canon" (Ungureanu 89), other critics tend to study canon formation from the interactions between literature and culture. Jan Gorak's *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea* (1991) is an interdisciplinary and cultural study in this field that takes culture as a more serious and seminal power in the process of canon formation. John Guillory's *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (1993) pushes the frontiers of the canonical debate from the perspective of sociology and cultural studies. In the field of world literature, the concept of canon is more closely related with the power of circulation, changes and national identity. Pascale Casanova, in her *The World Republic of Letters* (1999), proposes to remap a global canon which is established through circulation. In the year 2011, Liviu Papadima, David Damrosch and Theo D'haen published *The Canonical Debate Today: Crossing Disciplinary and Cultural Boundaries*. It testifies to the fact that the canonical debate is still going on with due importance.

Chinese scholars have also responded to the issue of classics and canon formation with great vigor. Xiao Minghan has published *The Development of English Literary Tradition in the Middle Ages* (2009) and *Tradition and Development: Studies of English and American Literary Classics* (2016). Equally important academic achievements are made in China, such as Zeng Yanbing's *Reevaluation of Western Literary Classics* (2011), Huang Weizhen's *What is the Canon and How is the Canon* (2018) and Jiang Ningkang's *Literary Canon and National Culture* (2015). A more noteworthy achievement has been made by Wu Di, who won a major program from the National Social Science Fund of China in 2010 and published the research findings of his team in an eight-volume series entitled *Studies in the Formation and Dissemination of Foreign Literary Classics* in 2019. It is a massive project on world literature, which "maximizes its coverage of foreign literary classics, tracing their formation from their source language contexts all the way to contemporary China's context" and is successful to "delineate the humanities genealogy of the formation and dissemination of foreign literary classics, revealing the profound dynamics underneath the cultural mechanics, aesthetic motivation and social factors" (Wang 181). It is one of the earliest efforts in China to carry out large-scale systematic research on the formation and dissemination of literature across the world. Jiang Chengyong's *Classical Reassessment and Innovation*

of Western Literature Research Methods (2020) is a no less fruitful theoretical exploration to address the idea of classics and canons by investigating the evolution of literary trends over history.

In contrast to the global and theorized research on classics in different countries, "British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture," a major program granted by the National Social Science Fund of China, was initiated by Yin Qiping in 2012. It focuses on the cross-examination of British literature and culture. Ten years later, Yin Qiping and his research team brought forth a monumental work entitled *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* (Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2020). It was funded by the National Publication Foundation, which is the symbol and guarantee of academic excellence. This series of books consists of six volumes: overview, beginning, burgeoning, maturation, expansion and fission. The ultimate aim of the book series is to "evaluate the roles that core values play in the evolution of literary canons over time" (Yin, *British Literature* back cover). *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* represents the latest advancement of academic research in China and can be deemed as an ideal response to the ongoing Canonical debate. As a central concept of this book series, "the idea of culture" is worthy of special notice. Yin Qiping clarifies this notion at the beginning of his general preface to the book: "The ideas of culture refer to such ideas as perceived in literary classics, especially the ideas which have been reflected by literary classics, characterized by critiques of modern civilization and by the aim to guide the overall way of life of a nation" (Yin, *British Literature* iii). In this way, he succeeds in bridging the gap between the shaping force of culture and the driving force for the formation of canon in British literature.

Culture and Canon Formation in British Literature

Influenced by the changes in the idea of culture, canon formation, as a long historical process, changes and evolves over time in a corresponding way. Early efforts of canon making are visible, though scarce, in the original phase of British literature. Trevor Ross argues that "Geoffrey Chaucer's self-consecration in the envoi to *Troilus and Criseyde* is the first notable instance of an English author canonizing his work by comparing it to the classics" (Ross, "The Canon" 370). This self-conscious endeavor itself is a historical entity, too. The notion of classics is always associated with the high standard of "the best" among all the literary works. Therefore, the criteria of classics bear a transecting relationship with culture, which is defined by Matthew Arnold in his *Culture and Anarchy* as "a pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all the matters which most concern us,

the best which has been thought and said in the world" (Arnold 5). In the great tradition of literary criticism in Britain, two intersecting currents are visible: the currents of moral criticism and cultural criticism, which are shaped by Thomas Carlyle, Matthew Arnold, John Ruskin, William Morris, F. R. Leavis, C. P. Snow, Raymond Williams, Terry Eagleton.

Efforts of canon making in British literature are not limited to the native language and culture. On the horizon of world literature, classics of British literature travel into other cultures and take different shapes in accordance with the cultural landscapes and historical circumstances of other countries. Great scholars, including Qian Zhongshu, Wang Zuoliang, Li Funing and Zhou Jueliang, have made significant contributions to the canon making process of the classics in British literature. Pursuing the courses charted by these predecessors, Yin Qiping is dedicated to the study and research of British literature. *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* is a continued academic effort on his part. He has dedicated himself to studying the reciprocal relationship between culture, literature and discourse. In his *Debating the Discourse of "Progress": A New Type of Novels in Nineteenth-Century England* (2009), he holds that even though Dickens, Thackeray, Disraeli, Hardy and Conrad have diversified writing styles and narrative strategies, they express the same anxiety in their works: "…a query on the quick pace of 'progress', an antipathy to the arrogant discourse of 'progress', a worry about the heavy price that is paid for 'progress'" (Yin, *Debating the Discourse of "Progress"* 13). One of the major arguments in his *"Apologia of Culture": Cultural Criticism in the 19th Century Britain* (2013) is that culture can soothe our anxiety over social transition mostly in two ways, namely "to criticize and to provide a vision" (Yin, "*Apologia of Culture*" 9). This argument inherits the great critical heritages created by the above-mentioned critics in England and China. Meanwhile, its innovativeness lies in the fact that it pushes the frontiers of the function of culture and concentrates on its shaping power that runs through all the literary works.

British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture is the culmination of a great tradition of canon making in China. It is necessary to take an overview on the reciprocal relationship between the idea of culture and formation of the canon in a specific historical period. A clear vein of this is visible in the historical texture of Britain. Over the past several hundred years, great writers have almost unanimously tended to provide a tentative answer for the real meaning of life and literature: a good life relies not on the targets and indexes of a mechanical society, but rather on the harmony of a community and the spiritual-material balance in a society (Yin, *British Literature* back cover). Here we can find the shared traits of literary classics

and culture.

British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture, nevertheless, brushes against the grain to appeal to the roles that writers and historical circumstances play in the process of canon-formation. In the theoretical framework of this book series, the beginning of the idea of culture in British literature covers the period between the latter years of the Middle Ages and "the Glorious Revolution" of 1688. It explores the historical phenomenon of the budding of the idea of "culture" in the early modern age. Literary works are studied in specific historical contexts to reveal the emergence of modernity and individualism in Britain. The burgeoning period addresses the historical span between 1688 to 1815 when the Napoleonic Wars ended. The maturation period covers the Victorian Age, whereas World War II divides the periods of expansion and fission. *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* cross-examines the interactions between the evolution of ideas of culture and literary classics in a reciprocal way, so that "A study of British literary classics in the perspective of the evolution of the ideas of culture reveals the new mechanisms of cultural history and literary history" (Yin, "The Evolution" 12). A central theoretical innovation of *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* can be found in its method of taking ten key words as the framework of the history of cultural ideas. The ten key words are the anxiety over transition, depiction of vision, fashioning of community, appeal for order, taste and aesthetic judgment, cultivation of the mind, creation of literary language, national conscience, the moral and ethical tradition, the way of work and life. By taking these ten key words as pillars to hold the theoretical framework, *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* distinguishes itself from all the other canon making efforts.

British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture focuses on interpretations of classics in light of the idea of culture. It does not intentionally create an authoritative canon. Nevertheless, it is an inevitable cause of canon making. The publication of this series of books functions as an important power of canon formation. As a monumental work in the study of British literature and culture, *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* is destined to be a landmark. Canonical writers, as in any work of canon formation, are studied with great details, including William Langland, Chaucer, Shakespeare, John Milton, John Bunyan, Metaphysical Poets, Francis Bacon, Alexander Pope, Daniel Defoe, Samuel Richardson, Henry Fielding, William Wordsworth, Walter Scott, Coleridge, Jane Austen, Alfred Tennyson, George Eliot, Charles Dickens, William Thackeray, Matthew Arnold, John Ruskin, Henry James, Thomas Hardy, Joseph Conrad, Samuel Butler, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, William

Butler Yeats, William Golding, William Somerset Maugham, George Orwell and others. Due space is allotted to philosophers, critics and popular writers. Edmund Burke, John Stuart Mill, William Empson, C. P. Snow, Tolkien, J. K. Rowling and many other writers occupy an important position in the project. *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* is not only the "magnum opus" of Yin Qiping, but also one of the greatest achievements in the research field of British literature in China.

Institutional Efforts on the Formation of Classics and Canons

Canon making has emerged as an important institutional force to shape the boundary of literature. The idea of canon formation, in turn, has stimulated and facilitated efforts of canon making with textbooks, professional criticism, cross-media adaptation, institutionally funded research programs and other methods. As Frank Kermode has rightly said, " the institution does not resist, rather encourages change; but it monitors change with very sophisticated machinery" (Kermode 85). Selective canons are only recent historical entities. Wendell V. Harris points out that "Further perspective comes from recognizing that, until the Renaissance, selective canons in literature were generally of little importance, that selective canons of European vernacular literature blossomed only in the eighteenth century and that selective canons of English and American literature are more recent still (Harris 113). Institutional efforts on the part of the publishing industry, universities and scholars are strongly tangible in the plan of a series of canons. Encyclopedia Britannica has published the 54-volume *Great Books of the Western World*, which is a collection of great books in western civilization. The Modern Library has initiated ambitious projects to fund the best books in English literature, while the publishing industry as a whole has provided readers with greater access to classics, which has in turn reinforced the notion of classics on the part of readers.

