

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫成果報告 (結案完整報告)

計畫名稱：從時「差」到時「間」：童妮·摩里森的小說時間

計畫類別：一般型研究計畫(個別型)

計畫編號：NSC 97-2410-H-003 -116 -MY3

執行期間：97年08月01日至101年7月31日

計畫主持人：李秀娟

執行單位：國立臺灣師範大學英語學系

日期：中華民國101年10月26日

一、研究內容概述

本計畫以時間理論與摩里森小說為兩大研究主軸。除了鑽研美國當代女作家童妮·摩里森的著作，深究其作品時間結構，也鑽研當代文學與文化理論中的時間論述，特別是由精神分析論述所發展出的時間架構與創傷理論中的時間，並將之與個人近年來一直在進行之亞美文學、美國族裔文學與電影研究結合。以下的研究成果，包括了個人四年來在摩里森研究、時間理論、與更廣泛之美國族裔文學研究領域所發表之主要期刊論文、演講、與研討會論文。

二、已出版/發表研究成果目錄

A. 期刊論文

1. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. "Historical Distance and Textual Intimacy: How Newness Enters Toni Morrison's *A Mercy*." *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies* 37.2 (2011): 135-155. (THCI-Core).
2. 李秀娟。〈從觀影「快」感到創傷時延：史考特·希克斯《雪落香杉》中的時間倫理〉。《英美文學評論》19 (2011): 1-28。(THCI-Core)
3. 李秀娟。〈歷史記憶與創傷時間：敘述日裔美國遷徙營〉。《中外文學》41.1 (2012): 7-43。(THCI-Core)
4. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. "The Remains of Empire and the 'Purloined' Philippines: Jessica Hagedorn's *Dream Jungle*." *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature* 45.3 (Sept. 2012): 49-64. (A&HCI)

B. 演講

1. "The Other of History and the Future of Time: Toni Morrison as a Case." 台師大英語系 Brown Bag Series. Taipei: NTNU, Nov. 23, 2010.
2. 〈文字與世界的相遇：從《一種慈悲》看童妮·摩里森的文學歷程〉。國立臺灣師範大學文化沙龍系列演講之五。希臘左巴師大店：Sept. 17, 2011。
3. 〈記憶的三種方法：童妮·摩里森《蘇拉》裡的自我、種族、與愛情〉。年國立臺灣師範大學文化沙龍系列演講之六。希臘左巴師大店：Sept. 21, 2011。
4. "Living on through Traumatic Time: A Post-9/11 Rethinking on Japanese American Internment." 九一一、巴特勒和生命政治研讀會。台南：成功大學，

Dec. 21, 2011。

C. 研討會論文

1. “Nation in Temporalities: Popular Documentary Photography on the Japanese American Internment” Paper delivered at the international conference on “Persectives on Migraiton, Nationalhood, and Ethnicity,” National Sun-Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, Nov. 8-9, 2008.
2. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “National Impossible: The “Purloined” Philippines in Jessica Hagedorn’s *Dream Jungle*.” Paper delivered at 2009 Association for Asian American Studies Annual Meeting, Hawaii, USA. April 22-26, 2009.
3. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “Japanese Colonial Legacy and the Rhythmic Everyday: Music, Time, and History in *Cape No. 7*.” Paper delivered at the 16th NATSA Annual Conference, University of California at Berkeley, Berkeley, USA. April 18-20, 2010.
4. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “Belated Memory as Palimpsests: Trauma and History in *Snow Falling on Cedar*.” Paper delivered at the 64th Annual RMMLA Convention, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA. October 14-16, 2010.
5. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “An Encounter of World and Letters: The Future of Time in Toni Morrison’s *A Mercy*.” Paper delivered at the Sixth Biennial Conference of the Toni Morrison Society, Paris, France. Nov 4-7, 2010.
6. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “Racial Memories in Baseball Diamond: From the American Wartime to *American Pastime*.” Delivered at “War Memories: The Third International Conference on Asian British and Asian American Literatures,” Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan. Dec. 9-10, 2011.
7. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. ““Trafficking in Seeds”: War Bride, Biopower, and Asian American Subjectivity in Ruth Ozeki’s *All over Creation*.” Delivered at the 2012 Association for Asian American Studies Conference, Washington D.C., USA. April 11-14, 2012.
8. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. “Asian America in Asia/America Distance and Transference: Asian American Studies in Taiwan.” Delivered at “Ethnic Literatures and Transnationalism: 2012 MELUS/USACLALS Conference,” San Jose, USA. April 19-22, 2012.
9. 李秀娟。〈「歐美」與「我們」之間：從亞美研究看美-亞的距離與傳會〉。發表於「我們的『歐美』：文本、裡論、問題研討會」。台北：中央研究院歐美所。
10. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. ““Posthumous Shock’: Time and Histroy in the Photographic Representations of Japanese American Internment.” Delivered at the Eighth Biennial MESEA Conference: “Media and Mediatate Performances of Ethnicity.” Barcelona: Blanquerna School of Communication, Ramon Llull University, June 13-16, 2012.

三、詳細研究內容：期刊論文全文（共四篇，依上列篇目順序排列）
 （註：出國發表之研討會論文全文附於各年度出國移地研究與參加國際研討會之心得報告）

Historical Distance and Textual Intimacy: How Newness Enters Toni Morrison's *A Mercy**

Hsiu-chuan Lee
Department of English
National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan

Abstract

Toni Morrison's *A Mercy* (2008) encourages a meditation on literature's interaction with history. Focusing on the way in which "novel time" operates here to challenge the serial, diachronic conception of history, I seek in *A Mercy* a space to negotiate the historical distance between periods, events, and peoples. The shifting tenses of narrating voices introduced by the novel, along with the linkages that memories create between times, prompt the spreading-out of seventeenth-century American history into a textual network of elastic ligaments and a kind of dialogism. Moreover, challenging the logic of ethnic division and racial segregation, *A Mercy* elucidates the proximity of different races in early American history. It enacts cross-color intimacy as a new way of conceiving the origins of American culture. Morrison's writing about history in *A Mercy* is not simply a return to the past or a retrieval of the repressed. By evoking a lost age and digging out from what has disappeared logics and ideas that resist existent historical lines and racial categorizations, the novel fosters in its textual present an intermediary agency for negotiating the structure of history, thereby ushering in *new* historical epistemes.

Keywords

Toni Morrison, *A Mercy*, history, textuality, time, race, intimacy

* A short draft of this paper was presented at "Toni Morrison and Circuits of the Imagination: The Sixth Biennial Conference of the Toni Morrison Society," held in Paris, 4-7 November 2010. I benefited greatly from the responses of audience members. I am also grateful to Guy Beauregard and Wen-ching Ho for their reading, advice, and support.

Toni Morrison's ninth novel *A Mercy* (2008) opens with its teenage heroine Florens rushing into the woods in search of a freed black man—an unnamed blacksmith—presumably possessing a cure for both her bedridden mistress and her own lovesick heart. Looking for paths through the dangerous wilderness, she exclaims at one point on her journey: “I am happy the world is breaking open for us, yet its newness trembles me” (5). Set in the late 1600s, when what was not yet the “United States” was only partly controlled by several European powers and the idea of race had not yet solidified, *A Mercy* ushers not only Florens but also its readers into a new world rife with dangers and opportunities. On the one hand, Virginia in 1682 “was still a mess” (11); it featured a world of shifting power formations and changing contours, where “land claims were always fluid” and “turtles had a life span longer than towns” (13). On the other hand, this world vibrated with air “so new, almost alarming in rawness and temptation,” which “never failed to invigorate” a person (12). The words of Jacob Vaark, a disowned orphan traveling from Europe to inherit a piece of land in America, best spell out the chances for those craving change in their social position and destiny: “Where else but in this disorganized world would such an encounter be possible? Where else could rank tremble before courage?” (25).

The “new” world introduced in *A Mercy* is, ironically, also an “old” world when restored to its “place” in the temporal sequence of American history. While the recurring ideas and images of a world still soft, still awaiting forms and formation, arouse readers to a sense of hope and anticipation, it may also be argued, with a clearer historical chronology in mind, that this novel represents, above all, an attempt to commemorate a lost age: whatever chances there were in the 1600s, they have long since been lost. The cartography of America has long been settled, and racial categories polarized into black and white. Interpreting *A Mercy* from the endpoint of either the novel or the history it deals with, John Updike sees in the text a pessimistic fatalism:

[A]s Morrison moves deeper into a more visionary realism, a betrauced pessimism saps her plots of the urgency that hope imparts to human adventures. “A Mercy” begins where it ends, with a white man casually answering a slave mother’s plea, but he dies, and she fades into slavery’s myriads, and the child goes mad with love. Varied and authoritative and frequently beautiful though the language is, it circles around a vision, both turgid and static, of a new world turning old, and poisoned from the start.

Given his assumption that history is linear and follows a line of succession, Updike sees this past as one doomed to be overtaken by the present. The world in *A Mercy* is inevitably “turning old” and “poisoned from the start” because of the subsequent, more fully-developed role of blackness as a stigma in Western history. The past is held hostage by, inflected by, and subject to our knowledge in the present. Writing about the past is accordingly a “turgid and static” mourning that goes nowhere.

I argue that Updike’s reading places *A Mercy* in the temporal prison house of historicism. Convincing in a way, it nonetheless ignores the operation of “novel time” in its resistance to and negotiation with chronology.¹ Although readers may assume or impose a linear time and history, and give the endpoint of the novel (or the history it speaks of) the greatest weight in their interpretation, the past in/of a novel does not disappear along with our act of reading it. The beginning of the story remains there, on a page one can (re)turn to, coexisting with the ending and any other moments in the story and thus accounting for the everlasting presence of the novel’s fictional times. Moreover, despite the fact that a novel draws materials from the past, the reading act takes place in the present. When the past that is spoken of in a narrative text is “read” in the present, it is given presence and immediacy. Novels are therefore capable of annexing pasts and presents and thereby giving their rendering of the past a new life. They need not subject the past to our present-day knowledge in the way of normal “history”; rather, novels have the potential to enable a flow of time through the interchange of temporal points. If modern history is conceived as being composed of concrete events occurring in succession, novels endow our acts of reading with an intermediary agency capable of enacting a temporal repetition, reversal, and realignment.

This paper takes *A Mercy* as an example to meditate on literature’s interaction with history. By focusing on the way Morrison’s “novel time” functions to challenge our linear, diachronic conception of history, I seek in this novel a space in which to negotiate historical distance. Referring to the temporal distance between

¹ Morrison expressed in an interview that she usually followed the “novel time”: “There is something called *novel time*. If you lay it down too clearly then you are just following a map and you are not letting it—you just have to let it go, wait for it to be there” (Houston 257; emphasis in original). Morrison resists to writing according to a pre-set chronology of plot development. “Novel time” evolves along with textuality and evokes the “paper time” proposed by Roland Barthes: the time of historical discourse, “the presence, in historical narration, of explicit speech-act signs” that “tends to ‘de-chronologize’ the historical ‘thread’ and to restore, if only as a reminiscence or a nostalgia, a complex, parametric, non-linear time whose deep space recalls the mythic time of the ancient cosmogonies” (130).

historical periods or events, the term “historical distance” is usually thought to designate an objective and stable entity measurable by clock-time. In his study of the theory and genres of history, however, Mark Salber Phillips proposes a more elastic conception of historical distance:

Some degree of temporal distance is, of course, a given in historical writing, but temporal distance may be enlarged or diminished by other kinds of commitments and responses. Thus historical distance, in the fuller sense I want to give it, refers to much more than the conventional understanding that the outline of events is clarified by the passage of time, or that the historian’s perspective necessarily reflects that of his or her generation. . . . [O]ur concept of distance, if it is to be helpful, should not be limited to forms of detachment or estrangement; in its wider sense, distance must take in the impulse to establish *proximity* as well as *separation*. Distance, to put this another way, should refer to a whole dimension of our relation to the past, not to one particular location. (217; emphasis in original)

Breaking away from a spatial model that takes the past as a “location” with a fixed distance from the present, Phillips suggests that “temporal distance may be enlarged or diminished by other kinds of commitments and responses.” His “fuller sense” of historical distance pushes the understanding of distance beyond objective, mechanical temporal measurements, and brings the *adjustment* of this distance—adjustments of proximity and separation, intimacy and estrangement between periods, events, and peoples—to the center of historical writing. By associating historical distance with “a whole dimension of our relation to the past,” his argument not only implies that our relation to the past is flexible, but also brings to the fore the importance of negotiating this relation in the formation of histories.

More precisely, Phillips’s notion of a malleable historical distance redirects our attention from history’s contents to its structure. While inquiries into the concrete and putatively “authentic” contents of the past have long been considered of primary importance in historical studies, Phillips’s analysis emphasizes the changeable constitution of historical times and lines. As we know, the modern West tends to organize the meaning and contents of history primarily by breaking time into periods:

Modern Western history essentially begins with differentiation

between the *present* and the *past*. . . . This rupture also organizes the content of history within the relations between *labor* and *nature*; and finally, as its third form, it ubiquitously takes for granted a rift between *discourse* and the *body* (the social body). It forces the silent body to speak. It assumes a gap to exist between the silent opacity of the “reality” that it seeks to express and the place where it produces its own speech, protected by the distance established between itself and its object. (de Certeau 2-3; emphasis in original)

Historical intelligibility as defined by modern Western history is thus generated not only from a temporal rupture but also from the separation of a discursive speaking position from its object of representation. The “rift”—the “distance” between discourse and object—has to be carefully regulated and maintained so that the discourse can be “protected” and the meaning of the object stabilized. Modern Western history could therefore be imagined as grounded on a neatly spatialized structure that forbids unregulated temporal fluidity or random conjoining of historical moments. It features a static structure, for modern Western historians in effect replaced “an acquaintance with time with the knowledge of *what* exists within time” (Gérard Mairet; qtd. in de Certeau 12; emphasis in original). Phillips’s emphasis on negotiable historical distance, however, challenges this logic of division and separation. It compels a different imagination of history: histories in plurality are conceived as networks of elastic ligaments and modifiable conjunctures.

Phillips’s contention thus restores complexity to historical practices. It also paves the way for comparisons and dialogues between history and a range of narratives, including literary ones, that engage with and may “contain” and/or, more particularly, “be contained by” histories. Proposing then that history itself is “a cluster of overlapping and competing genres,” different in terms of their “formal, affective, ideological, and cognitive elements that, in balance, shape the reader’s sense of engagement with the past” (213), Phillips draws attention to the forms, emotional designs, ideological contrivances, and cognitive mapping that underlie the production of each history. He blurs the division between histories and fictional genres such as the (historical) novel, memoir, biography, etc. This inclusion of creative literary writing with the wider spectrum of historical writing helps to explain fiction’s capacity, not just to draw on historical materials for imaginative creation but to intervene into and have a real impact on historical epistemes. If at one end of the historical-writing spectrum lies the conventional historiography that

silences the past with “scriptural tombs” (de Certeau 2), at the other end perhaps lie novels that play on their various proximities with the past through their own fictional elasticity.

A Mercy would seem, then, to help us elaborate on this issue of negotiable historical distance because in her novel Morrison has introduced provocative and intricate takes on history. Noted for her interest in the old and in the past, she has set each of her novels in a specific period of the American past. Indeed she claims that all her hopes in her creative literary work are “in the past” (McCluskey 40). Yet she says this not out of a sense of nostalgia or a pessimistic belief in the impossibility of the future, nor because of her passive submission to the return of those repressed memories, those revenants, those ever-haunting pasts. On the contrary, Morrison has actively sought the future and the new in her every effort of writing about the past. When asked whether “any of your characters get away from their past,” she replied:

I hope not. No. I don't want anybody to get off scot-free.

I think what I want is not to reinvent the past as idyllic or to have the past as just a terrible palm or fist that pounds everybody to death, but to have happiness or growth represented in the way in which people deal with their past, which means they have to come to terms, confront it, sort it out, and then they can do that third thing. (Hackney 128-29)

The past in Morrison's novels is neither a refuge we may return to nor a horror we may escape from; it rather offers a temporal space for us to explore, one that somehow fosters the doing of “that third thing.” It is not the past in itself or the past in its being-already-past, its “past tense” that needs to be recovered, but rather the possibility of our own encounter with this past, our own potential confronting and dealing-with it, which may have a generative or transformative effect on our lives.

Morrison spells out more clearly the permanent presence of the past in another passage:

The past for my characters, I believe, is—I was going to say more intimate, but I don't mean intimate. Why don't we put it this way: I understand that in many African languages there is an infinite past, and very few, if any, verbs for the future, and a major string of verbs for the continuous present. So that notion of its always being now,

even though it is past, is what I wanted to incorporate into the text, because the past is never something you have to record, or go back to. Children can actually represent ancestors or grandmothers or grandfathers. It's a very living-in-the-moment, living now with the past, so that it's never—calculated; it's effortless. Sometimes that causes a great deal of trouble to some of the characters. (Hackney 130)

Drawing on African linguistic features, Morrison explains the close connection of the past and the present in her writing. There is no need for one to travel across temporal gaps in order to reach the past as the past is already part of the present, an integral part of our “living-in-the-moment.” Curiously, in the above passage Morrison started to use the word “intimate” to describe her characters’ relationship to the past and then rejected it. “Intimate” is probably not the right word if it denotes—narrowly—a strong emotional attachment or affectionate relationship, given that one’s relationship with the past, which could cause “a great deal of trouble,” is far more complicated than this. Yet this Morrisonian slip of the tongue might lead us to ponder the wider connotations of this adjective: “intimate” refers to the “interior” and the “innermost,” hence to the past as that which is integrally woven with the present; or, it indicates “close” and “near” in terms of distance, hence Morrison’s echoing of Phillips’s emphasis on a malleable historical distance. By portraying her characters’ ambivalent relationships with their past, Morrison is perhaps coming to terms with the various degrees of her own intimacy with history, and/or with the various kinds and degrees of intimacy within history itself.²

Morrison’s play on historical distance finds an illustration in *A Mercy*. In terms of its historical setting, *A Mercy* traces the depth of American history farther than any of Morrison’s previous novels into the 1600s. This effort to dig deeper into history nevertheless comes along with its protagonist Florens’s first person narrating voice in the present tense. The novel thus takes place in a time both far away and in the present. Morrison attests that among the voices of her characters’ in this novel, she

² The concept of “intimate” or “intimacy” as employed in this paper is also indebted to Lisa Lowe, who identifies three meanings of “intimacy”: (1) intimacy as “spatial proximity or adjacent connection” (193); (2) intimacy as associated with “privacy, often figured as conjugal and familiar relations in the bourgeois home” (195); (3) intimacy as embodied in “the variety of contacts among slaves, indentured persons, and mixed-blood free peoples” (202). More about cross-racial intimacy will be discussed later.

heard Florens's first, the girl. And she approaches language in a slanted way. She can read and write; she learned from a Catholic priest under scary circumstances. And she's taken someplace else; she doesn't know what they're talking about. When she was with her mother she spoke Portuguese. She knows Latin. So I just put all her language together and gave her an individual voice that was "I"—first person—and very visual. But also, once I realized that I could make her speak only in the present tense, it gave the narrative an immediacy. . . . (Smallwood 37)

Florens's hybrid linguistic upbringing reflects the geographical and cultural porosity characteristic of the world she grows up in. And as if carrying this cultural and linguistic fluidity into her narrating voice, Florens speaks in a perpetual present tense that resists temporal divisions: "Everything is now with her" (Toomer 21). *A Mercy* is structured so that Florens's voice appears every other chapter. In-between her first person narratives are inserted chapters in a third-person voice in the past tense that features by turns other main characters' perspectives. The shifts between present tense and past tense, complicated by the narrative's movement back and forth between moments of characters' lives, forge a collage of times.

Certainly, not all reviewers appreciate *A Mercy*'s resistance to sequential storytelling. Amy Frykholm observes that "the lack of a coherent, continuous plot will frustrate some readers. Just as you think the story is taking off, you turn back again to the past, to the history of another in the menagerie of characters" (46). B. R. Myers further asserts that *A Mercy* is "larded with anachronisms": due to Morrison's "all-too-contemporary prose style," as well as her "back and forth" going "over the same period" by evoking different characters' memories, the novel "never seems to settle into narrative 'real time'" (104). My contention is that the attention to Morrison's "anachronisms," more precisely *A Mercy*'s refusal to settle into a specific historical temporality in style and language, instead of invalidating Morrison's writing, actually casts into relief the fundamental difference between the temporality of Morrison's text and that advocated by modern Western history. Firstly, in a way that contrasts with the "history" that appeals to a conventional sense of realism, Morrison's writing, which enacts an encounter of world and words, works toward a "textualization" of the world through a disintegration of the so-called reality into disparate yet intersecting narratives and memories. Moreover, Morrison's "textualized world" resists an arbitrary division between the past and the present. *A Mercy* allows time to "flow" by experimenting with the circular

interchanges of different temporal points. While one may wonder whether textuality here is achieved at the expense of historical depth or truth, it is important to note that the violence of history is usually associated with a fixed and authoritative past or periodization. By transforming the world of evidence into “a world of words,” Morrison might seem to “flatten up” history; yet in doing so she also launches a rhetorical and epistemological movement away from “what was” to the past conditional of “what might have been,” even toward the future projective of “what could be.”

Instead of arguing that *A Mercy* tells the story of what happened—realistically—in the late seventeenth century, I suggest that it is more accurate to interpret *A Mercy* as exploring, and, furthermore, restructuring the ways in which we read and understand pre-revolutionary America.³ The lines and ligaments of textuality—that is, the networks set up between readers and the past which the text tries to recall and reason with—are given a central position. From the very beginning of the novel, Florens’s narrating voice addresses and ushers a “you” into her storytelling: “Don’t be afraid. My telling can’t hurt you in spite of what I have done and I promise to lie quietly in the dark—weeping perhaps or occasionally seeing the blood once more—but I will never again unfold my limbs to rise up and bare teeth. I explain” (3). The “you” to whom Florens addresses her narrative is the free blacksmith with whom she falls in love. Yet there is a strong suggestion she is also addressing to Morrison’s readers at these moments. Apparent throughout is Florens’s intention to direct the attention of the “you” from the real world of violence and blood, where she “unfold[s] her limbs to rise up and bare teeth,” to the world of words—the world of her storytelling and explanation. This urgency for the “you” to read her text instead of the world is brought to the fore again toward the end of her narrative, where Florens calls to mind the fact that the blacksmith is illiterate. He has to learn in order to read her words: “You read the world but not the letters of talk. You don’t know how to. Maybe one day you will learn” (160).

³ Although many critics have sought in Morrison’s text more “authentic” versions of history (versus the whites-dominated version), it has to be noted that Morrison has resisted the idea that her writings make any absolute claims to truth. In her Nobel Prize reception lecture she commented on the need for language to be humble in face of historical reality. Not only must one recognize the fact that “language can never live up to life once and for all” and “can never ‘pin down’ slavery, genocide, war,” but language should never “yearn for the arrogance to be able to do so” (270). The power of language, Morrison continued, lies not in that it is able to capture the whole or to finalize the history, but in its ability to “reach toward the ineffable” (270). These issues will be discussed later on in more depth.

Florens's question about the blacksmith's ability to read "the letters of talk" points to *A Mercy's* concern about the issues of reading and textuality. Florens actually poses two main questions to "you": "Stranger things happen all the time everywhere. You know. I know you know. One question is who is responsible? Another is can you read?" (3). Of primary importance is not only "what happened" but also whether the blacksmith can read what happened. And this question can be directed to Morrison's readers as well: in what way and to what extent have the readers of Morrison's text comprehended the history of pre-revolutionary America? What are the possible readings introduced through the characters in *A Mercy*? Into what forms of textuality does Morrison guide her readers, and how do they change our way of approaching American history or history in general?

The narratives of *A Mercy*, put simply, evolve around the establishment and collapse of the white trader Jacob Vaark's household. A "ratty orphan" abandoned by his family in Europe, Jacob becomes a landowner and a trader after he inherits 120 acres from a distant uncle in Milton, Virginia (12). Over time he sets up a household that develops into a makeshift home and a place of encounter for the following persons: Rebekka (a European escaping religious savagery and limited opportunity, traveling to America in answer to Jacob's advertisement for a wife), Lina (a Native American woman purchased by Jacob after her tribespeople were wiped out by a smallpox epidemic), Florens (a black girl given away at the age of eight by her slave mother to settle her owner's debt to Jacob), Sorrow (a vixen-eyed and red-haired survivor of a shipwreck with unknown ancestry accepted into Jacob's household), and Willard and Scully (two white indentured laborers hired by Jacob to build his house). The increased size of his household and his accumulation of wealth, mostly from his rum investments in Barbados, testify to Jacob's gradual rise in status and fortune in the new world. But Jacob is heirless, and his sudden death in the midst of building his grand house leaves Rebekka, Lina, Florens, and Sorrow in the condition of "unmastered women" whose selves and lives are cast into jeopardy (58).

Told in what Morrisonian scholars identify as a "'chorus' method of storytelling" in which different characters' memories and perspectives are presented by turns (Hooper 5), the rise and fall of Jacob's household serves as a nodal point around which sprawl layers of intersecting narratives, hence the generation of a textual space that allows contacts and connections of historical points and lines. For example, the story of an early European immigrant such as Jacob, who comes to the new world with the heroic ambition to build "a place out of no place, a temperate living from raw life" (12), is coupled in *A Mercy* with a telling of the importation

and exploitation of slave laborers in the Americas. On the one hand, Jacob insists that “flesh” is not “his commodity” (22). Trading only on “goods and gold” (25), he looks down on slave traders such as Sehor D’Ortega and sneers at “wealth dependent on a captured workforce” (28). On the other hand, although Jacob is determined to “prove that his own industry could amass the fortune, the station, . . . without trading his conscience for coin” (28), his investment in a sugar and rum business in the West Indies makes him complicit, albeit from a distance, in the development of slavery. This is revealed in another passage:

Knowing full well his shortcomings as a farmer—in fact his boredom with its confinement and routine—he had found commerce more to his taste. Now he fondled the idea of an even more satisfying enterprise. And the plan was as sweet as the sugar on which it was based. And there was a profound difference between the intimacy of slave bodies at Jublio and a remote labor force in Barbados. Right? Right. (35)

Jacob assuages his initial horror at the slave trade by convincing himself of the innocuousness of his investment. He attempts to comprehend the slave trade undertaken in Jublio, a plantation established by D’Ortega in Maryland, as distinct from the recruitment of a labor force in the geographically more remote Barbados. While the “intimacy”—the emotional proximity and physical nearness—between European settlers and the slave bodies in continental colonies is considered immoral, Jacob justifies the “remote” trading and exploitation of slaves in the West Indies as a separate and harmless story. *A Mercy* challenges Jacob’s reasoning, however, by bringing the two lines of history together within one (con)text.

A Mercy restructures American history by playing upon the separation or connection of historical lines. Another example is its conjoining of the rise of European settlers and the ravaging of native and natural life. The epidemic disaster that nearly exterminated the native population, embodied most specifically through Lina’s memory of the wipeout of her tribe by smallpox, is one instance. Another is the slow destruction of nature along with the expansion of whites’ power. Intriguingly, Jacob is introduced in *A Mercy* as a person with a “pulse of pity for orphans and strays” (33). He would dismount his horse to “free the bloody hindleg of a young raccoon stuck in a tree break” (11), and “[f]ew things angered Jacob more than the brutal handling of domesticated animals” (28). Florens’s mother decides to entrust her daughter to Jacob also because Jacob sees Florens “as a

human child, not pieces of eight” (166). As merciful as Jacob may at times appear, he is nonetheless perceived to be in violation of nature’s laws when he decides to build his third house. Lina comments: “[t]hat third and presumably final house that Sir insisted on building distorted sunlight and required the death of fifty trees” (43).

Reading the house-building project from another perspective, Rebekka further attributes Jacob’s changing relationship with nature to his positional changes from a farmer to a trader and then to a squire:

It was some time before she noticed how the tales were fewer and the gifts increasing, gifts that were becoming less practical, even whimsical. . . . Having seen come and go a glint in his eye as he unpacked these treasure so useless on a farm, she should have anticipated the day he hired men to help clear trees from a wide swath of land at the foot of a rise. A new house he was building. Something befitting not a farmer, not even a trader, but a squire. (88)

Indeed, Jacob dissociates himself not only from the land and nature but also from his servants as he ascends in class. As Lina observes, of the three houses Jacob builds, the first one—“dirt floor, green wood”—is too weak to accommodate a household (43). Strong with “wooden floors,” “four rooms,” “a decent fireplace and windows with good tight shutters” (43), the second house is also the one that allows Lina and Florens to stroll in and out at will and gives Sorrow a place to sleep every night. By contrast, the third house marks Jacob’s increasing distance from his mixed-race household. Though “bigger” and “double-storied,” the third house is “fenced and gated” (43). The servants’ entrance into it is even completely forbidden by Rebekka after Jacob’s death.

And inseparable from this emergence of class demarcation is the formation of racism. Morrison once declared that the central question she wanted to ask in writing *A Mercy* is: “How did racism develop in the United States?” (Stein 178). The setting of her story against the historical moment not long after Bacon’s Rebellion clearly spells out an institutional origin of racism against blacks in relation to class conflicts:

Half a dozen years ago an army of blacks, natives, whites, mulattoes—freedmen, slaves and indentured—had waged war against local gentry led by members of that very class. When that “people’s war” lost its hopes to the hangman, the work it had done . . . spawned

a thicket of new laws authorizing chaos in defense of order. By eliminating manumission, gatherings, travel and bearing arms for black people only; by granting license to any white to kill any black for any reason; by compensating owners for a slave's maiming or death, they separated and protected all whites from all others forever.
(10)

While tracing the birth of racism in American laws, this passage conveys a provocative message. It subtly calls attention to the fact that "black people only" were picked up as scapegoats in what initially was a war between classes. The color lines were drawn as a convenient legal solution to—or a distraction from—class divisions. Indeed, if racial discrimination was not juridically institutionalized until "a thicket of new laws" passed after Bacon's Rebellion, racism (in the way we know it) is by no means natural or innate in the Americas. While admitting to the fact that racism against blacks has existed "forever" since Bacon's Rebellion, the passage above also conjures up a time during and before Bacon's Rebellion, a time when races were not clearly delimited and blacks could ally with natives, whites, and mulattos in a "people's war" against local gentry.

If the development of the Americas has come along with the production of lines and separations between humans and nature, between classes, as well as between races, clearly Morrison does not simply trace the emergence of these lines and separations but also evokes a time and place before and beyond the codification of differences. Instead of offering a unidirectional narrative that mimics the progressive line of history, the narrative of bifurcating memories in *A Mercy* restrains from imposing order on the "mess" or the "wilderness" characteristic of pre-revolutionary America. In a way, seventeenth-century America was chosen as a productive setting for the novel not as much because it offers a temporal point of origin for the subsequent development of American history as because it provides a time before the history with which we have been familiar takes shape. Morrison's writing evokes a lost age and digs out from what has disappeared logics and ideas that resist existent lines and separations.

When asked about why she was drawn to seventeenth-century America for her novel, Morrison uttered that this era is marked by "wilderness" that allows intimacy across color lines: the seventeenth century is "raw, ad hoc. Everybody was here" (Toomer 21). The Spanish, the Dutch, the French, the British, the Portuguese, the Swedes, etc., according to Morrison, were all there: everybody was "clambering for space and resources. . . . And you want to know what were all these people running

from” (Interview by Charlie Rose). In *A Mercy*, Jacob’s household could be read as a microcosm of the colonial settlement that brings people of different racial origins and cultural backgrounds together. Although the death of Jacob leaves the cross-racial community on the verge of collapse, characters in different chapters bring readers recurrently to the presence of the community. In Florens’s narrative, for example, the image of four women—Lina, Rebekka, Florens, and Sorrow, each with a different skin color and “each holding a corner of a blanket” whereon lies Jacob, who is “sleeping with his mouth wide open and never wakes” (37)—testifies to these women’s mutual need and support of each other. In Lina’s chapter, Florens, Rebekka, and Lina are described as “a united front in dismay” when joined by Sorrow (53). In fact, Lina “had fallen in love” with Florens right away, “as soon as she saw her shivering in the snow” (60). And although she and Rebekka have seen Sorrow as “useless” (53), a person who “dragged misery like a tail” (55), they accept Sorrow into their household and allow her to “sleep by the fireplace all seasons” (54). Moreover, as if echoing Lina’s remembrance that the initial animosity between Rebekka and herself is “utterly useless in the wild” and “died in the womb” (53), Rebekka in her chapter reasons that “[p]erhaps because both were alone without family, or because both had to please one man, or because both were hopelessly ignorant of how to run a farm,” she and Lina “became what was for each a companion” (75).

Among the four women, Sorrow appears to express “placid indifference to anyone” except Twin, her imaginary double (124). Yet Lina has paid close attention to her. It is Lina “who told Sorrow she was pregnant” (122), which makes Sorrow flush “with pleasure at the thought of a real person . . . growing inside her” (123). Besides, the fact that Sorrow has been saved by different men through her life makes her a figure bridging genders: she is first saved by the sawyer’s sons and then Jacob after the shipwreck; the blacksmith cures her smallpox; the two white indentured laborers, Williard and Sully, further help her deliver a baby daughter.