When English literature circulates within other cultures, the issue of textbooks for this "foreign" literature looms large, in a certain sense, as a very important channel of canon making. In China, a great variety of textbooks on British literature are finished by scholars including Wang Jin (1920), Ouyang Lan (1927), Zeng Xubai (1928), Xu Mingji (1934), Jin Donglei (1937), Fan Cunzhong (1983), Chen Jia (1981-1986), Liu Bingshan (1981), Liang Shiqiu (1985), Wu Weiren (1988), Wang Zuoliang (1996), Zhang Dingshuan (2002), Nie Zhenzhao(2004), Wang Shouren (2006), Li Zhengshuan (2006), Liu Yiqing (2008), Suo Jinmei (2009) and Chang Yaoxin (2010). These textbooks lay a solid foundation for the notion of British literature, providing an outline and framework for generations of Chinese college

students. These institutional efforts play a central role in making Chinese versions of the British literary classics and canons. They exert an extremely influential power on college students and shape their notion of the classics and great writers in British literature. Their importance can never be overestimated. The institutional force can also be seen in the National Social Science Fund of China. Over the past twenty years, the Fund has supported dozens of research programs in the field of foreign literature to carry out studies on the issue of canon. Some of these academic endeavors are noteworthy due to their ground-breaking originality, insight and all-inclusiveness. Compared with the monographs in the west, Chinese scholars distinguish themselves with a broader vision and a more systematic scope. Combing the institutional and authoritative force of the National Social Science Fund of China and the conscientious efforts of scholars, *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* inherited the merits of general history and textbooks of British literature. As pointed out by Ou Hong, "there are histories of facts and histories of ideas of the compiler embodied in the facts. Most of the histories written by scholars from the Chinese mainland belong to the first type, hence lacking originality" (Ou 5). *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture*, no doubt, belongs to the second type. It fulfills all the expectations of histories of ideas in a good way, aiming to delve into the complicated reciprocal relationships between culture and literature. By focusing on the idea of culture and tracing its changes and dynamic development over time, *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* reshapes the canon of British literature in the shifting cultural landscape of the Great Britain. In this sense, by remapping the scope of literary classics from Chaucer to the 21st century, *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture* establishes, in fact, a new version of canon. As the research achievements of a major program of the National Social Science Fund of China, this series of books is endowed with the authority of the institutional power of the National Office for Philosophy and Social Sciences.

British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture approaches the process of canon-formation from the perspective of a constantly changing culture and form. As a special design of this project, *the book series* has a very diversified version of appendixes. From the text of the story of the Holy Grail, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, *The Faerie Queene*, *God and the Bible*, *Across the Pond: An Englishman's View of America*, Johnson's preface to the Dictionary, *The Tatler*, *Signs of the Times*, Matthew Arnold's "Stanzas from the Grande Chartreus," Benjamin Disraeli's *Sybil,* John Stevenson's *British Society 1914-45* and David Lodge's *Thinks....,* the selection of these classical texts aims to provide a cultural and historical context to

illustrate the process of the formation of the literary canon. In this way, Yin Qiping testifies to his determination not to make a closed, authoritative and old-fashioned canon. He leaves gaps, ellipsis and open space for readers to open up the boundary of the book series.

The formation of classics and canons is a complicated phenomenon created with institutional efforts. For centuries the term "literary canon" has often been used to refer to the classics and masterpieces which are constructed by textbooks and critical reviews. However, the formation of the literary canons is shaped by the notion of culture, which does not stay in a static state but evolves over time. Herein lie the elements that lead to the formation of the literary canons that changes over history by corresponding to the changes of the idea of culture. In this sense, it is a suitable, feasible and reasonable model for us to use to remap the literary canon through the shaping power of British culture. In the field of literature, the word "canon" is used in a secular sense. It still, nevertheless, implies a force of power, authenticity and authority. In a postmodern age, it is always problematic to say that we have a fixed and existentialist body of selected texts that can be termed as "The Canon." Instead, it is safe to propose a more localized, personalized and diversified version of "the canon" or "canons" out of the classics. Trevor Ross points out that "canon making is a way of ordering important works, and the conceptual order a canon provides simplifies much about these works that is hard to comprehend" (Ross, "The Canon" 368). *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture*, in all aspects, is a great new stride made in the research field of British literature and culture. It not only offers a new path for research on canon formation and culture in the future, but its achievement also has a retroactive effect: the hidden vein of British literature midst changes in the idea of culture over the past centuries is revealed for the first time.

Works Cited

Arnold, Matthew. *Culture and Anarchy*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.

Bloom, Harold. *The Western Canon: The Books and School of the Ages.* New York: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1994.

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.

Gorak, Jan. *The Making of the Modern Canon: Genesis and Crisis of a Literary Idea*. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Harris, Wendell V. "Canonicity." *PMLA*. 1(1991):110-121.

Henshon, Suzanna E. "Classics/ Great Books." *Encyclopedia of Giftedness, Creativity, and Talent*. Ed. Barbara Kerr. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2009. 138-139.

Kermode, Frank. "Institutional Control of Interpretation." *Salmagundi* 43 (1979): 72-86.

区鉷：《关于英国文学史编撰的思考》，《广东外语外贸大学学报》4（2006）：5-7。

[Ou Hong. "Reflections on the Compilation of the History of English Literature." *Journal of Guangdong University of Foreign Studies* 4 (2006): 5-7.]

Ross, Trevor. *The Making of the English Canon: From the Middle Ages to the Late Eighteenth Century*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's UP, 1998.

—. "The Canon." *The Oxford Encyclopedia of British Literature*. Ed. David Scott Kastan, Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006. 367-372.

Ulrich, Eugene. *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Developmental Composition of the Bible*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015.

Ungureanu, Delia. "What to Do about Constructing the Literary Canon: Canonicity and Canonical Criteria." *The Canonical Debate Today: Crossing Disciplinary and Cultural Boundaries*. Eds. Liviu Papadima, David Damrosch and Theo D'haen. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2011. 87-98.

王卓："重读外国文学经典 构建中国气派人文谱系：读吴笛八卷本《外国文学经典生成与传播研究》"，《文学跨学科研究》4（2020）：181-186。

[Wang Zhuo. "Rereading Foreign Literary Classics, Constructing Humanities Genealogy with Chinese Manner." *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature*. 4 (2020): 181-186.]

殷企平：《"文化辩护书"：19 世纪英国文化批评》。上海：上海外语教育出版社，2013 年。

[Yin Qiping. *"Apologia of Culture": Cultural Criticism in the 19th Century Britain* Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2013.]

——：《文化观念流变中的英国文学典籍研究》。上海：上海外语教育出版社，2020 年。

[—. *British Literature midst Changes in the Idea of Culture*. 6 Vols. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press, 2020.]

——：《推敲"进步"话语：新型小说在 19 世纪的英国》。北京：商务印书馆，2009 年。

[—. *Debating the Discourse of "Progress": A New Type of Novels in Nineteenth-Century England*. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 2009.]

——："文化观念流变与英国文学典籍研究"，《浙江外国语学院学报》1（2020）：1-12。

[—. "The Evolution of Ideas of Culture and British Literary Classics." *Journal of Zhejiang International Studies University*, 1(2020): 1-12.]

帕金斯·马什的环境书写与《人类与自然》的伦理反思
Perkin Marsh's Environmental Writing and Ethical Reflection on *Man and Nature*

秦文华（**Qin Wenhua**）　　张　媛（**Zhang Yuan**）

内容摘要：帕金斯·马什被誉为美国资源保护先知，其作品《人类与自然》是对人类与自然关系的思考之作。马什亲历 1860 年代美国现代化、工业化进程，并率先意识到美国人对环境的戕害。作为曾经的美国驻意大利大使，马什目睹地中海地区生态被毁的悲剧，并警示美洲人反思人与自然的关系。回顾马什的环境书写以及其间折射出的环境伦理，人类必须重新审视保护大自然和解决生态危机的重要性并做出新一轮的伦理反思和伦理选择，担负起对环境的伦理责任和伦理义务。文学伦理学批评就其理论架构和现实意义而言，有助于纠偏人类自认为是大自然主宰的错误观念。重读马什的环境书写，可以促进美国人以及任何处于发展冲动中的人群省察"人定胜天"的不当思维以及与人性贪婪相关的"增长癖"，从而尊重环境伦理，以合作共赢的姿态和远见共同关注人与环境的和谐共处。

关键词：帕金斯·马什；《人类与自然》；环境书写；伦理反思；伦理选择

Abstract: Perkin Marsh, as an early vocal environmentalist, gives a detailed and astonishing account of how industrialization and modernization affects the natural world in his *Man and Nature: or, Physical Geography as Modified.* By reflecting on Marsh's environmental writing, the author deems that it is of significance for us to call for the moral responsibility of humankind to make the ethical choice rationally after the first biological selection instinctively. Through ethical reflection mankind has access to solving global ecological crisis. Mankind should be able to get emancipated from the illusion that man is the arch-god of earth. The theoretical foundation and practical significance of ethical literary criticism serve to root out the causes of

worsening environment. In *Man and nature*, Marsh considers it is the characteristic American defect of "restless love for change" and "the instability of life" that is responsible for "the appalling denudation of the American landscape." This paper aims to remind mankind to respect the affinity between man and nature on the basis of reflecting the environmental ethics profoundly so as to undertake the reconstruction of a win-win situation that is beneficial both for mankind and for the nature.

Authors：**Qin Wenhua** is Associate professor at School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Nanjing Normal University (Nanjing 210024 China). Her research interests cover the fields of translation and cultures as well as Western Civilization (Email: qinwenhua1969@163.com); **Zhang Yuan** is Associate professor at School of Foreign Languages and Cultures, Nanjing Normal University (Nanjing 210024 China). Her research interests include American literature and American history (Email: zhangcarmen@sina.com).

　　1874 年，美国牧师 H·布什奈尔（Horace Bushnell，1802-1876）对教众做了一个题为"论永无止息的生命之力量"的布道："狂风暴雨、天摇地动、五湖四海、四季变化、天地万物，这些大自然的力量，都比不上人类改变地球的雄心壮志。人，自降临世间，就生命不息，折腾不已"（Lowenthal 291）。当时的听众之一，已年逾古稀的乔治·帕金斯·马什（George Perkins Marsh，1801-1882）内心却在翻腾：人真的可以做到无所不能，凌驾于地球之上、主宰一切吗？在马什看来，"人就是原本和谐的大自然的破坏者"（291）。

　　早在十年前，这位美国环保先知对人类与自然关系的思考之作《人类与自然：被人类行为改观的自然地理》（1864，简称《人类与自然》）就已经问世了。只不过，马什和布什奈尔所处的时代，正值美国摘除了奴隶制毒瘤，开足马力朝着工业化和现代化一路狂奔。发展经济的代价之一就是竭尽全力开发自然资源。不顾一切的增长欲几乎支配了整个民族，马什的环境书写和对未来生态危机的预见在当时并未激起很大的反响。一个半多世纪过去了，历史见证了马什的远见。他被其传记作家洛温泰尔（David Lowenthal）称为"美国资源保护先知"。马什以天才般的超前性宣告人定胜天是不切实际的。人类必须理解并尊重环境伦理，再度审视且重置与自然的关系，做出新的伦理反思和选择。