Like Sorrow, Willard and Scully seem to occupy the margin of Jacob’s household. Yet they are sharp observers of other household members: “Willard judged people from their outside: Scully looked deeper” (151). In their chapter, they comment on the four women and their changes after Jacob’s death. Willard points to the “melancholy” added to Rebekka’s “newly stern features” (145), to which Scully appends the fact that underneath Rebekka’s piety is “something cold if not cruel” (153). Lina’s loyalty to Mistress or Florens indicates to them not so much her “submission” as “a sign of her own self-worth” (151). Florens has changed in their eyes from the “combination of defenselessness, eagerness to please, and . . . a

willingness to blame herself for the meanness of others” into a “feral” woman after her journey through the woods (152, 146). Besides, they disagree with Lina and assert that Sorrow is not “the odd one” (152). For them, Sorrow is the only one whose change seems “an improvement” (146).

As shall be seen, a “chorus” in *A Mercy* occurs as characters speak to, read, and memorize each other. Although Jacob’s household is never released from its temporary nature and fragile structure when put back in historical reality, a sense of community, if not sustainable through the flow of time, is achieved and preserved in textuality. On the one hand, *A Mercy* narrates the inevitable disintegration of a cross-racial community in historical progressivism: Lina may have “relished her place in this small, tight family,” but she has to admit that this “family” is nothing but “a swallow’s nest” (58). Likewise, Willard and Scully confess toward the end of their chapter that “the family they imagined they had become was false. Whatever each other loved, sought or escaped, their futures were separate and anyone’s guess” (156). On the other hand, however, by writing about the cross-racial intimacy that once existed or is imagined between Jacob’s household members, *A Mercy* has registered a textual presence of this intimacy. The novel’s grammatically striking title, in which mercy is represented as countable and singular, attests to the fact that Jacob’s “mercy” that makes his household possible might not be common in pre-revolutionary America.⁴ Yet even if Jacob’s household is not a typical representation of “what was,” by recording and deploying its presence *A Mercy* has launched an imaginary projection of “what could be,” based on the logic of chance encounters and racial mixings characteristic of what Morrison termed “pre-racial” America (Interview by Charles Rose).

The cross-racial intimacy evoked in *A Mercy* carries an echo of the “intimacy” Lisa Lowe describes in her project on “the intimacies of four continents.” One problem of Western historical studies Lowe points to is the lack of comparative perspectives:

Europe is rarely studied in relation to the Caribbean or Latin America, and U.S. history is more often separated from studies of the larger Americas. Work in ethnic studies on comparative U.S. racial formation is still at odds with American history that disconnects the study of slavery from immigration studies of Asians and Latinos or

⁴ As Stein notes, *A Mercy* was initially titled “Mercy,” but Morrison “changed it to *A Mercy* because there is only one” (179).

that separates the history of gender, sexuality, and women from these studies of “race.” (204-05)

Based on the tenet of demarcation and separation, modern Western history may allow a parallel existence of different histories under the banner of multiculturalism, but fails to explore “the braided relations” between them (Lowe 205). Lowe thus calls for the study of cross-racial intimacy in the formation of the Americas, with a view to teasing out the political and economic knowledge that “might link the Asian, African, creolized Americas to the rise of European and North American bourgeoisie societies” (204).

The relevance of Lowe’s argument in the reading of *A Mercy* becomes evident if we take note of the fact that Morrison has been concerned with the crisscrossing relations between people of different colors from an early point of her career onward. When editing *The Black Book* in the seventies as a Random House editor, she already commented on the interconnection of black and white histories.⁵ In *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination* (1993), Morrison explored further and in greater detail the important position of “the four-hundred-year-old presence” of Africans and African Americans in the formation of the Americas (5). Morrison’s argument is twofold. First, she suggests, it has been a misconception in terms of historical chronology to think that white people have come earlier than Africans or African Americans to the Americas. Morrison elaborates that “a black population accompanied (if one can use that word) and in many cases preceded the white settlers” (8). Moreover, Morrison notes that the black population “has always had a curiously intimate and unhingingly separate existence within the dominant one” (12). Like Lowe, she argues that a “parallel inclusion” of African American culture into the American culture is inadequate in tackling the much more complicated racial structure, which prescribes separation yet remains susceptible to intimacies across color lines.

Sharing Lowe’s attention to the issue of cross-racial intimacy, Morrison nonetheless has focused her study not on the nineteenth century which Lowe investigates, but on a much earlier time, the late seventeenth century. More importantly, while Lowe draws insight mostly from historical and anthropological

⁵ Morrison states in “Rediscovering Black History”: “In spite of this tendency to have one set of rules for black history and another for white history, I was, in completing the editing of *The Black Book*, overwhelmed with the connecting tissue between black and white history. The connection, however, was not a simple one of white oppressor and black victim” (49).

evidence, Morrison has taken literary creation as a crucial site upon which to experiment with different logics of racial formation. As the work of anthropologists and historians is driven primarily by a realist desire for a more “genuine” or “complete” version of the past, literature’s long suit is not so much to provide a first-hand sociopolitical record as to introduce to the past a textual immediacy and, if possible, a dimension of futurity. Indeed, as if foreseeing her writing project in *A Mercy*, Morrison meditated, as early as 1974, upon the insights colonial America could lend to our imagination of racial relationships. In “Rediscovering Black History,” she pointed to the possible value of “speculat[ing]” a line of history out of its absence in the past:

Just as it is interesting to speculate on what Africa might have become had it been allowed to develop without the rapacity of the West, it is wondrous to speculate on what black Americans might have been had we moved along at the rate and in the direction we seemed to be going in New York in the sixteen-hundreds. During that time, the Dutch had given large tracts of land to blacks of various homelands and descriptions. (53-54)

What does the racial and cultural logic once existing in early America inspire us to think beyond the logic of ethnic division and racial segregation? Is literature’s function not to provide an imaginary grounding for exploring possibilities that have not been carried out? Instead of providing a history of affirmation, literature as Morrison urges works toward a history of speculations and possibilities.

Morrison’s passage on why she wrote *Beloved* (1988) most vividly captures literature’s function to summon into presence a history of absence:

There is no place you or I can go, to think about or not think about, to summon the presences of, or recollect the absences of slaves; nothing that reminds us of the ones who made the journey and of those who did not make it. There is no suitable memorial or plaque or wreath or wall or park or skyscraper lobby. There’s no three-hundred-foot tower. There is no small bench by the road. There is not even a tree scored, an initial that I can visit or you can visit. . . . And because such a place doesn’t exist (that I know of), the book had to. (*The World* 44)

Literature serves as a monument commemorating a place and time that did or did

not exist. In this way it generates a “textual” life for history to pursue a direction it did not take. Following this line of thinking in the way that it does, does *A Mercy* not mark Morrison’s effort to summon into textual presence a cross-racial community, be it existent or non-existent in early America? While Updike, as mentioned in the beginning of this paper, is correct in pointing out that America’s “new” world is destined to “turn old,” by writing her novel Morrison nonetheless transforms the absent or the disappeared into textual existence.

One dramatic episode in *A Mercy* is that Florens covers the walls of Jacob’s grand house with her narrative. Designed with a “spectacular” gate that separates its “impressive” enclosure from the outside (149), Jacob’s third house, as made clear in the discussion above, best symbolizes the emergence of lines and demarcations in the new world. After Jacob’s death, the house is left incomplete and empty, turning from the symbol of white wealth and status into an embodiment of a disintegrated household. Yet the meaning of the house changes again after Florens sneaks into it at night and carves her words, with a nail, into the walls of one room. From being a house with an iron gate, it gradually transforms into a “house-qua-text” that begs a reading by “you.” Indeed, is this house-qua-text not a metaphor of Morrison’s text as a monument? Is *A Mercy* not a “text-qua-house” that has been created as a substitute for the disappearance of Jacob’s household? The makeshift family described in the novel might disappear as time moves on, but the “house-qua-text” remains in Morrison’s novel to be (re)visited.

Perhaps not too surprisingly, Morrison once compared a novel to a house in an interview. Reading a novel, according to her, is like exploring an unknown house.⁶ In *A Mercy*, the “house-qua-text” is conceived by Florens as a space that is capable of generating conversations and connections. Through textual threads and lines it continues forms of intimacy now forbidden in the world: even if “you” cannot read the text, Florens observes, these “careful words, closed up and wide open, will talk to themselves. Round and round, side to side, bottom to top, top to bottom all across the room” (161). Besides, as Florens transforms the house into a text, the “wilderness” also gradually invades and slowly takes over the house: “Spiders reign in comfort here and robins make nests in peace. All manner of small

⁶ Morrison elaborated this novel-as-house comparison in an interview: “If you would just, as a reader, open the door or see an open door, step in, and look around. No, you don’t know who this is right away, no, you don’t know who that is, no, you may not know what that room is for. If you like it, you’ll go further. If you’re afraid of it, you’ll step out. Maybe you’ll go back in later in another time. And then maybe you’ll run around the whole house and get the lay of the land” (Silverblatt 222).

life enters the windows along with cutting wind" (158). The acceptance of "all manner of small life" into one house bespeaks a mercy given by the text itself. Perhaps the act of mercy that Morrison means with her novel's title is not Jacob's acceptance of Florens. Perhaps it is by giving American history an open memory that Morrison delivers a true mercy.

I started this paper by citing Florens's entrance into the "new" world. It turns out that, while Florens "see[s] a path and enter[s]" the presumably pathless woods (106), Morrison's readers are not simply led into a remote past—the historical era already superseded by the development of Western modernity—but also guided into a textual labyrinth of times and encounters that project newness into our imagination of history's future. In her lecture "The Future of Time: Literature and Diminished Expectations" (1996), Morrison suggests a turning toward "literature in general and narrative fiction in particular" in search of "the future of time" (178). The "future of time" as defined by Morrison is not equal to time in the future (as differentiated from the time of the past or that of the present). Nor does it connote a linear progress achieved through a breakage from the past. Rather, it refers to a temporal dimension that brings newness to history. Morrison makes this clear: the "future of time" becomes available when "one looks through history for its signs of renewal" (185). The historical past is not "past" when taken as a reservoir of the "signs of renewal." Morrison's texts ceaselessly evoke the past's proximity to the present and the future, as well as the affective force it exerts upon them.

To conclude, if modern Western history generates meaning by producing order—both temporal and epistemic—*A Mercy* casts the temporal breakage and epistemic delimitations into flux for unregulated intimacy to become conceivable. The textual present, where the temporal points and historical lines are played out and restructured, is where "newness" is able to enter *A Mercy*. In fact, when Homi Bhabha seeks in "the sign of the present" of modernity an empowering condition for newness to enter the world, does he not also foreground the textual nature of the present? Rejecting the idea of the present as a transparent point of temporal measurement, Bhabha casts it as a "sign" made of "disjoined signifiers" (220). An "in-between" space where temporal points conjoin and "foreign" elements converge, the present is described by Bhabha as a "textile superfluity of folds and wrinkles" (227). Perpetually splitting, it heralds newness by enacting postcolonial cultural translation. In encountering Morrison's "textual present" along with Bhabha's "sign of the present," we uncover a clearer idea of the "new" as inseparable from the past and the old, and experience its production as entangled with the negotiations with historical lines and cultural differences. Like Morrison, Bhabha looks for history's

“intermediacy” that “poses the future . . . as an open question” (235). It is the textual present that fosters an intermediary agency to negotiate the structure of history and usher in “newness” in historical epistemes.

Works Cited

- Barthes, Roland. “The Discourse of History.” 1967. *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. Richard Howard. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986. 127-40.
- Bhabha, Homi. “How Newness Enters the World: Postmodern Space, Postcolonial Times and the Trials of Cultural Translation.” *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994. 212-35.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Writing of History*. 1975. Trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.
- Denard, Carolyn C., ed. *Toni Morrison: Conversations*. Jackson: Mississippi UP, 2008.
- Frykholm, Amy. Rev. of *A Mercy*, by Toni Morrison. *Christian Century* 24 Feb. 2009: 46-47.
- Hackney, Sheldon. “‘I Come from People Who Sang All the Time’: A Conversation with Toni Morrison.” 1996. Denard 126-38.
- Hooper, Brad. Rev. of *A Mercy*, by Toni Morrison. *Booklist* 1 Sept. 2008: 5.
- Houston, Pam. “Pam Houston Talks with Toni Morrison.” 2005. Denard 228-59.
- Lowe, Lisa. “The Intimacies of Four Continents.” *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in Native American History*. Ed. Ann Stoler. Durham: Duke UP, 2006. 191-212.
- McCluskey, Audrey T. “A Conversation with Toni Morrison.” 1986. Denard 38-43.
- Morrison, Toni. *A Mercy*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2008.
- . “The Future of Time: Literature and Diminished Expectations.” 1996. *Toni Morrison: What Moves at the Margin*. Ed. and intro. Carolyn C. Denard. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2008. 170-86.
- . Interview by Charlie Rose. *Charlie Rose*. 10 Nov. 2008. 23 June 2011. <<http://www.charlirose.com/view/interview/9464>>.
- . Nobel Lecture. 1993. *Toni Morrison: Critical and Theoretical Approaches*. Ed. Nancy J. Peterson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1997. 267-73.
- . *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*. New York: Vintage, 1992.
- . “Rediscovering Black History.” 1974. *Toni Morrison: What Moves at the Margin*. Ed. and intro. Carolyn C. Denard. Jackson: UP of Mississippi, 2008.

39-55.

Myers, B. R. "Mercy!" *The Atlantic Monthly* Jan.-Feb. 2009: 104.

Phillips, Mark Salber. "Histories, Micro- and Literary: Problems of Genre and Distance." *New Literary History* 34 (2003): 211-29.

Silverblatt, Michael. "Michael Silverblatt Talks with Toni Morrison about *Love*." 2004. Denard 216-23.

Smallwood, Christine. "Back Talk." *The Nation* 8 Dec. 2008: 37.

Stein, Karen F. *Reading, Leaning, Teaching Toni Morrison*. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

Toomer, Jeanette. "Literary Giant Toni Morrison Empowers 'Voices' of Past at 92nd Street Y." *The New York Amsterdam News* 18-24 Dec. 2008: 21.

Updike, John. "Dreamy Wilderness: Unmastered Women in Colonial Virginia." *The New Yorker* 3 Nov. 2008. 23 June 2011. <http://www.newyorker.com/arts/critics/books/2008/11/03/081103crbo_books_updike>.

The World: The Journal of the Unitarian Universalist Association. "A Bench by the Road: *Beloved* by Toni Morrison." 1988. Denard 44-50.

About the Author

Hsiu-chuan Lee is Associate Professor of English at National Taiwan Normal University, where she teaches American literature, women's literature, Asian American literature, psychoanalysis and film theory. She authored *Re-Siting Routes: Japanese American Travels in the Case of Cynthia Kadohata and David Mura* (Taipei: Bookman, 2003), and translated Toni Morrison's *Sula* (1973) into Chinese (Taipei: Commercial, 2008). Her article "The Remains of Empire and the 'Purloined' Philippines: Jessica Hagedorn's *Dream Jungle*" is forthcoming in *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature*.

[Received 27 March 2011; accepted 10 July 2011]

從觀影「快」感到創傷時延

史考特·希克斯《雪落香杉》中的時間倫理[◆]

李秀娟*

摘要

本文從史考特·希克斯（Scott Hicks）執導的電影《雪落香杉》（*Snow Falling on Cedars*, 1999）節奏太慢的問題出發，探索「時間」在電影形式與意義建構上扮演的角色。論文首先釐清，《雪落香杉》的「慢」，不是因為鏡頭剪接速度太慢、攝影機移動速度太慢、或是演員動作與場景調度太慢，而是畫面與敘述分離，造成感知與情節脫鉤，時間因此逸出觀影者的視聽與思維統合而四處漫延的「慢」。論文第二部分細讀《雪落香杉》片段，說明希克斯運用了畫面剪輯與聲音的不連貫，創造一種記憶不支撐現時／現實（the present/reality），時空斷裂，記憶主體粉碎的聲、畫不同步經驗，於形式上挑戰觀影者的鏡像「快」感。第三部分轉至創傷理論，說明《雪落香杉》一片的時間能量，其實來自影片傳衍（transfer）創傷的意圖。《雪落香杉》拍死亡、拍戰爭、拍種族矛盾、拍日裔美國遷徙營（Japanese American relocation camp），其漫延過情節和敘述的時間，正是「創傷時間」的具形呈現。筆者主張《雪落香杉》之「慢」，除了實驗一種電影美學形式，更有延展創傷時間「後遺」（belatedness）與「延遲」（prolongation）效應的意義。「慢」可以是一種倫理，讓《雪落香杉》在創傷「時延」（duration）

《英美文學評論》19（2011）：1-28 | ©中華民國英美文學學會

收到稿件：Jul. 31, 2011 | 接受刊登：Nov. 5, 2011

◆ 本文為國科會研究計畫「移動記憶、驛動身份：日美電影中的時間、歷史、與負面／片顯影」（95-2411-H-003-039-MY2）部分研究成果。作者受益於兩位審稿人寶貴的論文修改建議，也感謝臺師大英語研究所游羽萱、林恩仔兩位同學在資料蒐集與文稿校對上的協助。

* 李秀娟，國立臺灣師範大學英語學系副教授。

2 英美文學評論

之中探索一個人我交會、記憶交融、跨越膚色界線的思維，讓二戰創傷滲入影片中每一個族群，而遷徙營也不再只是專屬於日裔美國人的歷史記憶。

關鍵詞：《雪落香杉》、時間、創傷、種族、日裔美國遷徙營

From Visual Pleasure to Traumatic Duration

The Ethics of Time in Scott Hicks's *Snow Falling on Cedars*

Hsiu-chuan Lee*

ABSTRACT

This essay expounds the aesthetics and meanings of Scott Hicks's feature *Snow Falling on Cedars* (1999) by attending to criticisms on this film's slow pacing. First, I argue that it is not lengthy shots, motionless camera, lagging movement, or visual/aural minimalism that slows down *Snow Falling on Cedars*. The film feels slow because of the disintegration of its images and narrative, and the disconnection between its senses and plots. As the film's signifying structure falls apart, time drifts away and overflows. The second section analyzes sequences selected from *Snow Falling on Cedars* to reveal the incoherence and discontinuity of images and sounds, of reality and recollections. I argue that Hicks splits narrative and characters, thereby undermining spectators' screen identification and visual pleasure. The third section turns to trauma theory and contends that *Snow Falling on Cedars* is loaded with traumatic time. Filming death, wars, racial conflicts, and the forced relocation of Japanese Americans during the Second World War, *Snow Falling on Cedars* seeks in traumatic duration opportunities to explore and generate social logics and meanings. I conclude that *Snow Falling on Cedars* does not simply experiment with an aesthetic style of slowness; being slow is an ethical move to obtain the time needed for probing into self-other encounter, past-present convergence, and cross-racial communication. *Snow Falling on Cedars* ultimately introduces a vision in which the trauma of Second World War brings together people of different colors and the memory of mass relocation no longer belongs exclusively to or affects only Japanese Americans.

* Associate Professor, Department of English, National Taiwan Normal University

4 英美文學評論

Keywords: *Snow Falling on Cedars*, time, trauma, race, Japanese American relocation camp

史考特·希克斯 (Scott Hicks) 的電影《雪落香杉》(*Snow Falling on Cedars*)，改編自大衛·古特森 (David Guterson) 1994 年出版的同名小說，1999 年耶誕檔期在美國上映。古特森的小說以美國華盛頓州西北角普結灣 (Puget Sound) 外海班橋島 (Bainbridge Island) 的風土、歷史、與人物為藍圖，創造了虛構的聖皮多島 (San Piedro)。故事發生在 1954 年，德裔刺網漁夫 (gill-netter) 卡爾·海納 (Carl Heine) 在海中溺斃，檢察官展開調查，迫出海納家族和島上日裔宮本 (Miyamoto) 家族有土地買賣糾紛，認為同為刺網漁夫的宮本家二世 (nisei) 長子宮本株雄 (Kabuo Miyamoto；電影版將株雄的名字改為「Kazuo」，即「一雄」) 涉嫌重大，因而予以起訴。¹ 故事以這場官司的法庭審判為主軸，透過雙方傳喚證人的過程，作者古特森回顧相關人物的過去，並藉此刻畫了聖皮多島上族裔遷徙的歷史與二戰期間的創傷。其中最重要的橋段，是日裔美國族群在珍珠港事變之後遭強制驅離至內陸「遷徙營」(relocation camp)，當時還在念高中的日美女子今田初惠 (Hatsue Imada) 因此被迫與初戀白人同學伊斯梅爾·錢柏斯 (Ishmael Chambers) 分開。迫於家庭壓力，初惠在戰爭期間與伊斯梅爾分手，嫁給了株雄。沒想到在戰爭結束九年之後，卡爾·海納的謀殺官司使株雄成為被告，初惠是被告之妻，而伊斯梅爾則因繼承了父親一手創辦的島上報紙《聖皮多評論》(*San Piedro Review*)，成了採訪、報導這樁官司的記者，最後並掌握了足以洗刷株雄冤屈的證據。敏感的跨種族三角戀情，小島上不同族裔之間微妙的共生與仇恨傳承，加之古特森對美國西北小島風光及農村生活采俗、漁夫海上生活的細膩描繪，對戰爭、意外、人性等議題的深入剖析，使《雪落香杉》甫一推出即成為暢銷書，並獲得 1995 年國際筆會／福克納小說獎 (PEN/Faulkner Award for Fiction)。

不過，就像眾多小說改編為電影的先例一樣，原著小說的盛名與獲獎紀錄，並不能確保電影改編版叫好不叫座。電影《雪落香杉》的拍攝固然受到重視，拍攝完成之際還大做廣告，促成原著小說 1999 年重登《出版商週刊》(*Publishers Weekly*) 暢銷排行榜的盛況 (Maryles 117)。但是，電影上映之後，影評貶多於褒，大多視《雪落香杉》為小說改編成電影的失敗範例。當然，要將古特森接近三百五十頁，人物

¹ 本文日文姓名對應的漢字，參考了《雪落香杉》小說版的中譯本，譯者為趙伏柱。

眾多、情節糾葛的史詩式鉅作翻拍成電影談何容易。令人玩味的是，影評們批評《雪落香杉》，理由多不是希克斯將片子拍得太複雜，想呈現的人物、影像、情節太多，反而是電影故事性不足，映演的時間太長、節奏太慢。《滾石雜誌》(*Rolling Stone*) 挖苦《雪落香杉》令人「昏昏欲睡」(“coma-inducing”)，是「失眠者必賞之作」(Travers)。《紐約阿姆斯特丹新聞》(*The New York Amsterdam News*) 認為《雪落香杉》「大費周章，卻只說了個簡單的故事」，還好種族正義最後得以伸張 (Pryce 20)。《美國閱聽人》(*The American Spectator*) 以〈失竊的時間〉(“Stolen Time”) 為影評標題，指出像《雪落香杉》這樣的片子浪費／偷竊觀影者的時間；該影評不客氣的指出，這樣的電影「拍五分鐘就夠了」(Bowman 62)。《新聞周刊》(*Newsweek*) 與《紐約時報》(*The New York Times*) 的評論或許算是深入了一些。《新聞周刊》指出古特森的小說其實並不難拍，只是導演希克斯不斷地「讓故事說不下去」；希克斯「將故事切成碎裂片段，或前或後在時間軸上藝術式地跳躍」，造成《雪落香杉》只有「畫面」(shots)，沒有「故事」(scenes)，「編畫冊不錯，說是戲劇就無藥可救了」(Ansen)。《紐約時報》也認為《雪落香杉》過度碎裂的單格美景讓影片淪為「與真實世界脫節的冰冷藝術品」，而太多「延宕的特寫鏡頭」與「超現實的剪接」，又讓敘述時間停滯不前 (Holden)。同樣注意到影片時間運用的問題，加拿大的《麥克林雜誌》(*Maclean's*) 更明確地指出《雪落香杉》敗在「節奏」(pacing)：層層疊疊的倒敘鏡頭，讓故事「如墜五里霧中」，就連「落在那該死的香杉上的雪都落得太慢了」(Johnson)。

小說改編為電影的問題千頭萬緒，當然不是一篇論文能夠說得明白。本文的撰寫，也不是為了比較古特森的小說與希克斯的電影孰優孰劣。令筆者感興趣的，是《雪落香杉》節奏太慢，「只有畫面，沒有故事」的說法，帶出了「時間」在電影形式與意義建構上該扮演何種角色的問題。《雪落香杉》之所以備受批評，用一句話來總結，或可說是影片太「慢」，以致於無法引起觀影「快」感。² 不過，這樣簡略地

² 本文用「『快』感」一詞來凸顯傳統電影理論中之「快感」(pleasure)和電影時間運用密切的關係。下一節討論蘿拉·萊薇 (Laura Mulvey)「視覺快感」(visual pleasure)的概念時，會更進一步說明這一點。

對照影片的「慢」和觀影者要求的「快」感，除了無法清楚說明《雪落香杉》之「慢」以及觀影者需索之「快」的涵意，更忽視了觀影經驗中的「快」與「慢」，往往不取決於絕對的物質或機械速度，而牽涉了影像呈現與觀影者精神感知的相對速度。造成《雪落香杉》「慢」的原因是什麼？觀影者希望這部電影「快速」呈現的又是什麼？「慢」代表溝通失敗，還是別有用心與意義？電影中那些看似多餘、過剩的時間，是真的百無聊賴、毫無意義，還是具有形式與內容上的特殊價值？一般電影要「好看」，多仰賴緊湊的情節以及連貫的敘事，讓觀影者在觀影過程中全神進入情節，忘記電影放映時的時間流逝，直到離開電影院時才恍然驚覺已經過了幾個小時。只是，「好看」的電影一定要「快速」嗎？若說許多電影都是以情節緊湊連貫的「快速」作為「快感」(pleasure)的來源，我們是不是可以想像有一種電影逆向操作，不濃縮、遮掩時間，反而應用影片的形式與內容來召喚、衍生電影時間，在「慢速」的時間感性中發掘另一種觀影快感，建立另一種觀影倫理？

一、哪一種「慢」？

張小虹在 2007 年發表了一篇討論亞洲新興電影「低限主義」(minimalism)的論文——〈台北慢動作：身體—城市的時間顯微〉，精彩地剖析了電影多種「慢」的可能。她從大衛·鮑德威 (David Bordwell) 對好萊塢商業電影與亞洲新興導演「平均鏡頭長度」(average shot length)的比較，談起亞洲電影的影像風格：相較於好萊塢電影日趨快速的鏡頭剪接，亞洲名導包括日本的小津安二郎 (Yasujirō Ozu) 和台灣的侯孝賢均以「長拍鏡頭」著稱。到了九〇年代以後，台灣新銳導演如蔡明亮、張作驥、吳念真、陳國富等，也都以「長拍鏡頭」為風格標誌，征戰世界各地影展。不過，張小虹認為電影節奏是快或慢，並不完全取決於鏡頭剪接速度，而要同時考量「攝影機的運動與被攝人物角色的身體運動」等要素 (127)。她以蔡明亮的電影為例，說明蔡明亮之「慢」，不只因為其鏡頭遠超過數據平均值的「長」，更因其電影中「低限」的情節對白與場面調度、「慢兩拍」且不演戲的「真實身體」、以及「去隱喻化」且單調反覆的日常生活空間 (136-37, 144)。據此，張小虹將「慢」的概念

由物理學上可以量化的速度，延伸到對電影整體形式內容與美學風格之「質」的考量。此外，她亦引用德勒茲（Gilles Deleuze）「時間—影像」（time-image）的電影理論，申論蔡明亮趨近符號與意義零度的定鏡長拍，要呈現的或許是一種不依附於空間動作、不侷限於劇情鋪陳的「真實時間」。蔡明亮的「低限主義」促成了「時間顯微」（temporal magnification），也因此呈現了電影的「時間—影像」。

蔡明亮的「慢」，提供了本文一個重要的起點與對照，有助於我們思考《雪落香杉》速度緩慢的問題。有趣的是，《雪落香杉》雖被責為節奏緩慢，其剪接速度、影像風格、甚或題材內容，均和蔡明亮的電影大相逕庭。衡諸蔡明亮趨近零度、低限的剪接、動作、對白以構成「慢」的標準，《雪落香杉》不僅不慢，其實是快，就許多元素而言甚至是極快的。首先，就鏡頭剪接的速度而言，《雪落香杉》中鏡頭的長度錯落不一，以影片一開始五分半鐘為例，前二十一個鏡頭用掉了約五分鐘，從第二十二到第二十八個鏡頭卻只用了約三十秒。這樣的速度，不只遠遠快過蔡明亮《你那邊幾點》的鏡頭均速六十四秒，與鮑德威統計的一九九〇年代好萊塢劇情片的鏡頭均速二至八秒相比，也不算慢。³ 而若撇開鏡頭速度「量」的計算，改就場景調度與影像風格的「質」來評斷，《雪落香杉》構圖豐富，畫面、音效、與人物動作對白之多層次，也和「低限主義」形成強烈對比。以影片中發現卡爾屍體這一連串大約歷時一分二十秒的鏡頭為例：刺耳的海鳥叫聲先劃破漆黑的畫面，接下來雷雨聲伴隨著一個幾乎靜止的海景遠拍，一動也不動的漁船剪影，落在遠山與雲靄環抱的畫面中央。不過，這個鏡頭停駐了僅約一秒，就被晃動著波紋的水影特寫取代，同時從畫面之外傳來人的喘息聲。接著，畫面依次呈現漁網拖繩特寫，警長阿爾特·莫倫（Art Moran）和其助手用力收網的背影特寫，跳接到漁網特寫，在尖銳嘈雜的海鳥叫聲中還可以依稀聽見兩人的對話。下一個鏡頭特寫閃著水光與人影的甲板，幾隻魚掉落甲板，拍打著軀體作垂死掙扎，發出清脆的打水聲。然後畫面跳接到助手，拍他在凝望海面之後忍不住作嘔，阿爾特取而代之趨前觀望，反拍鏡頭則慢慢拉近纏繞著魚網、在水中載浮載沉的卡爾屍體。畫面再度切回船上的阿爾特，這次

³ 鮑德威的統計數字與《你那邊幾點》的鏡頭均速統計數字，均引自張小虹；詳見頁 127 註 4 與頁 128。

我們終於獲得一個比較接近「空間確立鏡頭」(establishing shot)的全景畫面：阿爾特站在「蘇珊·瑪莉」(Susan Marie)號漁船上凝望海面，助手則倚著船舷正在嘔吐。緊接的反拍特寫卡爾在海水中的身影，看它慢慢沒入水光粼粼，漂浮向畫面左上。而當卡爾的身影就要漂出暫停不動的畫格時，鏡頭切到一隻在陰霾天空中盤旋的海鳥。

《雪落香杉》影像風格之繁複、豐富，從以上的例子可略窺一二。當然，《雪落香杉》並不是沒有長拍鏡頭，但即使是在一個沒有剪輯的長拍鏡頭中，希克斯也很少讓他的畫面靜下來或慢下來，而是讓觀眾的視覺與聽覺繼續忙碌。以電影進行到約八分二十五秒時開始，持續了超過一分鐘的法庭長拍為例：攝影機從法庭中嘶嘶作響、噴吐著熱氣的暖氣裝置開始移動，一雄的手銬在鏡頭經過時被解開了，搭配著畫面之外嘈雜的背景與偶爾清晰的幾句對話。此時，鏡頭維持水平不動，當一雄在被告席坐下時，他的臉和上半身取代了他的雙手，剛好落入鏡頭正中央。攝影機接著開始向左橫搖至剛走進法庭的檢察官亞文·霍克斯(Alvin Hooks)，鏡頭一度帶向亞文的公事包，卻沒有停下來，掠過公事包時我們看見亞文落在鏡頭裡那部分的手拿出一疊文件，並接過旁邊遞來的魚叉證物。攝影機繼續找尋視覺焦點，向右橫搖回來，拍到了法院指派為一雄辯護的律師尼爾斯·古蒙森(Nels Gudmundsson)走進法庭，並與一雄握手。但攝影機好像仍不滿足，先向下搖，看似不經意地捕捉到了尼爾斯和亞文握手的畫面，旋即向法庭後座逡巡，掃過人聲鼎沸。接著，攝影鏡頭忽然改變了方向往上搖，帶到了法院二樓旁聽席，一個旁聽者在鏡頭掠過時放下報紙開口說話了，可是攝影機並沒有停下來，繼續右移，說話的人於是很快的被移出畫面，倒是他和鄰座討論案情的聲音仍然清晰可辨。而就在這個時候，攝影機找到了走進二樓旁聽席的伊斯梅爾，跟隨著他，看著他入座，畫面這才剪接到另一個鏡頭，是伊斯梅爾膝蓋上筆記紙的特寫。有趣的是，這時鏡頭雖然轉換了，畫外音對案情的討論卻沒有停下來，一直持續到下一個初惠走入法庭一樓的鏡頭。