一、马什的环境书写与《人类与自然》中的环境伦理

　　人类文明发源至发展几千年，必有赖于肥沃的土地、适量的水源以及适

宜的气候，即合宜的环境。历经游牧文明、农耕文明、工业文明，人类谋求也见证了科技发展的日新月异以及人类生产方式、生活水平的巨大飞跃。然而，正如历史之父修昔底德所言，历史"在未来某个时候是会重现的，即使不是完全一样，也是非常相似"（qtd. in Burns 4）。当下，正视生态文明的人类似乎又不可避免地面临初始的困境：人类应当依托什么样的环境才能生活得更好——不太乐观的话，则是更具挑战性的问题：人类怎样才能让后代子孙得以在这个星球上存活下去？事实上，人类已经到了不得不承认自身局限性的时候了，也必须开启新的视角，尊重自然，建立起与自然互依互惠的新型伦理关系。

　　一个半世纪之前，美国人以内战解决了人和人之间的道德问题，即奴隶制争端；而马什则展开了超出同时代人的另类质询：人类如何在消耗和保护资源间寻求妥协？这位精通二十多种语言的语言学家和外交官，通过阅读大量欧洲原版文献，对旧大陆的过去和现在进行了透彻的反思，也对新大陆的未来产生了忧思。他的结论是：欧洲的古老文明已经崩塌，主因就是欧洲人破坏了赖以生存与发展其文明的自然环境，而美洲必须引以为戒。[1] 常年在欧洲游历的马什发现，无论在古老的欧洲，还是在年轻的美洲，比之地球上的其他物种，人类一直在以最具破坏力的方式损害自然。在《人类与自然》中，马什较为详尽且先知先觉地描述了人类行为对自然界的土壤、水源、森林以及各类物种的影响和戕害，同时观点鲜明地指出，自然具有与人一样的生命和灵性，溪水、树木、鲜花，还有野生动物，这些在他看来都是与人同等的存在体。正如柏林特所描述的，"自然界是无边无际的，不仅仅作为环境围绕着我们，而我们自己恰恰是环境中的一分子。我们不仅无法感知自然的界限，更无法与自然界分开"（Berleant 169-170）。

　　马什通过《人类与自然》这部作品传达了超出同时代人的生态思想，唤醒了美国有识之士保护森林水土的意识，并积极将其落实到政策和行动上，具有里程碑式的历史意义。他的声音在当时虽略显孤独，但并不是没有影响力。在 1870 年代的美国，这部"既解释了过去又预见到未来"的标志性作品就已经数度再版。该书与一个世纪后蕾切尔·卡森《寂静的春天》（1962）被公认为美国现代史上两大石破惊天的环境宣言。随着时间的流逝，随着现代化进程遍及全球，马什的环境书写以及从中反映出的生态洞见得到了明证，其重要性不仅在美国越来越显著，而且跨出国境，得到了全球性的关注。事实上，马什的环境书写不仅超越了政治历史话语范畴，而且以非虚构文学创作的艺术表现方式，提供了跨学科、跨文化的解读实践。

　　不得不提的是，美国系移民开创的国家，有自身对于美洲的环境想象。作为一个以拓荒开启其生产生活、意识形态与审美思维的民族，带着对新大

1　See George Perkins Marsh, *Man And Nature: Or, Physical Geography As Modified By Human Action* (New York: Scribners, 1864) 3-5.

陆 "应许之地" 的渴望, 他们勾勒出了富有特色的想象空间; 随着独立、建国、民主以及现代化进程, 美国人又产生了对本土文化构建的想象, 不仅体现在美国的政治与外交领域, 历史写作与文学领域也不例外。在古今中外的文学作品中, 都不乏对战胜大自然的英雄事迹的歌颂, 反映了一种长期占据人类头脑的思维: 人与自然的对立以及人对自然的征服。这种类型的伦理意识已被证明有待勘误。如果说在马什的时代, 也只有马什和少数志同道合者意识到这个关系的谬误, 那么在当下, 越来越多的有识之士已认清了这个事实: 任意破坏生态环境, 只会给自身带来更大的危机、更大的悲剧。

目睹地中海周围地带的森林被毁, 马什联想到了罗马帝国的覆亡。他进而指出, 美洲新大陆地广人稀, 开发农业、机械、制造、化工、矿产、林业等促成了工业化和城市化, 但一味的横征滥砍导致地表被急剧改观。马什指出, 美国虽占有地利, 但倘若持续以破坏性方式损害自然环境, 美利坚民族有可能成为毁坏地球生态的罪魁祸首。马什提醒自己的同胞, 必须变革观念——放下无知、傲慢和野心, 不再以占据地球主宰位置的物种自居, 如此, 才能与自然继续共生共存。现在看来, 作为地球上迄今为止被发现、被认可的最高级动物, 人类应当担负起对大自然的责任伦理, 建立与自然环境共生共存的伦理关系。毕竟, 人性因子亦即理性意志在人的身心发展过程中占据着主导性力量。在对人与自然的关系有了新的认知之后, 理性思考和理性意志占了上风, 就可以收敛、约束、控制兽性因子, 亦即自由意志, 趋向对新的环境伦理的遵守, 从而开辟美丽新世界, 让人类赖以生存和发展的生态环境趋于优化。

卢梭认为, "在我们的灵魂深处生来就有一种正义和道德的原则。" 这个原则就是我们常言的 '良知'。不过, 语境变迁之下, 良知已经不仅仅是情感和心理机制, 而是融入了理性与伦理。[1] 如果说人与人之间的伦理构建使得人类从中受益匪浅, 且文学文本对此的表达和引发的深思也让读者从中获得新的认知和反思; 那么, "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。道德秩序也可称之为伦理秩序。在具体的文学作品中, 伦理的核心内容是人与人、人与社会以及人与自然之间形成的被接受和认可的伦理秩序, 以及在这种秩序的基础上形成的道德观念和维护这种秩序的各种规范。文学的任务就是描写这种伦理秩序的变化及其变化所引发的道德问题和导致的结果, 为人类的文明进步提供经验和教诲" (聂珍钊, "文学伦理学批评: 基本理论与术语" 17)。

显然, 马什的环境书写是以这样的伦理为导向的: 人类有义务保护自然环境, 也应当为破坏自然而赎罪。环境书写本来就是以环境为导向的写作, 而自然环境本身就昭示着人类史与环境史密不可分。环境书写还有一个特征: 无论是虚构类、还是非虚构类作品, 文本中所显现或隐在的环境感始终是一

1　参见 聂珍钊:《文学伦理学批评导论》(北京: 北京大学出版社, 2014) 119。

个连贯的整体。美国或许从以温斯洛普为代表的清教徒时代开始，直到走向现代化，对待环境的压倒性态度就是人凌驾于自然之上。随着自然环境每况愈下，拓荒时代铸就的对于环境的想象遭遇了危机。

马什提醒读者重新检视美国人的环境想象和环境书写，并帮助读者指出一个显而易见且必须重新面对的现实：一方面，人类行为已经不可逆转地改变了地球的肌理，破坏了地球的环境和生态；另一方面，人类在背负这一罪责的同时，又不可避免地要承担起保护且与之共存的责任。马什并不否认，人这一物种，处于食物链的顶端，具备了超出其他所有物种的力量；但马什也强调，人是靠慷慨的大自然养活的。马什坚信，任何一个人类个体，也都只是与天地间万物平等的一分子。不能一味任由滥用大自然的自由意志与贪欲本能泛滥，毁灭地球、也毁灭人类自身。反之，人类应当分辨利弊，用理性意志反思并纠偏过往对待自然环境的思路与方式，约束对大自然索取的贪念，构建并接纳新的环境伦理。

二、人定胜天的谬误与《人类与自然》中的伦理警示

人与环境的关系的确是个永恒的问题，在提倡生态文明建设的当下是更为突出的问题。在人类文明的进程中，对周围环境的反应和对诸多疑难的解答成为思想意识的起源，可以说，观念就是应付环境的工具。人类从上帝和众神的束缚中解放出来后，一度陷入"人定胜天"的思维，形成了征服自然、占有资源的人类中心主义和工具理性主义。当环境问题已成为生态文明时代的全球性难题时，无论在中国、西方，还是发达、发展中乃至落后地区，无论是政府、专家、企业责任人以及普通民众，都需要更先进的文化观念、更大的智慧和勇气，在更高的层面上达成全球共识：人类理应尊重环境伦理，适度礼让环境，与"非人类"的万事万物成为不再有疏离感的伙伴。如果人类一味自以为是，认为自身无所不能、任由自身贪欲膨胀，对待自然为所欲为，那么不仅环境与资源保护的问题无从改善，其他很多问题都会接踵而来，直到人类遭到自然界的无情报复，到时候就绝对不是人定胜天，而是无力回天了。现在看来，马什之后的诸多环境灾难纷纷验证了马什的担忧，更凸显了"人定胜天"的谬误之处。

在马什之前，美国人经由《瓦尔登湖》，知悉了梭罗"自愿简单"、归隐林间的生活实践。而马什则更为关注人类对自然环境所带来的伤害。可以说，直到美国现代环保之父马什的这部作品问世，美国人的思维才产生了重大突破。是马什率先将对自然环境的关注从个人式的自我省察和地方性的利益关怀转向了整个人类文明命运的大视野，且更为切近、更为透彻。马什深入分析了美国人的民族性，并从思想文化根源挖掘到了美国人漠视生态，破坏环境的主因。他以美国式哀诉布道的口吻道出美国民族中的一个缺陷：生活的不稳定——表现出对"变化（change）"（Buell 306）的没完没了的挚爱和激情。

马什一针见血地指出，美国人的"增长癖"加剧了人类固有的贪婪习性和对环境粗暴无礼的行为，长此以往，地球会沦为贫瘠的荒芜之地，而受到蹂躏的大自然会以压迫者的身份反击人类。[1]地球上所有物种都绝灭，人类的任何出路也就被自己堵死了。最终，不但美国的繁荣会失去依托和前景，整个人类的文明都会衰落。

在《人类与自然》中，马什详细描述了人类从最初的艰难时日起是如何依赖大自然所馈赠的一草一木和飞禽走兽的。而人类为了满足自身所需，却不断地消耗、也在残酷地灭减原本多样化的其他物种。随着人类能力和欲望与日俱增，他们在消耗破坏的同时，保护也施加力量增长自身所需的动植物种类，由此引发生物界食物链混乱——有些物种数量猛增，有些物种数量锐减，自然界原初的平衡遭到人为的破坏。马什一步步推演着自然被人类改观的后果：森林和水土资源本来是人类文明发展的基本要素，滥砍滥伐将导致水源供给困难、水土流失、土地沙漠化，留下大片不毛之地，引发洪水和森林火灾。随着人类繁衍旺盛，资源日趋耗尽，又被迫绞尽脑汁，想方设法向大自然索取索取再索取：向动植物索取食物和穿戴，向森林索取木材和耕地，向海河索取，向沙地索取，最终恐怕只能是向人类自身索命了。说到底，人类自以为能征服自然、战胜自然，却引发一连串生态危机。从表象看，"生态危机是人类经济系统在地球生态系统中长期扩张的产物"（龙娟 47）；而从更深层次探寻根源，罪在"人定胜天"的谬思和不加克制的"增长癖"——人类行为方式受此引导，必然造成自然环境、也是人类自身生存环境的恶化。

当代生态批判学者认为，"生态危机是在人类中心主义思想主导下的人类主宰地位的危机、人类文化的危机"（胡志红 193）。要从根源上消除生态危机，必须走出人类中心主义观念主导下的生态文化范式。深层生态美学拒斥片面的人类中心主义，迫使人从主宰地位退位，成为大地生态共同体中平等的一员。在布伊尔看来，自然不是他者，而是人类连续体的一部分。[2]文学生态中心主义把抽取出来的人的概念重新放归自然，研究其与生态系统的关联。为此，深层生态学所主张的让渡美学，是对抗人类中心主义之于自然的工具主义态度，也拒斥对自然的征服与占有。在具体实践中，让渡美学又有两个层次：一种是我们熟知的、也较为常见、且具备可操作性的让渡形式，亦即放弃对物质的过度占有与依赖，放弃对自然的绝对征服与统治。另一种是更为激进、但难以实施的形式，即：对人的主体性的放弃。放弃人的中心性、主体性，隐去自我，赋予非人类以主体。而一个不争的事实是，人既是整个自然生态环境的一份子，同时也是具备高级思维能力的主体，因而

---

1   See George Perkins Marsh, *Man and Nature: Or Physical Geography As Modified By Human Action* (Seattle & London: U of Washington P, 2003) 308.