這一個例子，讓我們看到希克斯的鏡頭不僅不肯停下來、靜下來，還彷彿自有生命意志，在空間中游移，也因此不斷地創造畫外景、畫外音，以及音、身分離

(disembodied voice) 的效果，讓《雪落香杉》的聲、畫結構益形複雜。⁴ 很明顯的，《雪落香杉》若可以稱之為「慢」，則希克斯操作電影慢速感性的方式和蔡明亮的方法非常不同，而這也促使我們理解，要召喚電影的「時間—影像」，「低限」可能不是唯一的方法。張小虹在討論蔡明亮的電影時，認為定鏡長拍讓時間「不再是間接附身於鏡頭與鏡頭『之間』的『蒙太奇』(montage)」，而「成為直接浮現在鏡頭『之內』的『萌態奇』(montrage)」，讓影片中呈現的時間不等同於故事中被結構過的「現實」(reality) 時間，從而體現了柏格森 (Henri Bergson) 理論中的「時延」(duration) (134)。在此，張小虹將「時延」理解為「時間連續流逝的動態運動」(134)，強調「時延」連續不可切割的概念。她在蔡明亮的定鏡長拍中找到一種「靜物」似的「不言不語（不以過多的情節、對白或場面調度去干擾時間的連續流動）、不剪不動（不以過多的蒙太奇運動或攝影機運動去破壞、去打斷、去抽離、去中介時間的連續流動）」，作為「時延」的表徵 (135)。不過，筆者想補充，無論再怎樣「長」、再如何「靜」的「定鏡長拍」，也有其人為建構的時空侷限。「定鏡長拍」可以模擬「時延」，但無從等同於「顫動整體在時空中流動」(“time-space flux of a vibrational whole”) 的「時延」本意 (Bogue 3)。「單一鏡頭『之內』時間的連續流動」(張 135)，讓時間自己去演戲，固然是召喚電影時間的一種方法，但絕非單一方法。事實上，在德勒茲的電影理論中，「畫格」(frame)、「鏡頭」(shot)、與「蒙太奇」(montage) 三位一體，都是呈現時間的要角。雷諾·柏格 (Ronald Bogue) 這樣描述「畫格」、「鏡頭」、與「蒙太奇」三者之間的關係：

攝影機的畫格為影像元素定下封閉單元 (closed set) 的界線。鏡頭是一組獨立的影像單元，在時間中持續，因此是一個運動的單位，鏡頭之內的物體變換位置，因之表現了整體的變換。而蒙太奇，作為剪和接的過程，確實地讓不同的鏡頭產生關係，透過蒙太奇，時延的開放整體 (open whole)

⁴ 關於《雪落香杉》裡音、身分離，使得聲、畫不協調的特色，丹尼爾·列夫科維茲 (Daniel Lefkowitz) 有專文討論。列夫科維茲指出，在《雪落香杉》裡，經常是「聲音出現時，鏡頭沒有對著說話的人物；而當鏡頭指向人物時，人物卻又不說話了」(21)。

得以貫穿與注入整部電影。(42；原作斜體)

柏格進一步申論，「畫格」建立時間靜止的封閉單元，但在「定下界線」的動作中，不乏畫面自我解構，以及「畫格」內外互動辯證的動態可能。「鏡頭」帶入時間，用其內部物體的連續變換彰顯時間流動性，但其動能受限於鏡頭轉換時難以迴避的時空隔閡。而「蒙太奇」的功用正在於斡旋鏡頭與鏡頭之間的不連貫。「蒙太奇」雖然常常扮演強化敘事，致使時間「空間化」的元凶，但其在「剪」和「接」的動態過程中，卻不時召喚「時延」的開放整體。

換句話說，思考電影「時間—影像」的議題時，其實沒有必要對立鏡頭的靜止和移動，長拍與剪接，或鏡頭「之內」的「真實時間」與鏡頭「之間」的抽象時間。定鏡長拍可以創造流動的「萌態奇」，串接鏡頭的「蒙太奇」未嘗不能衍生另一種「萌態奇」。當然，這邊所說的「蒙太奇」，指的並不是艾森斯坦（Sergei Eisenstein）最早提出的一種特定的剪接方法，即連繫兩個內容不連續的鏡頭，以開發出第三意義的剪接手法。德勒茲筆下的「蒙太奇」，泛指不同的剪接法。在《電影 2：時間—影像》（*Cinema 2: The Time-Image*）裡，德勒茲承認，蒙太奇結合個別鏡頭中的「運動—影像」（movement-image）以趨近時間整體，讓時間由時延的「連續」（continuity）變成空間化的「序列」（succession），充其量做到時間的「間接呈現」（35）。但是他緊接著指出，古典電影裡蒙太奇遵循的「感知—運動法則」（sensory-motor schema），在現代電影中受到挑戰：現代影片的剪接不再確實地「縫合」（suture）影像，造成影像在運動中「脫軌」（aberration）；「剪接」創造出來的因此不再是認知與行動緊密扣合的「感知—運動情境」（sensory-motor situation），而是溢出情節敘事的「純粹視聽情境」（pure optical and sound situation），而時間也因為和「運動—影像」脫鉤，獨立成直接浮現的「時間—影像」（41）。要召喚電影時間感性，是不是長拍、是不是靜止不動、是不是「低限」，可能都不是最重要的。要趨近純粹的電影「時間—影像」，最根本的是要讓「認知—影像」（perception-image）和「動作—影像」（action-image）陷入危機，促成「感知—運動」連結的鬆弛。德勒茲指出，俄國導演塔可夫斯基（Andrei Tarkovsky）所說的「時間在鏡頭內流動」固然沒錯，但是「時間的作用力會超出鏡

頭的侷限，而蒙太奇本身也會在時間之中運作和生存」(42)。

德勒茲的說法，幫助我們思考另一種電影時間與電影運鏡、剪接技術的關係：不再是運鏡與剪接結構時間，而是時間牽引著鏡頭與剪接；不再是時間附屬在情節之下間接出現，而是時間「漫」過敘事，難以收束，無從結構。這一篇論文從這種時間「漫」過敘事的觀點出發，試著了解《雪落香杉》「慢」的方式及意義。筆者認為，《雪落香杉》的「慢」，並不是畫面層次、動作對白、鏡頭轉換或剪接速度太慢，而是一種畫面與敘述分離，感知與情節脫鉤，時間逸出觀影者視聽與思維統合，因而顯得多餘、過剩、四處漫延的「慢」。下一部份會進一步闡釋這一個論點。

二、「快」感鏡像

茱薇在〈視覺快感和敘述電影〉(“Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema”) 這一篇經典論文裡，將觀影快感歸因於電影對人類窺視欲望的滿足。觀影時觀眾隱身於黑暗的觀眾席，窺視電影銀幕上明亮、清晰的畫面。畫面上的俊男美女，是現實世界完形、完美的投射，吸引觀眾鏡像 (mirror-image) 式的認同。茱薇認為：「主流電影的傳統將注意力集中在人物的形狀 (the human form)。格局、空間、和故事都模擬人生現實 (anthropomorphic)。在此，想要看見的好奇心與渴望混雜著對影像的喜愛和熟稔：人的臉、人的身體，人的形狀和其四周情境的關係，鮮活的人物躍然世界，映入眼簾」(836)。表面上，茱薇在討論觀影快感時似乎並沒有提到時間快慢的問題；但是，當她引用拉岡 (Jacques Lacan) 的鏡像理論，有意無意之間其實已經將人類精神機制中的時間劇碼帶入視覺快感的論述當中。在鏡像理論裡，時間扮演了重要角色：拉岡筆下六到十八個月大的嬰幼兒，踉蹌著才正在學步的雙腳，撐著、扶著身邊任何可以幫他／她直立起身體的人或器物，為的就是要在瞥見自己鏡中影像時，感受愉悅。不過，鏡中影像為何能帶來愉悅？拉岡的解釋是：鏡中看似完整、圓滿的自我「全像／成像」(imago)，讓鏡前依然掙扎於「運動能力欠缺」(motor incapacity) 與「哺育依賴性」(nursling dependence) 的嬰幼兒，得以在看見鏡子的瞬間，彷彿見到了已然成熟獨立的自我(2)。說得更清楚一點，鏡像帶來愉悅，是

因為創造了瞬間「跨越時間」的幻象。鏡子像科幻世界中的時光機或任意門，讓人省略、刪去從此到彼，從嬰幼兒變為「成」人必須經過的漫長時光。嬰幼兒因無法統合身體運動機能，隨時處於自我四分五裂的焦慮當中，透過鏡子，卻能快速的化身為成熟的完整軀體。「鏡像」取代了時間，濃縮真實時間為「鏡前我」與「鏡中我」兩個可以在空間中迅速轉換的自我形象。

最早將電影銀幕比擬為鏡子的，除了茱薇，還有尚—路易·鮑德瑞（Jean-Louis Baudry）與克里斯提安·梅茲（Christian Metz）。前者在〈基礎電影機器的意識型態作用〉（“Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus”），後者在《精神分析與電影：想像的能指》（*Psychoanalysis and the Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*）裡，都主張觀影經驗不只延續了鏡像機制，還強化了這個機制。首先，電影放映時觀影者暫時不動，讓視覺主導感知，觀影者彷彿回到鏡像之前（Baudry 353）。此外，電影院讓觀眾隱身，看不見自己，成為「全知感的主體」（all-perceiving subject）（Metz 45）：鏡像理論中「鏡前我」和「鏡中我」或仍繫於兩個時空相互辯證的關係，觀影者卻可以更徹底的拋棄「觀影我」，化身為攝影機的「視線」（look），進入影片結構完整的時間。最重要的是，既然「電影模擬的『現實』正是『鏡中我』的延伸」（Baudry 353），「鏡中我」完滿無缺，「電影現實」也必須天衣無縫：情節的進行必須緊湊有力，環環相扣；連戲縫合等技巧若是不夠純熟，浪費了時間，就不免遭譏為歹戲拖棚，「快」感盡失。

可以理解，《雪落香杉》會被評為節奏太慢，跟希克斯在影片中不斷挑戰鏡像的「快」感原則息息相關。以下先以電影開場的一系列鏡頭為例。導演希克斯曾經表示，《雪落香杉》第一個畫面想要做的，就是給觀眾不知道自己看見了什麼，更不知道自己身在何處的感覺：均勻的深藍色，微微透光，觀眾不知道自己是「置身海底或佇立雲端」（“Talking with Scott Hicks” 143）。鏡頭緩緩拉近之後，慢慢映入眼簾的是一個左右搖晃的模糊身影，依稀可以辨認出一個人正顛巍巍的攀爬在一艘漁船的桅杆頂端。接著鏡頭繼續往前推進，貼近人影頭部與上半身時，鏡頭冷不防地打破了畫面的一百八十度原則，旋轉至人影的斜前方，讓我們看見站在桅杆頂端，正在裝置燈火的人是卡爾。但清楚的臉龐停留僅瞬間，很快又陷入刺眼燈光與大霧迷茫

之中，畫面接著在攝影機關機的喀擦聲中頓然消失，留下一片黑暗。接下來的鏡頭以火柴點燃油燈的特寫開始，然後畫面上又是一個模糊得幾乎要融入深藍色背景的身影，提著油燈，吹響號角。鏡頭在拉近人影時，黑色的人物剪影變得清晰，但緊接的鏡頭又詭譎地讓剪影逐漸變小，滑落到畫面右下緣，最後消失在畫面之外，而那令人摸不清、看不透的深藍色畫面，在人物消失了之後，還兀自停留了超過二十秒鐘。《雪落香杉》似乎從一開始就有意挑戰觀影者「看見」的欲望與時空定位感，人影模糊，畫面既像寫實，又如幻影，而鏡頭不斷挪動，人影出現了，卻又莫名地滑出畫格，更喚起觀影者看不見全景的焦慮。開場的這一系列鏡頭，以兩個人物的特寫作結：一個是卡爾提著油燈向外探望，另一個則是一雄的特寫。根據接下來的情節發展，我們可以試著理解這兩個特寫互為正反拍鏡頭，是卡爾藉著油燈亮光看見了在另一艘漁船上的一雄；但由於兩人在這一系列鏡頭中並不曾出現在同一個畫面，這兩個特寫的時空關係因此是隱晦的。嚴格來說，卡爾攀爬在漁船桅杆上，卡爾（根據之後的故事，我們會知道點燈吹號角的人也是卡爾）吹響號角，到卡爾提燈凝望，三個畫面的時空連繫也是模糊的。觀影者必須等到電影進行一個半小時之後，也就是在一雄坐上法庭證人席的那一段，才有機會回顧電影開場的深藍色霧色蒼茫，看見一雄和卡爾在大霧的海上相遇，聽見他們的對話，也才有可能為這幾個畫面，建立明確的時空關係。而像這樣超過一個半小時的時間差，可能也就是《雪落香杉》無法營造觀影「快」感的原因之一。

誠然，若將《雪落香杉》讀成一部命案推理電影，電影先呈現卡爾身亡，再透過法庭調查抽絲剝繭，慢慢回溯命案發生的細節，未嘗不能發展出一個手法細膩的劇情「全貌」(totality)；而上一段論及的畫面時間差，也可以被解釋為電影中常見的倒敘手法。然而，倒敘不一定會造成時間漫流，回憶的內容也可能緊扣現實，成為穩固敘事的要角。值得注意的是，《雪落香杉》在處理回憶時，回憶影像不時脫離現時／現實情節發展，回憶因此不像是填補現實空隙的素材，反而自成格局，自擁動能，衍生出影片中多層的時間與敘述走向。以法庭傳訊證人的系列場景為例，當第一位證人警長阿爾特剛開始接受兩造律師交叉詰問時，回憶尚能跟隨詰問的腳步：檢察官亞文問及九月命案發生當天清晨的情形，阿爾特於是提到了那個異常寂

靜的清晨，這時畫面準確地切換到當天清晨「蘇珊·瑪麗」號漁船漂流海灣的鏡頭。而當阿爾特陳述搜索海上命案現場的過程，接著並拜訪卡爾遺孀蘇珊·瑪麗以傳遞卡爾死訊時，回憶畫面佔用的時間變長了，但和阿爾特的法庭證詞在內容上尚稱同步。不過，當阿爾特準備離開蘇珊·瑪麗的家，這時畫面理當切回法庭，回憶的鏡頭卻脫軌似地，兀自切到法醫賀拉斯·韋利（Horace Whaley）開始動手解剖卡爾遺體的畫面。要特別留意的是，當賀拉斯開始解剖工作時，阿爾特應該不在解剖現場，所以這一個畫面並不能被解讀成阿爾特的記憶。而當畫面還停留在賀拉斯的解剖刀與卡爾臉部特寫時，一雄的辯護律師尼爾斯詰問阿爾特的聲音以畫外音的形式先傳過來，像是要將逐漸脫序的回憶影像喚回現實。下一秒鐘，畫面終於切回法庭上的阿爾特，鏡頭特寫他彷彿被抽離現實，茫然不知身在何時、何處的表情。

法庭現實和回憶畫面不同步，甚至逐漸分裂為互為競爭的多條思路，在影片接下來的發展中愈趨明顯。尼爾斯詰問阿爾特時，過去的畫面穿插出現，但經常不是尾隨著阿爾特的回覆，而是與尼爾斯提問的聲音同時出現，如此的同時性挑戰法庭上先問再答的次序。此外，幾個有關漁船上電池的零碎鏡頭，因為是特寫，又用了暗調打光（low-key lighting），對比強烈的光和影，表現式（expressionistic）風格和先前寫實的回憶鏡頭非常不一樣。阿爾特之後，檢方傳喚的第二個證人是法醫賀拉斯。有趣的是，阿爾特才回答完有關漁船上電池的問題，還坐在證人席上，畫面卻等不及法官傳喚賀拉斯，已經先切到賀拉斯的解剖房，接連幾個鏡頭分別特寫了卡爾遺體的手、耳、臉，還有賀拉斯專注工作的臉龐，維持濃厚的表現式風格。鏡頭在解剖室內待了二十餘秒之後，畫面外才傳來賀拉斯在法庭作證的聲音，由模糊到清晰。透過畫外音，觀影者聽見賀拉斯在法庭上提到卡爾左耳之後的致命傷口乃遭鈍物撞擊，這時畫面跳接到法庭上的陪審團，可是只停了一剎那，隨著檢察官亞文提問：「鈍物可能是魚叉嗎」，鏡頭便將焦點移到前景，用表現式的光影特寫亞文手中握著的證物魚叉，同時後景的陪審團因落到鏡頭焦點之外，變成一團模糊。法庭上的賀拉斯接著回答：「這非常有可能」，但是鏡頭還是沒有移到證人席上的賀拉斯，反而跳回法醫解剖室裡，賀拉斯正專注地檢查卡爾遺體。接下來，解剖室裡的賀拉斯向警長阿爾特指出卡爾左耳之後的傷口，而法庭中的詰問則以畫外音的形式同時

進行，但聲音逐漸被解剖室中賀拉斯與阿爾特的對話覆蓋。這樣的安排，一直延續到賀拉斯提到，像這樣的傷口，他在二戰中屢見不鮮，畫面才又回到法庭寫實的場景，而亞文這時才正開始詢問賀拉斯從前是否看過類似的傷口。綜觀賀拉斯作證的這一系列鏡頭，回憶不僅不再忠實地為法庭當下作註，還不時跑在法庭「現時」之前：不是法庭中的賀拉斯在作證時回憶先前的解剖情形，而是來自過去解剖室零碎的細節先出現，或是將法庭中的劇情推到畫外音的外緣位置，或是引導法庭詰問的方向。事實上，隨著影片的發展，「現時」和「寫實」不只逐漸失去對影片敘述的主導權，法庭上的魚叉特寫、陪審團落在視覺焦點以外的例子，都讓我們看見現時／現實逐漸感染了來自於過去畫面的表現式風格。用德勒茲的語彙來說，在《雪落香杉》裡，帶給觀影者明確時空印象的「認知—影像」與「動作—影像」逐漸退居次要，取而代之的是論示時間流動的「回憶—影像」(recollection-image)。

當然，德勒茲指出，不是所有的「回憶—影像」均能創造「純粹視聽情境」，要「記憶混亂，無從辨認」(55)，方能有效瓦解「感知—運動」連結。⁵ 德勒茲將趨近「純粹視聽影像」(pure opsigns and sonsigns)的「回憶—影像」與「夢境—影像」(dream-image)連結，描述一種「回憶」如「夢鏡」一般，層層疊疊，由一個迴圈(circuit)進入另一個迴圈，讓現實和「漂浮的孩童記憶、幻想、或似曾相識的印象」斷了線(56)，因此也無從區別夢裡的意象是屬於自己、屬於潛意識，還是屬於他人。在小說版《雪落香杉》裡，回憶基本上是條理井然的。古特森在每個人物登場時，仔細地爬梳其生活背景與性格心理。小說人物雖多，涵蓋的歷史時間雖廣，但是每一個事件的時間標誌都很清楚，每一個角色也都有屬於自己的回憶，不同人物的思維涇渭分明。在電影版中，記憶的歸屬與回憶指向的時間，顯然就不是這麼條理分明了。前面提到，明明是阿爾特在作證，畫面卻突然切到賀拉斯解剖卡爾大體的情景。在卡爾的母親伊塔(Etta)作證時，畫面也曾不期然地插入一個卡爾遺體與賀拉斯解剖刀的特寫。賀拉斯在作證時，畫面則曾經跳接到一幕卡爾生前的影像，那應

⁵ 《雪落香杉》創造「純粹視聽情境」，讓鏡頭與情節脫鉤，採用的策略除了打亂觀影者的視覺感知，聲音的運用也居功厥偉。關於聲音運用如何創造《雪落香杉》中「詭異」(uncanny)的效果，可參考列夫科維茲，本文不再贅述。

該是卡爾遺孀蘇珊·瑪麗的記憶。而當賀拉斯在證人席上介紹日本劍道（kendo fighting）時，畫面先是閃過一雄童年時與父親練習劍道的情景，然後依序出現兩個焦點模糊的鏡頭，一個是一雄的臉在一片沾滿水影的玻璃之後若隱若現，另一個畫面則是模糊的樹影與人影晃動著，同時幼童一雄和父親練劍的聲音以畫外音的形式，在兩個畫面出現時持續不斷。在這裡，不只是兩個模糊的鏡頭像夢境中的畫格一樣斷裂浮動（觀影者要等到影片之後出現類似、但沒有模糊處理的畫面，才有辦法將這兩個鏡頭擺入一雄加入美軍、參戰歐陸的回憶），這一系列鏡頭還讓影片裡的時間，由法庭的現時／現實與證人回憶兩個層次，進一步分裂為至少四個層次：法庭的現時、賀拉斯記憶中的劍道、一雄練習劍道的童年回憶、還有一雄加入歐戰的記憶。而除了層疊的記憶迴圈，這裡的「回憶—影像」還混雜了賀拉斯和一雄記憶中的劍道。賀拉斯腦海裡的劍道，是日本軍國主義冷酷的殺人技倆；一雄記憶中的劍道，卻包含了他對父親的記憶與參加歐陸戰爭時遭受的生死創傷。記憶迴圈不只帶來時間重疊，也促成不同思維的碰撞、協商。

在《雪落香杉》裡，將回憶時間繁複的層次推到極致的，當屬以初惠寫給伊斯梅爾的分手信為軸心，發展出來的兩段系列鏡頭。當第一天的法庭審理告一段落，伊斯梅爾與母親在晚餐時討論案情，鏡頭驀地跳接到二戰期間，初惠在加州曼澤納遷徙營（Manzanar Relocation Center）照顧一個小女孩入睡的畫面，而畫面外傳來的聲音，卻是戰前伊斯梅爾在聖皮多島杉木林中，向初惠吐露愛意。畫面旋即切到杉木林中年輕的伊斯梅爾和初惠纏綿的身影，然後再接回遷徙營中的初惠。此時初惠朗誦分手信的聲音以畫外音的形式出現，在讀到「我想再也沒有任何事比提筆寫這封信給你更讓我心痛」時，畫面跳接到現時，隨著伊斯梅爾打開房門時鑰匙喀嚓一聲，初惠的聲音化為伊斯梅爾腦海中兩個輪替的聲音，一個聲音已經讀到了「我必須告訴你事實」，另一個聲音還在重複「沒有哪一件事更令我心痛」。伊斯梅爾打開燈，房間頓時明亮，初惠的聲音也停了下來。在這一系列鏡頭裡，回憶的主體變得模糊。憶起分手信的是初惠還是伊斯梅爾？是初惠在遷徙營的一個夜晚想起了自己和伊斯梅爾的過去與分手信，還是伊斯梅爾在與母親談話之後，想起了曾經困居遷徙營的初惠、他們共有的過去、還有那封令人心痛的分手信？

影片第二度呈現分手信時，這「分不清楚究竟是誰在哪裡回憶誰」的記憶迴圈變得更加複雜。深夜裡伊斯梅爾遲遲寫不出對卡爾命案的評論，開始翻檢舊物，翻出了夾在高中畢業紀念冊裡，信封已經泛黃的分手信。畫面切到曼澤納遷徙營，伊斯梅爾寫給初惠的信件被初惠的母親發現，母親逼著初惠寫下分手信，並要初惠將分手信的內容唸給她聽。影片先是穿插出現初惠朗讀信件的畫面、現在的伊斯梅爾蜷曲在書房一角讀信、還有初惠母親傾聽初惠讀信時的表情，三個人彷彿分處三個被區隔開來、但互相對話的時空。慢慢的，遷徙營戶外活動的喧鬧聲，從一開始只是初惠唸信的背景，逐漸變得震耳欲聾，蓋過初惠的聲音，和伊斯梅爾腦海中戰爭的隆隆巨響連成一片。接著，畫面出現參與二戰的伊斯梅爾，正躺在床上讀初惠的信，初惠唸信的聲音也再度響起。接下來是一連串破碎的記憶影像：初惠的特寫、爆裂的火光、躺在床上讀信的伊斯梅爾眼角泛著淚水、在海水中載浮載沉的伊斯梅爾、還有被海水沖上岸的伊斯梅爾，海灘上盡是半身埋入沙土的戰士遺體和死去的魚。然後畫面帶過衝鋒陷陣的戰士、書房讀信的伊斯梅爾、遷徙營中唸信的初惠、還有臥倒沙灘的伊斯梅爾抬起頭，看見的竟是遠方，十幾歲的他 and 初惠在沙灘上追逐，拾起沙灘上一條死魚。最後，畫面出現了已經截去左手臂的伊斯梅爾，還有被醫護人員截取下來的斷肢。初惠唸完了信，沉默的臉龐淌下淚水。畫面這時跳接到一個頭部朝下的伊斯梅爾特寫，以他憤怒不解的眼神為這一系列鏡頭作結。在這一段影像裡，記憶的主體徹底粉碎。記憶不只在伊斯梅爾、初惠、與初惠的母親等不同角色之間游走，還在同一個角色不同時間的自我中流竄：現在的伊斯梅爾、戰爭中接到分手信的伊斯梅爾、戰事中受了重傷俯臥染血沙灘的伊斯梅爾、還有截肢之後的伊斯梅爾，讓所謂的「自我」碎成時間流逝中難以拼接的影像。伊斯梅爾被截去一大段手臂的軀體，鮮血淋漓的斷肢畫面，當然更強化了《雪落香杉》鏡像碎裂，人物四分五裂，劇情敘事離散脫軌的感知效應。

三、創傷時間

德勒茲認為「時間—影像」之所以在歐洲電影裡崛起，和歐洲經歷第二次世界

大戰密切相關：二次大戰的創傷改變了人類對時空的想像，戰後歐洲的「處境令人失措，空間讓人不知如何描述」(Deleuze xi)。就在這樣失序、失語，「感知—運動法則」崩潰的歷史情境當中，「一丁點兒純粹的時間」(“a little time in the pure state”)開始出沒銀幕 (Deleuze xi)。德勒茲從二戰帶來的人類歷史斷裂，了解電影時間的「質」變；瑪麗·安·朵恩 (Mary Anne Doane) 則回到電影發展的初期，指出電影從一開始就不斷地在記錄「偶發」(contingency) 與創造「結構」(structure) 之間徘徊、掙扎。在《冒現的電影時間：現代性、偶發性、全檔案》(*The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive*) 一書中，朵恩從電影發展史的觀點，指出電影在發明初期紀錄純粹時間的理念：最早的電影想記錄一種「非特定的、妾身未明」、一種「不依附軀體、不上錨固定」的時間，拍電影等同於經歷並保存一段未經加工的時間，一段「時延」(duration)，電影也因此被期待可以錄下人類真實的「全檔案」(the archive) (163)。朵恩認為，電影擅於捕捉偶發與剎那的特性，適足以說明為什麼最早的電影熱衷於拍死亡、處決、意外等其他媒介不容易捕捉到的、轉瞬即逝的題材。然而，朵恩也承認，「電影拍攝的過程常將意外拍成一個事件，彰顯其可拍性，削弱了偶發性」(23)。特別是在電影有了觀眾之後，電影的功能逐漸由錄下人類「真實」轉為吸引觀眾，關於電影時間的考量，也就不再是電影時間是否等於偶發的真實時間，而是電影如何「結構觀眾的時間」(24)。電影從一個紀錄時間的發明，演變為一種「演出」(performance)，為了顧慮觀眾的「快」感，電影無可避免地追求「經濟效率」(economy)：要避免時間浪費，就要儘可能遮掩、略去朵恩所謂電影中「死去的時間」(dead time) (162)。

朵恩將電影中超出「快」感結構的時間稱為「死去的時間」，一則因為時間一旦放入影像結構之中，就免不了死亡。手指按下相機或攝影機快門的那一剎那，影像享有的永恆是「身後」(posthumous) 的永恆。朵恩玩弄英文「execute」的雙關意義：「execute」既是「製作／完成」，也是「行刑／處死」，因此「製作影像時，時間同時遭處死刑」(“In executing images, one also executes time”)(152)。不過，朵恩談「死去的時間」，並不表示她悲觀地認為時間在電影中註定消失，再也回不來了。她稱電影時間為「死去的時間」，另一個原因是想藉此凸顯電影在結構化、空間化時間的表

象之下，記憶偶發與創傷時間的初衷。說得更清楚一點，電影時間正是一種可以用「死亡」意象來象徵的創傷時間。朵恩表示，「死亡和偶發相似之處，即在於兩者經常都無法被收束到意義的框架之內」（145）。「死去的時間」可能從意義的框架之外捲土重來，德勒茲的「時間—影像」，正可以被理解為「死去的時間」之具形呈現、幽靈復返。雷奈·梭羅·布魯克納（René Thoreau Bruckner）在論文〈失去的時間：鈍挫顛腦創傷與意外主導的電影〉（“Lost Time: Blunt Head Trauma and Accident-Driven Cinema”）裡，進一步延伸朵恩對電影記錄偶發與創傷的論點。他認為，電影常常透過刻畫意外，搬演一種「具創造力的後—創傷時間」（a productive kind of post-traumatic temporality）（376）：表面上，遭受顛腦創傷的電影角色跌出現時／現實結構的時空，像是「失去了」一段生命歲月；其實創傷讓他進入一種「時延」（duration），一段「讓基進創新變為可能與可知的時間」（Bruckner 376）。「意外」因此不見得完全是負面與具破壞性的。在電影裡，失去一段日常生活中的例行時間，換來的，可能是能量足以漫過結構與秩序的創傷時間。

朵恩和布魯克納都提到了「創傷時延」的概念。這裡的「時延」，除了呼應柏格森時間論述中代表時間整體在時空中持續流動的「時延」，更強調創傷「後遺」（belatedness）與「延遲」（prolongation）的時間結構。沈志中在〈解構事件與 911 創傷〉這篇文章裡，點出創傷的「三個時間」：「體驗」、「詮釋」、與「重複」（47）。「體驗」代表事件發生的時間，但一定是有待「詮釋」的事件，亦即是發生在主體意料之外、造成主體驚嚇不解的事件，才可謂之「創傷」。換句話說，是「詮釋」的必要，也就是創傷的第二個時間，回溯既往地（retroactively）確立了創傷的存在。可是，創傷並不會停在第二個時間，因為「詮釋」總只是逼近、但卻無法完全排除主體的疑惑。「詮釋」的努力註定要「重複」，於是產生了創傷的第三個時間。創傷三層的時間結構，說明了創傷「後遺」與「延遲」的效應：創傷看似源自一個過去的事件，但是創傷時間並不帶領創傷主體回到過去；相反的，創傷不肯罷休，不斷挑戰既成詮釋的能量，指向的其實是「尚未看見」的將來。

借用布魯克納的辭彙，《雪落香杉》可以被解讀為一部「意外主導」的電影。卡爾意外身亡，讓一向平靜的聖皮多島陷入命案審查的喧囂，也勾起島上不同族裔在

二次大戰期間或是參與戰爭、或是遭受強制遷徙、或是失去親人、愛情、友情、土地的創傷。卡爾身亡，意味著一個年輕生命「未來」的時間遭到剝奪，但也「意外」地將島上居民推向一段創傷時間之中。一般討論創傷文學或藝術，常以「見證」（witness）為主要關懷點：創傷文學與藝術創作多志在「見證」，讓那些遭否認與壓抑的記憶得以重現，轉化「看不見」的焦慮和恐懼為看見、敢看、知道如何看的心靈安頓與療癒。可以理解，「見證」意在促成創傷的終結，讓人「活出」（live beyond）創傷時間，重回現實世界裡井然的知識系統。⁶ 不過，假如觀影者對《雪落香杉》的期待，是影片能提供嶄新且具體的歷史內容和影像以「見證」過去，那他們肯定要失望了。《雪落香杉》雖然刻畫了二次世界大戰的殺戮戰場，但是描繪二戰的電影汗牛充棟，而且1998年史蒂芬·史匹柏（Steven Spielberg）的戰爭鉅片《搶救雷恩大兵》（*Saving Private Ryan*）才剛上映，希克斯零碎且充滿表現式風格的戰爭畫面很難成為賣點。《雪落香杉》或還可能被理解為一部揭露美國排日種族主義的電影，但是就像杰佛理·馬可納（Geoffrey Macnab）指出的，類似的題材在好萊塢早有約翰·史塔吉（John Sturges）的《黑岩喋血記》（*Bad Dad at Black Rock, 1954*）以及亞倫·帕爾克（Alan Parker）的《來看天堂》（*Come See the Paradise, 1990*）處理過。《雪落香杉》的種族正義論調或還稱得上政治正確，在內容上卻無甚新意。而若是要辯稱《雪落香杉》的貢獻，是刻畫了二戰期間日裔美國族群遭到強制遷徙的經驗，將日美遷徙營的歷史搬上大銀幕，亞美研究學者恐怕也多無法苟同。不只是《雪落香杉》裡缺乏對日裔美國角色個別心理的深入剖析，其中幾個根據檔案照片重建的遷徙鏡頭，還有剪接照片與紀錄片組成的影片片段，都無法深入遷徙營的歷史與生活。當然，最令亞美學者詬病的是，伊斯梅爾提出的證據成為一雄最後無罪開釋的主要原因，這讓《雪落香杉》擺脫不了白人英雄主義色彩。⁷