2   See Lawrence Buell, *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Cult*ure (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1995)19.

"唯自然论"或是"生态中心主义"的乌托邦式的幻想因过于激进而不切实际。将"让渡美学"引入对环境书写文本的评析，并不一定意味着人要彻底消除主体性，只是希望寻求与自然平等共存的可能性空间和有效性思路。

作为环境史上独特的作品，马什的环境启示录提供了一个非虚构类环境书写的典范，与生态批评研究的美学原则如出一辙。"视域的扩大和参照物的改变不仅导致了对征服自然观、人类中心论、主客二元论、欲望动力论、唯发展论、科技至上观、消费文化等思想观念的重新审视和重新评价，而且也导致了对美、审美和艺术表现的重新思考"（王诺 18）。由是观之，人不再是唯一合法的主体；一匹野狼、一只松鼠、一条小溪、一块石头、一粒谷物、一位月亮女神，都有权利观察世界和感知世界，在这个世界与人类共同生生息息。马什的《人类与自然》给当下的人们提出了新的伦理警示：人类在物质实践上必须调整与自然的关系，适当让渡对周围环境的占有和征服意念；在观念层面上，让渡以人为中心的主宰者立场，归还自然环境和外在万事万物的权利——这种具有多层次需求和妥协性立场的思路不失为拯救生态灾难的途径之一。对于当下任何处在发展冲动和资源有限张力中的族群而言，让渡美学会成为绿色思维的一方保障，功在破除人定胜天的错误观念，并纠偏在美国人身上较为典型、在其他国家和地区也愈演愈烈的增长癖。

针对人类文明史上一而再、再而三上演的生态悲剧，文学伦理学批评与生态批评提出了几个核心问题，可以帮助人类放下"人定胜天"的迷思，同时克服"增长癖"之弊：首先，人类作为自然有机体的一部分，如何与其他生物体共享自然？其次，人作为社会性的存在，其政治经济科技活动如何重塑自然以及与自然相互塑造，从而与自然在整体生态圈中共生共存？其三，人类的思维方式、价值观念、生产模式、生活方式、政治制度以及人性本身作为自我存在的映射，如何寻找在世间的生存之道和生存意义？在环境危机和生态灾难频发的当下，稍有常识的人都已认识到，自然不再是静穆的被征服者，倘若人类不加以反思，不减少贪念，则马什的伦理警示"大自然灭亡了，人类文明的灭绝还会远吗？"会一语成箴。如此，就更有必要以环境正义、环境伦理等新的学术话语呼吁人类抛开民族、国家、宗教、意识形态分歧，以合作共赢的姿态和远见共同关注人与环境的和谐共处。

三、重读《人类与自然》，再论人类的伦理选择

在马什的《人类与自然》中，西方文学写作传统中的神谕手法若隐若现，这也是他被誉为环保先知的主要原因之一。马什本人的初衷是什么，后人无法全然确证，但其文本写作本质上可以被看成是伦理教科书般的存在。马什既能以天启式的预言警示他的国人生态环境被毁后的晦暗悲剧，又能以发自内心的乐观态度给人以光明的信念：只要人们迷途知返，生态危机可以逆转。关注这样的作品创作和阅读评论，其意义无论是在西方还是东方，都值得重

视。在文学伦理学批评视域中，文学就是"起源于伦理表达的需要，文学是伦理的艺术，文学的基本功能是教诲功能。因此，研究生态伦理问题，依旧是为了给人类的生存提供道德经验，为人类与自然和谐相处提供道德警示"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》181）。文学伦理学批评还曾提出这样一个听似普通却又非常重要的问题："我们为什么要阅读文学，深度地研究和阅读文学（尤其是严肃文学）有什么价值？"（Lazer，14）对于作者而言，其创作包含才情，流露审美，也有社会责任；而对于读者和批评者而言，阅读作品，除了鉴赏，除了共情，也会各持道德立场。杨革新进而指出，"阅读是一个社会活动，因而我们阐释文本时的阅读习惯本质上具有社会性"（杨革新，"从伦理批评到文学伦理学批评：美国伦理批评的困境与出路"55）。读者和评论者会参照自身的生活经验，在得到文学审美感受的同时，调动作为受众的责任和伦理，接受道德教诲，明确自己的伦理立场，从而实现文本的伦理价值。

在西方先哲眼中，关注伦理就是关注善，而善是万事万物所归。亚里士多德认为至善是"心灵合于德行的活动"（周辅成 287），只有达到至善，才能获得幸福。亚里士多德的主张与其师祖苏格拉底如出一辙——"美德即知识"。这里的知识显然是合乎伦理与美的知识。文学伦理学批评的要素之一就是挖掘并弘扬文学作品中的道德关怀与道德约束。生态灾害大都源于人类的无知和贪欲，而"欲望的不自制比愤怒的不自制更为可憎"，甚而"在某种意义上就是邪恶"（转引自 聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》111）。聂珍钊指出，人类经过第二次伦理选择，渐渐脱离丛林法则，建立了规范自身行为、协调社会关系的良知和伦理，也同时意识到人与自然更需要一定的环境伦理规范。阿迪亚·门德尔森－茂兹则直截了当地把"把读者、叙述者和作者之间的关系视为伦理关系；〔……〕审视文学文本对年轻一代的教化力量，假定文本可以塑造我们的信仰和行为，帮助我们理解伦理两难；通过阅读文学文本来展示伦理理性，〔……〕展示从伦理学视角阅读文本的方式，挖掘文本背后的社会、政治和伦理暗流，研究权力关系"（Mendelson-Maoz 113）。如此，以文学伦理学批评为方法，借助生态批评话语，对于理解马什的环境书写具有一定的理论和现实意义。

从环境伦理视角重新解读马什的作品，可以为理解人与自然的关系拓宽视野，从而为人类提供更好的道德修养和人生思路以及生产生活方式。须知，"文学伦理学批评的任务是阐释文学的伦理功能，从伦理的视角解释文学中描写的不同生活现象及其存在的伦理原因，并对其做出价值判断"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》16）。人作为设定伦理的主体性存在，可以通过理性认识自身，反省自身，提升自身，成为有理性、有伦理的主体。在可持续性科学发展观中，人既是最终目标指向，也是实现目标的主体。以"人"这一要素展开文明渊源、政治政策、社会生活、公民责任等方面的思考，能弥

补光凭技术这一工具所达不到的效果。科技环保固然是重要手段，但科技也是经由人设想、创造并付诸实施的。关键在于人持有什么样的观念，又会在什么样的观念引导下做出何种伦理反思与伦理选择。或许这段话可以呼应《人类与自然》的文学伦理学批评解读和生态批评视角："生态批评跨越学科界限，一方面深入挖掘文化的生态内涵、凸显人与自然之间不可割裂的亲缘关系，另一方面从多视角透视危机产生的复杂原因，进行综合的文化诊断、文化治疗，目的在于建构生态诗学体系，倡导生态视野，让它渗透到人文社会科学、技术领域，一边从根本上变革人类文化"（胡志红 58）。

通过阅读马什对于他所在时空的环境书写，可以确知的是，在人类与自然的关系问题上，亟待新的伦理选择。"保护大自然和解决生态危机问题是人类应负的道德责任，是人类应该做出的选择的问题。〔……〕只有人才能做出正确的伦理选择，承担人类应负的道德责任，借助科学技术解决人类面临的生态危机难题"（聂珍钊，"从人类中心主义到人类主体：生态危机解困之路"32）。马什坚持认为，自然生态就像社会肌理一样，两者都需要人持续不断地维护，否则就会衰败。因此，人类需要对自身的贪欲加以节制，纠偏恣意破坏大自然而造成的人与环境之间的伦理混乱，重构新的认知和新的伦理秩序。当然，环境叙事和写作以及环境伦理解读并不能做到直接干预国家的环保政策和人们的日常行为，但至少可以为读者、为评论者、为决策者、为普通人提供警醒和反思空间，从而成为某种道德教诲和伦理启发，帮助人们做出恰当的伦理选择。

伦理选择是一种行为表象，其背后是人类深植于心的伦理责任与伦理义务。杨革新指出，"伦理选择的复杂性和责任性正在于人类价值观念的多样性和非公约性，因为做出选择所包含的道德份量不仅在于做出什么选择，还包括怎样做出选择"（"伦理批评的重新界定"120）。相信技术力量的马什呼吁公众对自然环境妥善管理。更为重要的是，从现在开始积极行动起来。从过去、到当下直至未来，人类遇到的问题会越来越多，天灾人祸也不断发生，如何评判、如何解释，又如何选择、如何以新的姿态理解人类与自然的关系？毕竟，人不仅仅是止于生物性存在，人还是一种社会性存在。马克思指出，"人的本质并不是单个人所固有的抽象物，实际上，它是一切社会关系的总和"（马克思 恩格斯 5）。作为社会性动物，就必然涉及伦理；而人的伦理选择就在于分辨善恶，超越原始本能、超越恶的冲动，处理好人与社会、也必须包含人与自然的伦理关系，放弃人定胜天的愚昧认知，适当礼让环境，减少因发展冲动而滋生的增长癖，接纳人与自然共享生态环境的现实。如此，才能以恰当的行为顺应环境伦理，最终得到保护的不仅是自然万物，受益的更是人类自身。

Works Cited

Berleant, Arnold. *The Aesthetics of Environment.* Philadelphia: Temple University, 1992.