毫無疑問，就呈現歷史知識鉅細靡遺的成就而言，希克斯的電影版《雪落香杉》

⁶ 用語言與敘述重現創傷記憶，以獲得心靈療癒的理論，可以追溯到佛洛伊德（Sigmund Freud）區分「行動化」（acting out）與「透工」（working through）的說法，前者還停留在重覆創傷情節的身體衝動層次，後者則進入了用語言來結構創傷經驗的階段。參見佛洛伊德。當代創傷理論對「見證」概念的闡釋，參見修學納·費爾曼（Shoshana Felman）以及多明尼克·拉卡柏（Dominick LaCapra）。

⁷ 亞美學者對《雪落香杉》的批評，詳見艾琳娜·柯芮芙（Elena Tajima Creff）110-18。

無法和古特森的小說版相比。甚至，我們可以說，若只考量影片中具體的情節與事件，電影版《雪落香杉》也許真的乏善可陳。筆者認為，要看見《雪落香杉》的新意與價值，必須從了解創傷由過去轉向將來的時間結構著手。也就是說，觀賞《雪落香杉》時，不能只拘泥於這部影片還原了多少過去，或希克斯在影片中涵納了多少歷史知識，而要觀察希克斯如何操作一種慢速時間感性，讓銀幕中的人物（甚至包括銀幕之外的觀影者），停留在類似布魯克納提到的創傷時間「具創造力」的「時延」之中。上文提到，回到過去，見證事件，一般為的是要「活出」創傷，但《雪落香杉》面對創傷的策略可能恰好相反。《雪落香杉》「慢」，因此延長了創傷時間，讓片中人物「活」(survive)在創傷之中。⁸ 前一種「見證」創傷的方法，基本上視創傷為一種有待治癒的病症，只有回到創傷發生的時空，還原事件原委，方得擺脫創傷記憶的糾纏；後一種「活」在創傷時間之內的策略，則認為創傷「時延」帶來思惟創新的機會。凱西·卡露思(Cathy Caruth)說過，雖然伴隨著創傷而來的經常是痛楚、難受、失落等負面的情緒，創傷其實並不是一種「病症」(pathology)，而是「一道精神與現實關係的根本謎題」(*Unclaimed Experience* 91)，不斷督促牽涉其中的個人重解、重組精神與現實的結構。

當然，我們要問：創傷時間在《雪落香杉》裡發揮了什麼效用？創傷「時延」在影片中究竟產生了什麼樣的「創造力」？影片中的法庭調查，一開始或可以被理解為現實世界企圖化解卡爾死亡創傷的方法：檢、辯雙方你來我往，所有證人的陳述，就常理而言莫不是為了還原事件發生的現場，並由陪審團作出判決，敲定創傷的責任歸屬。然而，正如筆者在前一節已經指出的，影片中意圖「見證」創傷原委的法庭審查，不斷被各色各樣的回憶打斷，這使原本意在終結、跳出創傷的法庭審判，反而成了延展創傷、喚起影片中人物創傷記憶，進而促使這些人物持續「活」在創傷之中最主要的舞台。首先，「回憶—影像」讓浮動漫延的創傷時間滲入了理當結構森嚴的法庭，影片的焦點遂由卡爾命案延展至聖皮多島上二次世界大戰之前與之間族裔共生與仇恨的漫長歷史。尤有甚之，法庭審理的過程開啟了層疊的時空，

⁸ 「活」在創傷之中的概念，出自凱西·卡露思(Cathy Caruth)，〈暴力與時間：活在創傷之中〉(“Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals”)。

讓記憶逐漸跨越個人與膚色的藩籬：阿爾特的記憶連上了賀拉斯的記憶、賀拉斯的記憶混接到一雄的記憶、一雄歐陸戰爭的記憶和伊斯梅爾亞洲戰場的記憶交疊、伊斯梅爾的戰爭創傷和初惠遷徙營生活的創傷更是難分彼此。特別值得一提的是，在現實／現時的法庭場景中，白種人與日裔居民在旁聽席上可謂楚河漢界。隔著法庭中間的走道，兩個膚色、兩種族群各據一邊，壁壘分明。然而，影片透過慢速時間感性發展出的思維，卻跨越了法庭現實／現時的族裔界線，創造了一個混雜錯接的創傷時空，讓你的記憶連上我的記憶，白種人的記憶混雜了黃種人的記憶。《雪落香杉》讓影片中的人物「活」在創傷「後遺」與「延遲」的時間效應裡，並藉此探索了一個新的思維，讓二戰創傷滲進聖皮多島上每一個族群，也讓遷徙營不再只是專屬於日裔美國人的歷史記憶。

四、「慢」的倫理

這一篇論文從討論《雪落香杉》節奏緩慢的問題出發，析論影片中層疊的「記憶—影像」，最後並試著將影片中漫延的時間讀為一種創傷時間，論證創傷不斷「後遺」與「延遲」的時間能量，將《雪落香杉》的銀幕鏡像震得粉碎。「慢」在影片中演變成一種策略：不得不慢，因為不想急著將創傷開啟的「時延」關閉；無法不慢，因為創傷事件的效應無法被圈限於一時一地。創傷的渲染性和感染力讓牽扯在其中的人、事、時、空，像滾雪球一樣向外延展，讓意義沒有終點。而相對於《雪落香杉》的「慢」，影評們要求「快」，除了追求傳統觀影理論所定義的「快」感，在更深的精神層次上，是不是因為不想、不願面對影片啟動的創傷時間，更不敢去把握創傷時間給予的意義重組機會？當觀影者急於想要為《雪落香杉》找到「完形」，急著想給一個標籤，說這部影片其實就是一部故弄玄虛的愛情電影⁹、一部不夠精彩刺激的戰爭電影、一部驚悚不足、高潮欠缺的謀殺推理電影、或是一部披著種族正

⁹ 《雪落香杉》在台灣的小說譯本與影片譯名，都是用「愛在冰雪紛飛時」，呼應影片中飾演伊斯梅爾的男星伊森·霍克（Ethan Hawke）拍過的浪漫愛情片《愛在黎明破曉時》（*Before Sunrise*; 1995），明顯地想利用伊森·霍克的知名度與浪漫愛情片的標籤，行銷《雪落香杉》。

義外衣的白人英雄主義電影，這些批評者是否想用現有的影片類型框架來論證《雪落香杉》的不足，好拒絕面對這部電影漫出了框架界線的時間感性？說得更明確一點，《雪落香杉》真正基進的地方，難道不是在影片鋪陳創傷時延之時，所能夠挑起的跨種族聯繫，特別是日裔美國遷徙營的歷史跨越時間與種族疆界的渲染力？仔細觀察，種族歧視在美國社會中雖被公開唾棄，不同膚色人種的差異與界線卻是美國文化與日常生活裡心照不宣的意識準則。美國總統可以為遷徙營的歷史道歉，但是在主流文化認知中，遷徙營的歷史應該放在過去（是美國政府「過去」的錯誤政策造成此一歷史事件）、應該專屬於日裔美國人（日裔美國人是此事件唯一的受害者）、也應該被隔離於美國主流歷史之外（此一事件和大部分美國人無甚干係）。¹⁰ 《雪落香杉》從卡爾意外死亡的事件拍起，卻也「意外」地拍出了一個人我交會、種族界線瓦解的創傷時空。在影片中，遷徙營的歷史效應跨越了二戰時空的侷限，在戰爭已經結束了九年的聖皮多島上依然餘波盪漾。影片中，遷徙營的悲劇也不僅僅影響了日裔美國族群：遷徙營不只是初惠的創傷，也是伊斯梅爾的創傷，是一雄的創傷，未嘗不也是卡爾及其家人的創傷。《雪落香杉》的記憶迴圈，把遷徙營織進一個美國社群共有的回憶裡，成為整個二次世界大戰創傷中難以分割的一部分。

珍妮·布蘭特利（Jenny Brantley）在一篇為小說版《雪落香杉》辯護的文章裡，點出「遽下評斷」（a rush to judgment）既是小說所探討的主題，也是諸多批評者犯下的相同毛病。布蘭特利之所以撰寫這篇文章，主要是為了回應 1999 年美國德州聖安東尼奧市（San Antonio）一所中學禁止老師指定學生閱讀《雪落香杉》的事件。校方的理由，是《雪落香杉》裡不無「繪聲繪影的暴力、種族偏執、露骨情色章節」，因此不適合中學生閱讀（Brantley 395）。布蘭特利卻認為，對《雪落香杉》遽下禁令的人，其實並沒有仔細讀懂古特森的小說。她還指出，《雪落香杉》裡人物之間的誤解與彼此傾軋、背叛，也多是「遽下評斷」的結果：阿爾特由株雄船上染血的魚叉把手，推論株雄謀殺了卡爾；賀拉斯由卡爾耳後的鈍挫傷，斷定殺他的人一定是個

¹⁰ 關於遷徙營記憶在美國歷史的邊緣位置，參見卡洛琳·辛普森（Caroline Chung Simpson）。辛普森用「不在場的存在」（absent presence）一詞，說明遷徙營的相關著述雖然很多，但多在亞美與日美社群中被討論，在美國主流歷史論述中，遷徙營的記憶無足輕重，雖然「存在」，卻經常「不在場」。

懂劍道的日本人；卡爾的母親因為宮本與海納家懸而未決的土地買賣紛爭，就認為株雄有足夠的動機殺了卡爾。而若將視野放大到小說影射的美國社會和歷史，「遽下評斷」的例子還有美國政府因日裔美國成員的日本血統，就懷疑整個族群對美國的忠誠；株雄也因曾經遭到美國社會集體不信任，在卡爾命案發生之初不願詳述真相。這些例子，除了印證了「遽下評斷」的危險，也說明了膚色分野往往是「遽下評斷」最基本的依據。小說裡每個角色都習慣於將不幸與災難，快速地歸咎於與自己膚色不同的族群，而不願意慢下來，「思考遽下評斷、遽然發怒可能帶來的後果」(Brantley 400)。

布蘭特利質疑「快」的效用，她的論點不偏不倚呼應了《雪落香杉》電影版呈現的「慢速」時間倫理。「不遽下評斷」的倫理態度，更可以幫助我們理解影片結局的雙重意義。表面上，伊斯梅爾提出新的證據，洗刷了一雄的冤屈，在劇情的鋪陳上還原了卡爾命案原委，也像是讓《雪落香杉》在一連串延宕與脫軌之後，終於獲得了一個劇情「全貌」。不過，換一個角度來看，伊斯梅爾的證據，雖然釐清了卡爾的死因，但是聖皮多島上因卡爾事件被挑起的種族矛盾，卻仍然懸而未決。當法官宣布陪審團解散時，法庭中一片譁然。《雪落香杉》搬演的創傷時間真的就此打住了嗎？還是在陪審團解散的那一剎那，希克斯其實是讓法庭審查的情節不了了之，不給陪審團「遽下評斷」的機會，同時巧妙地將評斷歷史、斡旋創傷的棒子交給了銀幕之外的觀影者，將創傷動能傳衍 (transfer) 到另一個時空？

引用書目

- Ansen, David. "A Blue Christmas." *Newsweek* 20 Dec. 1999. Academic Search Premier HTML. 9 pages. Web.
- Baudry, Jean-Louis. "Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus." 1970. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. 5th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 345-55. Print.
- Bogue, Ronald. *Deleuze on Cinema*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Bowman, James. "Stolen Time." *The American Spectator* Feb. 2000: 62-63. Print.
- Brantley, Jenny. "Clorox the Dishes and Hide the Books: A Defense of *Snow Falling on Cedars*." *Censored Books II: Critical Viewpoints, 1985-2000*. Ed. Nicholas J. Karolides. Lanham, MD: The Scarecrow P, 2002. 395-402. Print.
- Bruckner, René Thoreau. "Lost Time: Blunt Head Trauma and Accident-Driven Cinema." *Discourse* 30.3 (2008): 373-400. Print.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1996. Print.
- . "Violence and Time: Traumatic Survivals." *Assemblage* 20 (1993): 24-25. Print.
- Creef, Elena Tajima. *Imaging Japanese America: The Visual Construction of Citizenship, Nation, and the Body*. New York: New York UP, 2004. Print.
- Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*. Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989. Print.
- Doane, Mary Ann. *The Emergence of Cinematic Time: Modernity, Contingency, the Archive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2002. Print.
- Felman, Shoshana and Dori Laub. *Testimony: Crises of Witnessing in Literature, Psychoanalysis, and History*. New York: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Freud, Sigmund. "Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through." 1914. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. and ed. James

- Strachey. Vol. 12. London: Hogarth P, 1957. 145-56. Print.
- Guterson, David. *Snow Falling on Cedars*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994. Print.
- Hicks, Scott, director. *Snow Falling on Cedars*. 1999.
- Holden, Stephen. "Prejudice Lingers in a Land of Mists." *NewYorkTimes.com*. The New York Times, 22 Dec. 1999. Web. 30 Oct. 2011.
- Johnson, Brian D. "Hollywood Looks Back in Anger, and Love." *Maclean's* 13 Dec. 1999. Academic Search Premier HTML. 5 pages. Web.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience." *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: W. W. Norton, 1977. 1-7. Print.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *Representing the Holocaust: History, Theory, Trauma*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.
- . *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001. Print.
- Lefkowitz, Daniel. "On the Relation between Sound and Meaning in Hicks' *Snow Falling on Cedars*." *Semiotica* 155.1 (2005): 15-50. Print.
- Macnab, Geoffrey. "*Snow Falling on Cedars*." *Sight and Sound* 10.6 (2000): 54. Print.
- Maryles, Daisy. "Behind the Bestsellers." *Publishers Weekly* 20 July 1998: 117. Print.
- Metz, Christian. *Psychoanalysis and Cinema: The Imaginary Signifier*. Trans. Celia Britton. London: MacMillan, 1982. Print.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema." 1975. *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*. Ed. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. 5th ed. New York: Oxford UP, 1999. 833-44. Print.
- Pryce, Vinette K. "Justice Prevails in *Snow Falling on Cedars*." *The New York Amsterdam News* 6-12 Jan. 2000: 20. Print.
- Simpson, Caroline Chung. *An Absent Presence: Japanese Americans in Postwar American Culture, 1945-1960*. Durham: Duke UP, 2001. Print.
- "Talking with Scott Hicks." *The Shooting Script of Snow Falling on Cedars*. By Ron Bass and

Scott Hicks. New York: Newmarket P, 1999. 126-55. Print.

Travers, Peter. "Movies." *Rolling Stone* 3 Feb. 2000. Academic Search Premier HTML. 4 pages.

Web.