Burns, Edward McNall and Philip Lee Ralph. *World Civilizations: Their History and Their Culture.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company INC., 1974.

Buell, Lawrence. *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture.* Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard UP, 1995.

胡志红：“生态批评与跨学科研究——比较文学视域中的西方生态批评”，《四川师范大学学报》（社会科学版）3（2005）：58-62。

[Hu Zhihong. "Ecocriticism and Interdisciplinary Studies." *Journal of Sichuan Normal University (Social Sciences Edition)* 3 (2005): 58-62.]

——：《西方生态批评研究》。北京：中国社会科学出版社，2006 年。

[—. *A Study of Western Ecocriticism.* Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2006.]

Lazer, Hank. "Ethical Criticism and the Challenge Posed by Innovation Poetry." *Foreign Literature Studies* 2 (2016): 7-20.

龙娟：《环境文学研究》。长沙：湖南师范大学出版社，2005 年。

[Long Juan. *Environmental Literature Studies.* Changsha: Hunan Normal UP, 2005.]

Lowenthal, David. *George Perkins Marsh. Prophet of Conservation.* Seattle & London: U of Washington P, 2000.

Marsh, George Perkins. *Man and Nature: Or, Physical Geography as Modified by Human Action.* New York: Scribners, 1864.

Marsh, George Perkins. *Man and Nature: Or Physical Geography As Modified By Human Action.* Seattle & London: U of Washington P, 2003.

马克思、恩格斯：《马克思恩格斯全集》第三卷。北京：人民出版社，2002 年。

[Max & Angles. *Complete Works of Max and Angles* (vol.3). Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2002.]

Mendelson-Maoz, Adia. "Ethics and Literature：Introduction." Philosophia 2 (2007): 113.

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.]

——：“从人类中心主义到人类主体：生态危机解困之路”，《外国文学研究》1（2020）：22-33。

[—. "From Anthropocentrism to Human Subjectivity: A possible Solution to Ecological Crises." *Foreign Literature Studies* 1 (2020): 22-33.]

——：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年。

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

——：《文学伦理学批评理论研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年。

[—. *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism.* Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

王诺：“生态批评的美学原则”，《南京师范大学文学院学报》2（2010）：18-25。

[Wang Nuo. "The Aesthetic Principle in Ecological Criticism." *Journal of School of Chinese Language and Culture Nanjing Normal University* 2 (2010): 18-25.]

杨革新："从伦理批评到文学伦理学批评：美国伦理批评的困境与出路"，《上海师范大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）1（2019）：50-57。

[Yang Gexin. "From Ethical Criticism to Ethical Literary Criticism: The Dilemma and Way-Out of American Ethical Criticism." *Journal of Shanghai Normal University (Philosophy and Social Sciences* 1 (2019): 50-57.]

——："伦理批评的重新界定"，《江西师范大学学报》（哲学社会科学版）4（2016）：117-121。

[—. "Redefining the Ethical Criticism." *Journal of Jiangxi Normal University (Social Sciences)*4 (2016): 117-21.]

周辅成：《西方伦理学名著选辑》。北京：商务印书馆，1964 年。

[Zhou Fucheng. *Selected Famous Works on Western Ethic*s. Beijing: The Commercial Press. 1964.]

文学伦理学批评的跨学科理论景观：《文学伦理学批评理论研究》介评

Interdisciplinary Critical Landscape of Ethical Literary Criticism: A Review of *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*

陈红薇（**Chen Hongwei**）　　杨健林（**Yang Jianlin**）

内容摘要：《文学伦理学批评研究》五卷书是文学伦理学批评理论发展至今的集大成之作。其中，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》是五卷书中的理论部分，它不仅全面阐述了该理论兴起的文化背景和基本原则，还从跨学科的视域论述了文学伦理学批评与历史主义批评、美学理论、精神分析理论、后殖民主义理论、生态理论等理论之间的复杂关系，形成了一个多维度的文学伦理学批评的理论景观，成为文学伦理学批评发展中又一部重要的理论经典。
关键词：《文学伦理学批评理论研究》；跨学科；理论辨析；理论景观
作者简介：陈红薇，北京科技大学外国语学院教授，从事戏剧与文学伦理学研究；杨健林，北京科技大学外国语学院博士生，从事西方戏剧研究。

Title: Interdisciplinary Critical Landscape of Ethical Literary Criticism: A Review of *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*
Abstract: The five-volumes of *A Study on Ethical Literary Criticism* are the latest achievements of ethical literary criticism research, in which *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism* stands as its theoretical part. The book not only comprehensively discusses the cultural background and theoretical principles of ethical literary criticism, but also expounds, from interdisciplinary perspective, the complex relationship between ethical literary criticism and such theories as historicism, aesthetics theory, psychoanalysis, postcolonial theory and eco-criticism, thereby forming a multi-dimensional critical landscape of ethical literary criticism, which makes its publication a significant event in the development of ethical literary criticism.
Keywords: *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*; interdisciplinary; theory debate; theory landscape
Authors: Chen Hongwei is Professor at the School of Foreign Studies, University

of Science and Technology Beijing (Beijing 100083, China). She is interested in the study of drama and ethical literary criticism (Email: chenhongwei@ustb.edu. cn); **Yang Jianlin** is a Ph. D. candidate at the School of Foreign Studies, University of Science and Technology Beijing (Beijing 100083, China) (Email: 244261127@ qq.com).

由聂珍钊教授和苏晖教授主编的《文学伦理学批评研究》五卷书是自 2004 年文学伦理学批评理论提出之后的集大成之作，其中，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》是此五卷书中的理论著述，它不仅全面阐述了文学伦理学批评理论兴起的文化背景和基本原则，还从跨学科的视域论述了文学伦理学批评与历史主义批评、美学理论、精神分析理论、后殖民主义理论、生态理论、叙事学等理论之间的复杂关系，从而形成了一个跨学科视域下文学伦理学批评的理论景观。作为对该领域首部理论著述《文学伦理学批评导论》的深化和拓展，本书将成为文学伦理学批评史上又一部具有重要意义的理论经典。

《文学伦理学批评理论研究》一书由两个总序和十一章构成。虽然两个总序在五卷书中均有出现，但在这部首卷理论著作中却具有特殊的意义，它与本卷的十一个章节浑然一体，是本书不可分割的一部分。因此，本书在内容结构上共分为三个部分：总序部分是对文学伦理学批评宏观理论导入；前两章是对文学伦理学批评理论的阐述和溯源；后九章是从跨学科的角度，对文学伦理学批评理论进行多维度的学科观照和理论辨析。

一、总序：理论导入与综述

两个总序不仅是对五卷书的开宗明义，更是对本卷理论著作的点睛之笔。"总序（一）"由聂珍钊和王松林教授撰写，它从理论起源、理论立场、核心术语、跨学科视域四个方向，明确该理论的特点，即文学伦理学批评的方法论、文学的教诲立场、全新的话语体系，提纲挈领地概述其要旨，并构建起了本理论卷的论述框架。

"总序（二）"由苏晖教授撰写，它以综述的形式，全面梳理了文学伦理学批评理论的构建、发展、实践及影响，勾勒了文学伦理学批评理论的发展图谱，对文学伦理学批评研究者有很高的学术价值。根据苏晖教授的梳理，文学伦理学批评理论的进程经历了三个阶段。第一阶段（2004-2013）是理论的提出和话语体系构建阶段。如果说"文学伦理学批评：文学批评方法新探索"（2004）一文的发表标志着该理论的出现，那么《文学伦理学批评导论》（2013）这部纲领性著作的出版则标志着该理论话语体系的基本完成。第二阶段（2013-2018）是文学伦理学批评理论的推广阶段。其中，2015 年聂珍钊教授、尚必武教授等一批学者在《阿卡迪亚》（*Arcadia*）等国内外主流学术期刊上发表了近 20 篇重量级的论文，标志着这一亚洲原创性人文理论已

在国内外被广泛接受。第三阶段（2018- 至今）是文学伦理学批评的成熟阶段，其重点事件即是《文学伦理学批评研究》五卷本的出版和聂珍钊教授的《文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构》一文在 2020 年第 10 期《中国社会科学》上的发表，它标志着文学伦理学批评的理论体系已经形成。

二、导论：理论阐发与溯源

第一章"导论"是本理论著作的基础。该章聚焦"伦理选择"这一核心概念，提出了人类文明的发展进程由自然选择、伦理选择和科学选择三个阶段构成的批评观点。在自然选择阶段，人是文明进化的被动参与者；在伦理选择和科学选择阶段，人是文明进程的主动选择者。但就后两种选择而言，其选择的性质却不同：在伦理选择阶段，人选择的是人之为人的做人伦理，而在科学选择阶段，人选择的却是去人性化、去道德化的科学伦理，这种选择将最终使人从主动的选择者沦为被动的选择者。我们目前正处在伦理选择阶段的进程之中，在这个阶段，做人是它的最终目的，伦理道德是人之为人的根本动力。[1]

相比于前期的成果，本章的理论贡献在于其立足当下后人类时代对科学选择理论的深化。聂珍钊教授提出，科学选择阶段是人类文明发展的最后阶段，它以科学人（后人类或新人类）的大量出现、现代人走向消亡为标志。科学选择阶段既是一个道德消解的过程，也是一个人性消除的过程。在这个阶段，伦理道德让位于科学标准，在科学禁地和人性伦理之间，人选择了前者。其结果是，科学人类成为主体，人类文明进程走向终结，一个新的科学人的世界最终出现。在当下这个智能生命科学飞跃发展的时代，科学选择的伦理性正在成为人类面对的最重要的问题[2]，因为人类在人工智能革命中的选择将最终决定，在不久的将来主宰地球的是人类，还是新人类。事实上，不论是库兹韦尔（Ray Kurzweil）在《奇点临近》（*The Singularity Is Near*，2011）中提出的第五纪元人机文明，还是 1989 年美国"人造生命"大会所预言的，在未来的 100 年内一种能自我繁殖、自我进化、自我生存的有机生命将会出现（Noble 165、157）都证明了，文学理论批评所提出的关于科学选择阶段这一论断的正确性。

第二章的核心是对文学伦理学批评的理论溯源和概念厘清。本章聚焦文学伦理学研究从道德批评到伦理批评、再到文学伦理学批评的演绎过程，阐述文学伦理学批评是不同于西方伦理学研究的批评方法。虽然从柏拉图到 20 世纪初，伦理取向一直是西方主流文学的价值所在，甚至在 19 世纪和 20 世纪初道德批评还一度成为西方文学批评的主要流派，但由于 20 世纪西方文论

1　参见 聂珍钊："导论"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）28。

2　参见 聂珍钊："导论"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）20-29。

研究从作家向作品、从文本向读者接受的两次转移，以及道德研究中出现的哲学转向，以道德评判为主要特征的伦理批评在 20 世纪后期在西方文学主流批评中日渐式微。虽然上个世纪八十年代后西方学者力图对伦理批评进行重新界定，以区分与道德批评的不同，但由于西方伦理批评一直在方法论上未能获得突破，因此陷入困境。正是在这种学术背景之下，中国文学伦理学批评理论在继承中国道德批评传统和借鉴西方伦理批评的基础上，立足文学的伦理本源、伦理本质、脑文本等概念，构建起了不同于西方伦理批评的文学伦理学批评理论和话语体系，将文学伦理学理论研究升华为文学伦理学批评的方法论，使伦理批评在众多文学批评中获得新生。

三、文学伦理学批评：跨学科研究的发生

正如盛宁先生谈到后现代理论时所说，关于"后现代"问题的争论像一个巨大的漩涡，它在旋转的过程中会将各种问题吸附过来，纳入自己的运动，所以关于"后现代"的讨论包含着若干个既可独立、又与之密切联系的子话题。[1]与此相似，由于文学伦理学批评抓住了文学的本质是伦理这一核心，因此在视野上表现出强大的学术兼容性和开放性，不仅在理论形成过程中借鉴了不同学科的理论成果，如伦理学、心理学、哲学、历史学、人类学以及自然科学，而且也开拓了各种文学研究的新领域和新思潮。[2]因此，与聂珍钊教授的开山之作《文学伦理学批评导论》相比，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》的最大特点在于，它以更加宽阔的跨学科视域对文学伦理学批评理论进行了多维度的跨界探讨。

从内容上讲，本书用九章的篇幅覆盖了文学伦理学批评与历史主义批评、美学理论、精神分析学、后殖民主义理论、生态理论、叙事学理论、形式主义批评、存在主义哲学、形式主义、马克思主义理论关系的探讨。由于文学伦理学批评与这些理论关系的不同，其跨学科发生的模式也呈现出四种不同的类型：比较视野下的跨界理论借鉴、分歧中的理论对话、评判中的理论拓展、相向而行中的理论互融。如果说文学伦理学批评与历史主义和马克思主义理论的关系主要是借鉴，与美学、叙事学和形式主义批评的关系是分歧中的对话，那么，它与精神分析和存在主义哲学的关系更多的则是批评中的兼容，与后殖民主义和生态批评的关系是彼此的丰富和互鉴。

首先，在"历史主义视域下的文学伦理学批评"（第三章）和"马克思主义伦理批评"（第十一章）两章中，王松林和费小平教授重在论述文学伦理学批评在理论构建中对历史主义和马克思主义理论的借鉴。其中，第三章以历史主义与新历史主义为理论铺陈，通过考察西方历史中伦理概念的流变，

1　参见 盛宁：《人文困惑与反思》（北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，1997 年）85。
2　参见 聂珍钊、王松林："总序（一）"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）18。

系统论述了文学伦理学批评对历史主义批评传统的借鉴、以及立足具体历史语境考察个体伦理选择的批判立场。文学伦理学批评吸收二者之长，提出了文学批评要回归历史的伦理现场，以历史相对主义的视角分析不同时代伦理环境下的伦理选择的研究方法。第十一章以马克思主义理论为观照，考辩文学伦理学批评与马克思主义批评同源共振的伦理主张，并提出构建以马克思主义为理论指导、具有中国特色的文论主张。该章认为，在伦理选择、道德起源论及文学的功用性等重大问题上，文学伦理学批评继承并发扬了马克思主义伦理学的基本观点，形成了在精神上与马克思主义伦理学一脉相承的批评思想。文学伦理学批评正是采用马克思主义的辩证唯物主义方法和历史主义的道德相对主义立场，才形成了自己特有的方法论。[1]

其二，在"美学理论批评"（第四章）、"叙事学与文学伦理学批评"（第八章）、"形式主义伦理批评"（第九章）中，王松林、尚必武和陈礼珍三位教授分别聚焦美学与伦理、叙事与伦理、形式与伦理之间的分歧，开展文学伦理学批评的跨学科对话。其中，第四章"美学伦理批评"通过回溯西方哲学史中美学与伦理学之争，提出"美从属于善"的文学伦理学批评主张。本章认为，虽然美学与伦理学在研究主体、审视角度和自由维度方面存有迥异，但美与善非但不悖，而且互通互融。文学伦理学批评立足西方哲学中"至善亦至美"的观点，提出了文学在形式上是文本的艺术，但在本质则是伦理的表达[2]这一文学的伦理功能论主张，从而厘清了教诲与审美的关系。第八章《叙事学与文学伦理学批评》以叙事学与伦理批评之间的"非相关性"为切入点，探讨两者的互涉对话和互补空间。在文学批评史上，虽然叙事研究和伦理批评皆源远流长，但两者却鲜有交叉。[3]虽然 20 世纪后期西方学界提出了"叙事伦理"（narrative ethics）、"伦理叙事学"（ethical narratology）和"批判叙事伦理学"（critical ethical narratology）等观点，但这些理论往往是"重叙事而轻伦理"。对此，聂珍钊教授指出，伦理批评之所以屡遭挫折，根本原因是缺乏"一个完整的系统理论体系"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》159）。为此，文学伦理学批评应立足伦理与叙事形式之间的内在关联性，建立自己的批评原则、伦理立场、话语体系，形成叙事伦理学的批评方法。[4]第九章"形式主义伦理批评"则是聚焦形式与伦理问题的对立，以俄国形式主义批评的核心术语为审视对象，评判了形式主义的反道德批评立场和消解伦

1　参见 聂珍钊、王松林："总序（一）"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）14。

2　参见 聂珍钊："文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构"，《中国社会科学》10（2020）：71-92+205-206。

3　参见 尚必武："叙事学与文学伦理学批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）184。

4　参见 尚必武："叙事学与文学伦理学批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）196。

理教诲的文学观。文学伦理学批评认为，形式主义强调文本内在规律的理论立场缩减了文本的阐释空间，其核心术语，如"文学性"和"陌生化"所聚焦的多是文本的审美体验或语言特质，而忽略了文学是道德的产物这一事实。文学伦理批评认为，文学是特定历史阶段社会伦理的表达形式，其本质是关于伦理的艺术[1]，在形式主义批评中注入伦理意识将弥合其因偏重文本内部结构而引发的阐释裂隙。

其三，在"精神分析伦理批评"（第五章）、"存在主义伦理批评"（第十章）中，陈礼珍和陈后亮教授聚焦文学伦理学批评与精神分析和存在主义哲学的关联性，探讨了前者对后者既评判又借鉴的跨界拓展。其中，第五章通过对精神分析学与文学伦理批评的对比分析，明确指出精神分析批评过度强调本能、冲动、欲望等非理性力量，而否认伦理道德取向的理论缺陷；同时，文学伦理学批评将俄狄浦斯情结、禁忌、本能、人性等精神分析理论概念纳入研究视野，不仅纠正了精神分析学将本能和性作用推向极端的理念，也将这种概念重新诠释，使其成为文学伦理学批评理论话语的一部分。这既是对精神分析学的扬弃，也是对其理论的丰富和发展。[2] 第十章从文学伦理学批评的视角重新审视存在主义哲学，围绕"人的本质选择"之辩，论证了对人的自由中伦理考量的必须性。本章指出，虽然存在主义哲学与文学伦理学批评在自由意志、伦理责任、自由选择等学术话语表述上表现出高度的相似性，并在人的本质取决于人的自我选择等内涵上有一定的共识，但双方所表达的意义却迥然不同。存在主义哲学强调的是"人的自由先于人的本质"，但文学伦理学批评强调的是伦理是人类主体存在的基石，人须经由伦理选择才能成为真正意义上的"人"。面对存在主义哲学，文学伦理学批评和对精神分析学一样，采取的是在分歧中对话、在扬弃中吸收的理论策略。

其四，在"后殖民伦理批评"（第六章）、"生态伦理批评"（第七章）中，徐彬教授和张连桥副教授以比较视野分析文学伦理学批评与后殖民主义和生态批评的重叠性，论述前者对后者相向而行的跨界互鉴。第六章"后殖民理论批评"指出，不论是后殖民文学描写的东方与西方、"自我"与"他者"之间权力关系，还是后殖民作家作品中的"伦理时刻"和其背后的政治立场，无不涉及道德正义和政治伦理，但这些问题虽在后殖民主义研究中有所涉及，却不是研究的重点。文学伦理学批评强调，"对文学的理解必须让文学回归属于它的伦理环境和伦理语境，这是理解文学的一个前提"（聂珍钊，《文学伦理学批评导论》14），将文学伦理学批评与后殖民主义理论结合，将给后殖民文学带来全新的研究视角。与此相似，文学伦理学批评与生态批评也表现出了深厚的融通性。如第七章"生态伦理批评"所述，生态批

---

1 参见 聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》（北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年）1。
2 参见 陈礼珍："精神分析伦理批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）117。

评的核心就是建构人与环境的生态伦理关系，因此生态批评和文学伦理学批评在研究对象和研究范畴是都有着不少交叉和重叠。[1] 这也是为什么聂珍钊教授在"总序（一）"中提出，"文学伦理学批评与生态批评可以结合起来构成文学生态理论批评，从伦理道德的角度对人类面临的生态危机、文明危机和人性危机进行反思"（16）。但必须指出的是，文学生态理论批评和后殖民伦理批评一样，在本质上是一种研究视角，而非一种批评方法，其价值在于从伦理的视角来分析、阐述和评价文学中的生态问题，并就人与环境的关系提出道德警示。[2]

历经十八年发展，文学伦理学批评理论秉承宽视野、跨学科的理念，以开放包容的姿态不断推进文学批评的进程，建构了具有中国特色的批判范式和文论体系。以《文学伦理学批评理论研究》为总纲，《文学伦理学批评研究》在五卷书中推出了以美国、英国、日本和中国文学为研究对象的系列著作，将"脑文本"、"斯芬克斯因子"及"伦理选择"等文学伦理学批评的核心术语运用到跨民族、跨地域和跨语际的文学批评中，开拓了文学文本批评实践的广阔空间，促进了中西方人文学科的交流互动，在西方学者占主流话语机制的 21 世纪发出了来自中国学界的理论强音。

作为一部跨学科的前沿理论著作，本书的主编聂珍钊教授和王松林教授也深知，文学伦理学批评的跨学科研究是一个通向未来的研究地域，因此本书在完成最后一章"马克思主义伦理学"论述之后，并未像惯常一样对全书做收官总结，而是以非终结式的姿态就此收笔。其原因在于，本书的最大特点是以"文学伦理学批评+"的跨界视野将文学伦理学批评引入其他领域，为下一步的拓展研究指明方向，因此本书在九章跨学科的理论探讨过程中，提出了大量的新问题，预设了大片的留白地域——所有这些均显示出本书作为一部通向未来理论拓展的价值。

Works Cited

陈礼珍："精神分析伦理批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编。北京：
北京大学出版社，2020 年，115-135。

[Chen Lizhen. "Psychoanalytical Ethical Criticism." *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Eds. Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020. 115-135.]

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.]

——："导论"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编。北京：北京大学出版社，

1　参见 张连桥："生态伦理批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）155。

2　参见 张连桥："生态伦理批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编（北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年）181。

2020 年：1-33。

[一. "Introduction." *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Eds. Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. Peking UP, 2020. 1-33.]

——：" 文学伦理学批评的价值选择与理论建构"，《中国社会科学》10（2020）：71-92+205-206。

[一. "Value Choice and the Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism." *Social Sciences in China* 10 (2020):71-92+205-206.]

聂珍钊、王松林："总序（一）"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年：1-19。

[Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. "Forward One." *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Eds. Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020. 1-19.]

Noble, David F. *The Religion of Technology: The Divinity of Man and the Spirit of Invention*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1998.

尚必武："叙事学与文学伦理学批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年：183-197。

[Shang Biwu. "Narratology and Ethical Literary Criticism." *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Eds. Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020. 183-197.]

盛宁：《人文困惑与反思》。北京：生活·读书·新知三联书店，1997 年。

[Sheng Ning. *Humanistic Perplexity and Reflection*. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1997.]

张连桥："生态伦理批评"，《文学伦理学批评理论研究》，聂珍钊、王松林编。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年：154-182。

[Zhang Lianqiao. "Ecological Ethical Criticism." *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Eds. Nie Zhenzhao and Wang Songlin. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020. 154-182.]

揭开道德假面 重返伦理之美：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究新动向

Unveiling Moral Masquerade and Reviewing the Beauty of Ethics：A New Approach to Henry Fielding's Novels

方文开（**Fang Wenkai**）

内容摘要：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》基于对亨利·菲尔丁经典作品的文本细读，以文学伦理学批评的视角切入菲尔丁小说，总结了处于 18 世纪英国历史变革时期菲尔丁小说中的道德思考和伦理建构。作者通过内向和外向视角的互补，探究了影响菲尔丁小说伦理建构的宗教和心理因素，剖析了菲尔丁小说中的伦理叙事，并将菲尔丁个体道德体验研究扩展到了 18 世纪英国文化建构研究，充分展现了菲尔丁小说艺术审美与伦理之辩的完美结合。该著作拓展了我国菲尔丁小说和英国文学研究的广度和深度，同时也是文学伦理批评视角下经典作家和作品文学批评分析的典范之作。
关键词：《道德假面与伦理建构》；文学伦理学批评；伦理建构

作者简介：方文开，江南大学外国语学院教授，主要研究兴趣为文学伦理学批评及美国气候小说批评。本文系 2020 年度江南大学基本科研计划社科类重大培育课题【项目编号：JUSRP2002ZD】的中期成果。

Title: Unveiling Moral Masquerade and Reviewing the Beauty of Ethics: A New Approach to Henry Fielding's Novels

Abstract: *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*, a new monograph published by Professor Du Juan, summarizes the moral thoughts and the constructive process of ethical thoughts in Fielding's novels in the 18th Century Britain, based on a close reading of his three novels from the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism. The author investigates the religious and psychological factors affecting the construction of ethical thoughts in Fielding's novels with both inward and outward angles and explores their narrative ethics, thus promoting the research on individual moral experience to the research on the cultural construction in 18th Century Britain and fully displaying the combination of ethical debate and aesthetic appreciation in Fielding's novels. On the whole, the

monograph not only widens and broadens the research on Fielding's novels and British literature bus also serves as an excellent example of the critical analysis of classical authors and works from the perspective of Ethical Literary Criticism.

Keywords: *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels*; Ethical Literary Criticism; ethics construction

Author: Fang Wenkai is Professor at School of Foreign Studies, Jiangnan University (Wuxi 214122, China). His academic interests are Ethical Literary Criticism and American Cli-fi criticism (Email: fangwenkai@jiangnan.edu.cn).

亨利·菲尔丁（Henry Fielding, 1707-1754）是英国 18 世纪最杰出的小说家之一，他的小说理论和小说艺术在 18 世纪欧洲文学史上起着举足轻重的作用。追溯国外菲尔丁研究，菲尔丁小说中的道德问题一直是研究者和批评者所争论的焦点；而自 20 世纪 20 年代菲尔丁被引介到中国至今，百年来国内菲尔丁小说研究也经历浮沉。近年随着文学批评理论的不断发展，围绕着菲尔丁小说研究涌现出了一批具有开拓性和创新性的成果。杜娟教授的新作《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》）（以下简称《道德假面与伦理建构》）就是其中的典型代表。该书是近年来伴随文学伦理学批评理论和批评实践研究兴起所诞生的又一力作，也是作者在 2010 年所出版专著《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》基础上的又一次学术升华。

作为专攻菲尔丁研究的青年学者，杜娟教授多年来一直潜心致力于菲尔丁小说伦理研究，并取得了一系列高质量的成果。《道德假面与伦理建构》基于对菲尔丁小说的细读，以文学伦理学批评的视角对菲尔丁小说进行了研究。全书除引论和结语外共分为四章，主要以菲尔丁的《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯的经历》（*The Adventures of Joseph Andrews*, 1742）（简称《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》）、《弃儿汤姆·琼斯的历史》（*The History of Tom Jones, a Foundling*, 1749）（简称《汤姆·琼斯》）和《阿米莉娅》（*Amelia*, 1751）三部现实主义小说为研究文本，分别从菲尔丁小说伦理的人性起点、文本脉络、思想建构、内在矛盾等方面系统而全面地考察了菲尔丁在小说创作中所依据的伦理思考线索。具体而言，该书以小说文本中人物的具体伦理境遇作为研究对象，深入研讨了菲尔丁小说中伦理体系的建构以及何为菲尔丁小说的核心价值等问题，并从历时和共时的角度阐明了菲尔丁小说作品的伦理特性和体系内涵，旨在"对作家的道德意识、伦理诉求以及承载其伦理思想的叙事艺术等问题做出详尽论述"（《道德假面与伦理建构》6）[1]。纵览全书，可以发现新著视野开阔、新见迭出。本文将围绕该著作中在研究视角、研究路径和研究方法等方面所展现的显著特征进行评述，探究《道德假面与伦理建构》对于推进菲尔丁小

1　本文相关引文均出自杜娟：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》（北京：北京大学出版社，2021 年）。以下仅标出页码，不再一一说明。

说研究和文学伦理批评研究的重要意义。

一、文学伦理批评分析与文本细读紧密结合

在研究视角方面,《道德假面与伦理建构》突破了传统文学批评方法的局限,从文学伦理学批评角度对菲尔丁的代表性作品进行了重读,提出了研究菲尔丁道德思想的新思路和解读菲尔丁文学经典作品的新视角。"文学伦理学批评是一种从伦理的视角阅读、阐释、理解、分析和评价文学的一种理论和方法"(聂珍钊 13)。它着重强调批评的客观性和历史性,提倡把自己放置在文本所处的具体历史语境和伦理环境中,把文学作品的当代价值看成是其历史价值的重新发现。在文学伦理学批评视角指导下,作者回到了历史的伦理现场,进入菲尔丁文学当时所处的伦理语境中,站在 18 世纪英国社会当时的伦理立场上对菲尔丁的三部文学作品进行了解读和阐释,试图寻找菲尔丁小说中产生的客观伦理原因并解释其何以成立,分析其小说中导致社会事件和影响人物命运的伦理因素,不仅用伦理的观点对事件、人物、文学问题等进行解释,还从历史的角度作出了道德评价。这种独特的解读视角不仅重新阐释了文学经典的道德价值观,也为文学批评理论注入了新的活力。"用新方法对过去已经定评的文学作品进行再批评,从中发现新的东西,得出新的结论,这就是文学批评的创新"(黄开红 118)。

杜娟教授不仅深刻理解了文学伦理批评视角的内涵,更能驾轻就熟地借助该视角指导具体文本的批判性实践。这点从作者以文学伦理批评视角对菲尔丁小说文本的细读可见一斑。文学研究离不开文本细读,通过文本细读有助于研究者进行历史化的理解,从而避免冲动的道德评价。《道德假面与伦理建构》紧扣《约瑟夫·安德鲁斯》、《汤姆·琼斯》和《阿米莉娅》这三部现实主义小说,对菲尔丁小说的人物塑造和情节安排进行了细读,并在专著中逐一进行了充分展现。在第一章中,《道德假面与伦理建构》围绕菲尔丁观察世界的一个独特视角——"假面"(masquerade)——深入挖掘了菲尔丁小说的伦理起点。第二章借助文学伦理学批评中的伦理线、伦理结、伦理冲突等概念,通过文本细读阐述和厘清了菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络,并指出菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络主要通过小说中的伦理线把伦理结串联起来,组合成文本的完整结构。因此菲尔丁小说的伦理结构构成了菲尔丁小说伦理的文本脉络。第三章探讨了菲尔丁小说伦理的思想建构。作者通过文本细读论述了菲尔丁小说伦理中蕴含的核心价值观念,指出他对忠贞、谨慎和仁慈的理解;又从善的发生、保障与回报的角度反驳了批评家们所说的"菲尔丁作品不考虑心理学"的错误认识。

此外,基于对三部小说的细读分析和论述可以看出,作者一方面注重对菲尔丁作品中蕴含的伦理及道德因素的分析,在历史而不是当下的语境中分析菲尔丁作品及人物的伦理选择;另一方面,聚焦于菲尔丁小说与现实社会

中道德现象的关系，阐释了菲尔丁小说对现实社会的道德教化作用。这两个方面都体现了文学伦理学批评区别于传统文学批评的鲜明特征。尤其是对菲尔丁三部作品中不同角色的道德处境和伦理选择的深入分析，不仅使读者对伦理环境、伦理选择等文学伦理学批评概念有了清晰的认识，更向读者展示了菲尔丁经典作品在文学伦理学批评观照下所焕发的新意。

因此，《道德假面与伦理建构》将文学伦理学批评理论的系统性与对批评实践的指导性有机结合，相辅相成。文学伦理批评理论为文本细读提供了理论支撑和研究方法；对菲尔丁小说的文本细读则是对文学伦理批评理论术语和话语体系的批评实践。理论观照与文本细读交相辉映，相得益彰，既体现了文学伦理学批评的重要理论价值，又展现了其在文学批评实践方面极强的适用性和实用性，为如何将理论与文本、方法与实践紧密结合起到了较好的指导作用。

二、从个体道德体验研究到 18 世纪英国文化建构

在研究路径上，《道德假面与伦理建构》按照从一般到具体、从微观到宏观的研究路径，通过考察菲尔丁对 18 世纪英国社会伦理现实和道德体系的书写与重构，凸显了菲尔丁个人道德体验的个性化特征；与此同时，又阐明了其个人道德体验与 18 世纪英国民族文化的同构关系。

一方面，该专著在论证过程中以时间为纵轴，从菲尔丁小说伦理的人性起点、文本脉络、思想建构和内在矛盾四个层面，通过分析小说中人物的伦理选择与当时的历史、政治、经济和文化之间的紧密联系，梳理了菲尔丁小说的道德追问和伦理体系；四个层面层次明晰、逐层递进，从历时角度勾勒出社会图景如何编织进入主人公的个体生命历程。作者在专著结语部分总结："菲尔丁这位现代小说之父也堪称是伦理学界的马丁·路德，他以艺术审美推进伦理之辩的思想方式，深刻影响了传统伦理的现代转型"（276），从而凸显了菲尔丁小说道德的特征，并阐述了其小说艺术审美之维。除了研究菲尔丁伦理思想的纵向历史变迁，《道德假面与伦理建构》还注重"以同时期的欧洲伦理思想史作为参照，通过影响研究的方式，具体阐明菲尔丁伦理思想的价值内涵与历史变迁"（6）。此外，作者还对菲尔丁小说相关的研究进行了横向深入探究，总结了不同年代对菲尔丁道德主题研究的主流评论，指出菲尔丁的道德主题经历了从早期的质疑、争议到逐渐得到认同与理解的漫长转变过程。

另一方面，在考察菲尔丁创作的伦理表征和文化特性的同时，《道德假面与伦理建构》还将研究置于具体的历史背景中，挖掘菲尔丁小说作品与其他学者之间的互文性，剖析了 18 世纪同时代哲学家、伦理学家和作家等与菲尔丁思想之间的影响、传承关系，阐明了菲尔丁小说伦理思想与 18 世纪英国民族文化的同构关系。例如在结语部分，作者多处运用了对比研究，指出菲

尔丁主要受到了当时风行的沙夫茨伯里、哈奇森、休谟等情感道德哲学家的影响，认为情感才是善行的起源和基础；在价值标准和行为路线上，菲尔丁小说伦理带有功利主义色彩，反映了其受培根、托马斯·霍布斯等影响而产生的合理利己主义思想；在人性论方面，菲尔丁又在对曼德维尔等人观点的批判和若即若离中确立了自身的伦理学体系。同时作者也强调，菲尔丁并未止步于对前代哲学家的继承式思考，而是形象展现道德实践领域内的问题，对抽象的道德哲学作出了有益的补充和推进。

通过对菲尔丁与同时期作家作品对比的深入解读，作者揭示了菲尔丁个体道德体验与 18 世纪英国主流人文思想之间的对话和互动；既在细微之处发掘出了菲尔丁伦理思想阐释的独特性，又在整体层面上透视和论述了其伦理思想的普适性，揭示了菲尔丁伦理思想如何参与 18 世纪英国文化的建构过程，"从而在更高的层次上实现了现实主义作家对'真'的寻求；而且反映的正是知识分子亲身参与并在思想层面参与英国社会的现代化转型的一个历史进程"（15）。从个体道德体验研究到 18 世纪英国文化建构的研究路径不仅体现了作者扎实的学术功底和宽广的学术视野，更体现了作者稳健的学风和勤于思辨的学术能力。

三、内向和外向视角的互补

在对菲尔丁相关文学作品进行文学伦理学批评分析过程中，杜娟教授并没有简单机械地用文学伦理学批评理论来加以框定、图解，而是在聚焦菲尔丁小说中的道德追问和伦理体系构建的同时，关注影响菲尔丁伦理体系构建的内在和外在因素，从而有的放矢地将宏观视野与微观观照相结合，体现出了作者明确的问题意识。

《道德假面与伦理建构》在梳理菲尔丁小说的道德追问和伦理体系的过程中，以宗教为切入点，充分关注菲尔丁小说伦理建构的宗教问题，详细考察了菲尔丁小说道德和伦理建构背后的社会、历史等外在因素影响，对"菲尔丁基督教徒化"的研究状况做出某种程度的回应（10）。18 世纪的英国有着深厚的宗教文化背景，在此背景下产生的宗教文学往往都同道德哲学有密切关系。这些背景和因素显然对菲尔丁的小说创作，尤其是其中的伦理叙事产生了重要影响，从而将宗教问题含括在菲尔丁小说的伦理建构之中。作者通过考察 18 世纪英国的宗教思想和菲尔丁所信奉的英国国教等教义，对菲尔丁小说中涉及的宗教原型、宗教情结、宗教追问等宗教特色进行了合理的阐释，并分析了菲尔丁小说人物带有宗教宿命论的原因。厘清和辨析菲尔丁小说复杂的宗教道德观念，有助于更深入地了解菲尔丁作品，并从整体上把握其伦理价值体系。

在探索影响菲尔丁小说伦理体系构建的外部因素的同时，作者还采用内向视角，构建了菲尔丁小说伦理的心理学体系。与一些批评家认为菲尔丁小

说是"一种不考虑心理学的假深刻的现实主义"（173）相反，在第三章中，作者通过对菲尔丁小说的细读后指出，菲尔丁在探讨善的发生、保障及报偿过程中强调的伦理问题让其小说伦理带上了心理学体系特征。首先，菲尔丁认为人物自身的情感或理智需求在道德善举发生的过程中都发挥了重要作用；其次，在论述善的保障时，菲尔丁的独特之处在于阐明了理性与情感之间的辩证关系，体现出一种以情理相融为目标的人生和谐思想；最后，他更注重人类的情感体验，认为回报美德的最好方式，就是满足人道德情感的价值回馈。由此可见，菲尔丁小说伦理"恰恰是从心理学的角度出发，关注了人物内心在道德中的重要作用，也因此具有了一种鲜明的心理学特征"（174）。

将宗教问题和心理因素作为了重要研究切入点，将向内和向外两个角度相互补，共同剖析影响菲尔丁小说伦理构建的内在和外在因素，体现了该著作区别于以往文学伦理学批评研究的创新之处，彰显了作者锐利深刻的思想锋芒和严谨求实的创新精神。

四、叙事结构与伦理内涵的融合

伦理思想体系的构建离不开伦理叙事结构的支撑。正如特里·伊格尔顿（Terry Eagleton）所指出的："如果一部作品有任何衔接如此连贯的东西，那么就是它的道德观同时隐蔽于作品的形式和内容"（Eagleton 46）。作者在梳理和分析菲尔丁小说伦理的思想建构过程的基础上，将菲尔丁小说伦理思想内涵与小说的伦理叙事结构相融合，指出了菲尔丁小说伦理内涵指涉的模糊性及其小说伦理正义达成的传奇性特点。

在第四章中，作者一方面探讨了同情、荣誉和自爱这三种伦理价值，剖析了其伦理内涵指涉的模糊性；另一方面从小说中主人公的身份发现与突转、"天意之手"的宿命安排和家庭罗曼司三个方面分析了菲尔丁创造的"散文体喜剧史诗"（prosaic-comic-epic writing）中如何弥合其伦理思想中的价值冲突，从而实现伦理传达的正义性。"散文体喜剧史诗"以其表现内容的宏阔、人物形象的生动真实以及充满生活气息的现实主义品格，最终支撑起了菲尔丁借助小说情节传达自己伦理思考的叙事意图。因此，"虽然传奇叙事在菲尔丁的文体改革中未必完全成功，但它却担负起了伦理救赎的重要使命"（243）。

由此可见，《道德假面与伦理建构》在对菲尔丁小说伦理叙事的剖析中既关注了伦理内容的研究，又兼顾了叙事形式的考察，并没有偏废一方，或顾此失彼。通过将菲尔丁小说伦理思想内涵与小说的伦理叙事结构分析相融合，不仅体现了传奇性叙述的现实意义和伦理价值，还为如何将叙事特征分析与伦理特性分析的进一步结合提供了借鉴和参考。

综上所述，杜娟教授基于对菲尔丁经典作品的文本细读，以文学伦理学

批评的视角切入菲尔丁小说，总结了处于 18 世纪英国历史变革时期的菲尔丁如何运用小说进行道德思考和伦理建构，深入分析了当时历史语境和伦理环境中的伦理现实和道德状况，充分展现了菲尔丁小说艺术审美与伦理之辩的完美结合。《道德假面与伦理建构》一书研究思路清晰明了，内容全面而又不乏深度，语言简练，立意深刻，重点突出。作者从个案研究出发，结合文学伦理学批评方法并融会贯通，援引了丰富详实的道德例证，使整个论述呈现出条分缕析、细致入微的特点。作为杜娟教授长期以来对于菲尔丁小说的道德追问和伦理体系梳理的成果，该书系统展示了菲尔丁小说伦理的艺术之维，深入拓展了我国菲尔丁小说和英国文学研究的维度和深度，同时也是文学伦理批评视角下经典作家和作品文学批评分析的典范之作。

Works Cited

杜娟：《亨利·菲尔丁小说的伦理叙事》。武汉：华中师范大学出版社，2010 年。

[Du Juan. *Ethical Narrative: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels.* Wuhan: Central China Normal UP, 2010.]

——：《道德假面与伦理建构：亨利·菲尔丁小说研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2021 年。

[—. *Moral Masquerade and Ethical Construction: A Study of Henry Fielding's Novels.* Beijing: Peking UP, 2021.]

韩加明：《菲尔丁研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2010 年。

[Han Jiaming. *A Study of Henry Fielding.* Beijing: Peking UP, 2010.]

黄开红："关于文学论理学批评——访聂珍钊教授"，《学习与探索》5（2006）：117-119。

[Huang, Kaihong. "An Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism—An Interview with Professor Nie Zhenzhao." *Study & Exploration* 5 (2006): 117-119.]

刘建军："文学伦理学批评：中国特色的学术话语构建"，《外国文学研究》4（2014）：14-19。

[Liu Jianjun. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Construction of Academic Discourse with Chinese Characteristics." *Foreign Literature Studies* 4 (2014): 14-19.]

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.]

——："文学伦理学批评：基本理论与术语"，《外国文学研究》1（2010）：12-22。

[—. "Ethical Literary Criticism: Its Fundaments and Terms." *Foreign Literature Studies* 4 (2014): 12-22.]

苏晖："学术影响力与国际话语权建构：文学伦理学批评十五年发展历程回顾"，《外国文学研究》5（2019）：34-51。

[Su Hui. "Academic Influence and the Construction of International Discourse Power: The Development of Ethical Literary Criticism in the Past Fifteen Years." *Foreign Literature Studies* 5 (2019): 34-51.]

Terry Eagleton. *The Event of Literature*. New Heaven: Yale UP, 2012.