張小虹。〈台北慢動作：身體·城市的時間顯微〉。《中外文學》36.2（2007）：121-54。

趙伏柱譯。《愛在冰雪紛飛時》。大衛·古特森（David Guterson）著。台北：輕舟，1998。

沈志中。〈解構事件與 911 創傷〉。《當代》207（Nov. 2004）：42-55。

歷史記憶與創傷時間： 敘述日裔美國遷徙營¹

李 秀 娟

摘 要

這一篇論文爬梳日裔美國遷徙營（relocation camp）敘述的歷史，討論既存的遷徙營敘述，也試圖建立一個以創傷理論為核

¹ 本文為國科會研究計畫「移動記憶、驛動身份：日美電影中的時間、歷史、與負面／片顯影」（95-2411-H-003-039-MY2）部分研究成果。作者感謝審稿人的論文修改建議，以及臺師大英語研究所林恩仔、游羽萱兩位同學協助整理書目及校稿。

日裔美國遷徙營在英文相關著述中有“relocation camp”、“internment camp”、與“concentration camp”等說法，美國政府的官方說法則是“war relocation center”。在一般輿論與學術研究中，前面三種名稱均常被使用。在中文語境裡，陳福仁與游素玲稱之為「集中營」；本文將之暫譯為「遷徙營」，一則和納粹集中營（concentration camp）區隔，再則直譯美國官方“relocation”的說法，更因為想保留“relocate”一字「移置、遷徙至他方」的意義。筆者認為，“relocation”在最早雖然是官方掩蓋國家種族暴力的一種委婉說辭，但是從整個事件發生已經超過半個世紀的現在來看，「遷徙營」早已不只是美國官方便於集中管理日裔美國社群的「集中營」或「拘禁營」，也不只是美國種族主義原罪最具形的象徵。在戰爭期間，許多日美居民胼手胝足，將「遷徙營」挪用、轉化為戰爭期間日裔的「遷徙之地」，持續發展其文化與社群。戰後這些年遷徙營論述的發展，更令人清楚地看見遷徙營作為日裔社群在北美發展的轉折點。遷徙營促使日美人士由戰前聚居美國西岸的生活方式，轉變為戰後散居各地之「遷徙」社群。這個論點，在本文中會清楚闡釋。

* 本文 100 年 11 月 7 日收件；101 年 1 月 20 日審查通過。

李秀娟，國立臺灣師範大學英語學系副教授。

中外文學·第 41 卷·第 1 期·2012 年 3 月·頁 7-43。

心的遷徙營敘述模式。論文主張不只將日美遷徙營視為一樁發生在過去的歷史事件，並將其視為一個歷史創傷：作為歷史事件，遷徙營有其發生的特定時空，敘述遷徙營是為了回到歷史過去以還原史實；作為歷史創傷，遷徙營記憶的「時間後延性」（temporal belatedness）則足以連繫不同時空，敘述遷徙營的重點也不再只是史實挖掘，而是透過不斷的歷史敘述與傳衍的過程，去延伸事件的衝擊力與渲染力。論文第一部分先勾勒出一個日美遷徙營的敘述史，了解遷徙營歷史在不同論述情境下被賦予的不同意義，並討論這些不同敘述模式帶來的論述意涵與侷限。接著，筆者援引拉卡柏（Dominick LaCapra）、卡露思（Cathy Caruth）、凱普蘭（E. Ann Kaplan）、以及班涅特（Jill Bennett）等學者對創傷結構與歷史書寫的見解，特別是創傷如何締造記憶時延的動能，思索創傷時間如何能被挪轉為有意義的文化批判時間，並藉此導引出一個敘述遷徙營的新模式。論文最後一部份從創傷跨界與時延的角度閱讀史塔吉（John Sturges）執導的《黑岩喋血記》（*Bad Day at Black Rock*; 1954），透過對日美遷徙營歷史一種創傷式的閱讀，探索遷徙營創傷效應穿越時間與族裔邊界的可能。

關鍵詞：日裔美國遷徙營，創傷，時間，歷史，記憶，種族，《黑岩喋血記》

Historical Memory and Traumatic Time: Narrating Japanese American Relocation Camps

Hsiu-chuan Lee*

Abstract

Investigating the narrative history of Japanese American relocation camps, this paper studies the changing modes of relocation narratives and seeks in the efforts of activating the relocation's traumatic contagious force a new model and ethics of writing history. I propose to read the Japanese American relocation not simply as an event that occurred in a historical past but as a trauma. In the case of the former, the relocation studies call for a return to a specific time and place and a restoration of the Japanese American internees' experiences. In the case of the latter, emphases are shifted to the impact of the relocation, whose transference potential is not confined to any singular time, place, generation, or ethnic group. The first part of the paper surveys the significance and limitations of existing narratives that give the relocation different meanings. The second part draws on Dominick LaCapra, Cathy Caruth, E. Ann Kaplan, and Jill Bennett to explore the temporal belatedness of trauma and locate in "traumatic time" a space of critical negotiations and conceptual innovations. The last section analyzes John Sturges's Hollywood feature *Bad Day at Black Rock* (1954) as a textual example to illustrate the contagiousness of relocation memories across time and beyond the Japanese American community.

Keywords: Japanese American relocation, trauma, time, history, memory, race, *Bad Day at Black Rock*

* Associate Professor, Department of English, National Taiwan Normal University.

在日裔美國社群發展的過程中，二次大戰期間遷徙營的創傷歷史一直占據重要位置。² 為何會有日裔美國遷徙營？居住太平洋沿岸的日美社群，為何會成為美國少數族裔中唯一遭受大規模遷徙，拘禁於美國西、南部內陸的社群？針對這樣一樁侵犯美國公民權，且具有明顯種族主義色彩的歷史事件，美國官方如何自圓其說，方能將之收編於多元族裔共存發展的主流論述？遭逢創傷的日美成員及其後代，又該如何看待、考掘、與演繹這段歷史？而在已經進入二十一世紀的現在敘述日裔美國遷徙營的歷史，與在二次大戰期間、其後，以及平反運動仍如火如荼時比較，可以發展出如何不同的策略和意義？

在二次大戰發生以後的日美文化與歷史論述當中，以上問題不斷地被提出討論。在二戰期間以及戰後的五、六〇年代，遷徙營的歷程一般被視為日裔美國社群發展的斷裂點。日本移民於 1880 年代起進入夏威夷及太平洋西岸，取代華人成為北美亞裔勞工的主要來源；到了日美太平洋戰爭爆發前，日裔人士已經在美國西岸發展出穩固的社群。森敏夫（Toshio Mori）仿照安德森（Sherwood Anderson）《小城故事》（*Winesburg, Ohio*; 1919）的形式，撰寫了一系列短篇小說，後來結集為《加州橫濱》（*Yokohama, California*; 1949），就生動地刻畫了二戰以前日美社群的生活狀況。然而，珍珠港事變之後美國向日本宣戰，旋即

² 日裔美國遷徙營的始末或可簡述如下：日軍在 1941 年 12 月 7 日清晨偷襲珍珠港，隨著美國對日本宣戰，羅斯福（Franklin Delano Roosevelt）總統在 1942 年 2 月 19 日頒布 9066 號行政命令（Executive Order 9066），賦予軍方權力將太平洋沿岸劃為「軍事作戰區域」（military areas），將加州、奧瑞岡州與華盛頓州西半、以及亞利桑納州南部之日裔居民大規模先遷移至臨時搭建的「集合中心」（assembly center），再分別發配至十個散落猶他州、亞歷桑納州、科羅拉多州、懷俄明州、加州、愛達荷州、與阿肯色州內陸荒漠或沼澤地區的遷徙營。超過 110,000 日裔人士遭到強制遷徙，其中百分之六十以上為出生於美國的美國公民，在沒有任何犯罪事實或接受審判的情況之下，被迫在極短的時間內搬離美國西岸的家園。遷徙營在二戰結束之後陸續關閉。

對太平洋西岸日美社群展開調查、逮捕、戒嚴，進而集體強制遷徙至內陸遷徙營，也因此引發日美社群嚴重的分裂，以及個人在國家與身份上的認同危機。受美國法律限制而無從歸化美國的一世（*issei*），和生而即為美國公民的二世（*nisei*），在國籍與認同上分裂；出生美國，但回日本受教育，之後再返回美國的「返美二世」（*kibei*），³ 與出生美國並在美國成長的其他二世，因教育文化淵源的差異而產生嫌隙；隨後還有接受美軍徵召入伍、加入戰爭的日裔美國人，與拒絕徵召入伍的「叛國小子」（*no-no boy*），⁴ 究竟誰是忠誠的美國人、誰是害群之馬、誰有資格融入主流美國社群的爭辯。戰後遷徙營關閉後，部分日裔人士迫於美國社會的敵意選擇被遣送日本，而多數日美成員或者遷徙至美國中西部或東岸，找尋求學與工作的機會；或者回到美國西岸，希望重建已不存在的家園與社群；或者因經濟壓力，成為遷徙於美國各州之間的遷徙勞工。日美社群遭逢離散命運，自是不復戰前社群凝聚一體的光景。

到了六〇年代晚期，美國少數族裔民權運動興起，緊接著是七〇年代的亞美文學與文化運動，遷徙營的歷史重新受到重視。七〇年代末期，遷徙營的平反運動（*redress movement*）崛起，日裔美國社群對此一段歷史不再噤聲，力主重新發掘歷史真相，督

³ “Kibei”字面上的意義為「歸美」、「返美」，用來稱呼出生於美國，但在日本接受教育，後來又返回美國的日裔人士。

⁴ “No-no boy”指二戰期間拒絕美軍徵召的日美二世。戰時美國政府在1943年2月要求所有年滿十七歲的日裔成員回答一份「忠誠問卷」（*loyalty questionnaire*），對問卷中兩個最關鍵、且極具爭議性的問題均給予否定回答者，即被稱為“no-no boy”。相對於受召入伍的日美成員，“no-no boy”被認為拒絕效忠美國，筆者因此將之暫譯為「叛國小子」。「忠誠問卷」中兩個關鍵的問題分別是第27題：「你是否願意在接到徵召時隨時加入美軍並參與戰事？」；以及第28題：「你是否願意宣示無條件效忠美利堅合眾國，在美國遭到任何外來或內部的攻擊時忠誠地護衛美國，並誓言不再對日本天皇或其他外國政府、政權或組織進行任何形式的效忠？」。參見 Weglyn 136。

促美國政府與主流社會正視日美社群在二戰期間公民權遭不合理侵犯的事實，也帶起從八〇年代迄今日美遷徙營歷史的研究與出版風潮。大量的檔案研究、學術論述、文學創作、口述歷史、紀錄片、劇情片、與其他影像記錄的出版，再加上博物館的興建，使遷徙營歷史在日美文化與身份論述中的位置產生微妙的變化。原本造成社群離散與身份認同危機的遷徙營事件，近幾十年來卻儼然成爲日美身份與文化論述的中心。在某一層面上，遷徙營事件對日美社群而言，已經由破壞力強大的創傷，轉化成爲社群共有的歷史記憶，一種類似確立與凝結社群的「建國創傷」（founding trauma）。拉卡柏（Dominick LaCapra）解釋「建國創傷」爲那些「矛盾地變得有價值，成爲個人或群體強烈情感投注的認同根基，而不再威脅、質疑身份的創傷」（23）。「建國創傷」的例子在弱勢族裔抗爭、第三世界後殖民建國、與全球宗教與族裔傾軋的歷史中比比皆是。從納粹屠殺猶太人激起的猶太人建國意識、台灣二二八事變成爲台獨支持者歷史訴求的核心、到九一一恐怖攻擊之後高漲的美國國家意識，創傷往往昇華爲形構想像共同體的最佳素材，以及悲情國族神話建立的基礎。

當然，筆者指出遷徙營歷史對日美族群意義的轉變，並不是要主張日美社群因遷徙營所遭受的創傷已然療癒，更非暗示遷徙營在歷史敘述上已經不成問題。相反的，這篇論文想要討論的，正是遷徙營歷史作爲日美「建國創傷」這個論述的侷限性，並試著提出敘述遷徙營的其他模式。誠然，晚近仍不斷出版的遷徙營相關文獻，讓人不得不認真思考：遷徙營的歷史是否未曾被說盡？遷徙營對日美社群、美國國家文化、甚至跨太平洋亞—美文化流動的衝擊力是否仍然餘波盪漾？將遷徙營敘述侷限於少數族裔政治，亦即將論述核心放在日裔美國身份的斷裂與重建，或是在認知上轉移遷徙營對日美社群造成的傷害，使其成爲日美「建國創傷」，不僅不應該是遷徙營敘述的終點，更可能在論述

上作繭自縛，為遷徙營的影響力預設族裔政治的邊界。可以確定的是，時間的流變，日美社群在美國地位的改變，國際情勢的轉變，還有亞美社群及學術界對遷徙營漸深、漸廣的了解，正不斷地移轉日美遷徙營敘述的重點與意義。遷徙營是日美社群的創傷、美國的創傷、還是橫越太平洋之亞洲與美洲政經文化流動與戰爭所鑄成的創傷？除了日美社群，遷徙營事件還牽涉了哪些人、物、地？若說遷徙營事件先是拆解了、然後又成為日美社群重建的論述基石，那麼它拆解和重建的是同一個社群嗎？日美成員經歷了遷徙營以及遷徙營之後的離散命運，他們的社群產生什麼樣的質變？而在平反運動告一段落，美國政府對日美社群已經給予官方道歉與賠償，⁵且在對遷徙營中所發生之事也幾乎有了定見的現在，要如何敘述遷徙營，方不至於流於史實的重覆，或自我設限於日美族裔政治的範疇，而能進一步策動這一歷史創傷具有的時空外延性？

這一篇論文旨在思考日美遷徙營的歷史衝擊力，探索遷徙營創傷效應穿越時間與族裔邊界的可能。筆者主張不只將日美遷徙營視為一樁發生在過去的歷史事件，並將其視為一個歷史創傷：作為歷史事件，遷徙營有其發生的特定時空；作為歷史創傷，遷徙營記憶的「時間後延性」（temporal belatedness）則足以讓遷徙營的記憶在事件發生之後，在不同的時間與空間裡反覆出現，也因此聯繫起不同時空的經驗與認知。⁶更明確地說，當遷徙營

⁵ 1988年，美國國會通過公民自由法案（Civil Liberties Act），並由總統雷根（Ronald Reagan）為遷徙營歷史事件公開道歉並展開賠償。1990年布希總統（George Bush）再度發表聲明，為二次大戰期間日美社群遭受的「嚴重侵權」（serious injustices）表達歉意。布希總統的聲明見 Inada 412。

⁶ 「時間後延性」，或稱「時延」，是指創傷效應「後遺」與「延遲」的時間結構。創傷之所以成為創傷，在於其不只是帶來單一時間之內的經驗，還不斷在記憶中重複，要求重新詮釋，其效應也因此不斷地向未來推移。下文對創傷「時延」的概念還會再加著墨。

僅僅被當作一樁歷史事件時，敘述遷徙營的努力會是回到歷史過去以還原史實，了解在特定時空的過去發生了什麼，以對歷史做出公正的評斷。但當遷徙營被視為歷史創傷，則敘述遷徙營的重點已不只是史實挖掘，而是透過不斷的歷史敘述與傳衍（transference）的過程，⁷ 去延伸事件的衝擊力與渲染力，活絡創傷效應跨越時空的動能，用以拒絕論述與歷史既有疆界的限制。在接下來的討論裡，筆者將先嘗試勾勒出一個日美遷徙營的敘述史，了解遷徙營歷史在不同論述情境被賦予的不同意義，並討論這些不同敘述模式帶來的論述意涵與侷限。接著，論文援引拉卡柏、卡露思（Cathy Caruth）、凱普蘭（E. Ann Kaplan）、以及班涅特（Jill Bennett）等學者對創傷結構與歷史書寫的見解，特別是創傷如何讓記憶隨時間流逝不斷反覆再現的動能，思索創傷時間如何能被挪轉為有意義的文化批判時間，並藉此導引出一個敘述遷徙營的新模式。論文的最後一部份從創傷跨界與時延的角度閱讀史塔吉（John Sturges）執導、1954 年發行的劇情片《黑岩喋血記》（*Bad Day at Black Rock*），試著給日美遷徙營歷史一種創傷式的閱讀。

從噤聲到平反運動

簡單地追溯日裔美國文化發展史，遷徙營的歷史記憶最早可

⁷ “Transference” 是精神分析的概念，在此彰顯歷史的傳遞不是單純的歷史事件重述，而是類似精神分析談話治療過程中的「傳衍」。歷史「傳遞」（transmission）的說法，在本質上跳不出對歷史真實性（authenticity）的訴求，而「傳衍」則牽涉了對話兩者的情感渲染，以及歷史「後延再敘」（belated recounting）——即歷史在不同的時間可以被重新詮釋、定義的特質。拉卡柏認為，「傳衍」概念有助於解釋歷史創傷的「傳染性」（contagiousness），可以說明創傷如何能不只屬於受難者，而得以延伸其動能到歷史的研究者與書寫者（LaCapra 142）。本文用「歷史傳衍」的概念取代「歷史傳遞」，藉以凸顯遷徙營歷史的創傷格局。

以說是一個「說」或「不說」的問題。除了官方的報告與記錄，零星的文學創作、口述歷史、攝影與影像記錄作品在二戰之後雖然存在，但對創傷經驗的指涉或者隱晦，或者用側寫的方式，或者在美國族群融合與國族一統的論述基調之下運作，在五、六〇年代的冷戰氛圍中並沒能引起太多迴響。⁸ 此外，在戰後重返社會、重整家園的經濟與政治壓力之下，大多數的遷徙營受害者不願也無暇去回顧戰時創傷歷史。說得更明確一點，許多遭逢創傷的日裔人士及其後代對這一段歷史「噤聲」，不只因為說話者主體單純、一廂情願的「不想說」或「不願說」，而是包含更多成分的「不知道怎麼說」——不知道可以、或應該說什麼，更不知道要用什麼樣的論述架構、什麼樣的語彙與邏輯來說。小川(Joy Kogawa)的《歐巴桑》(*Obasan*; 1981)以加拿大日裔二戰時的經驗為背景，早已被公認為描述日裔北美二戰創傷的經典創作。小說中反覆出現的一句日文——「為小孩之故」(*Kodomo no tame*; “For the sake of the children”)，可被視為戰後日裔成員迴避創傷之無法理解與不可再現性最具象徵意味的遁辭。小說中的日裔一世伯母(即「歐巴桑」)以「為小孩之故」為託詞，企圖創造一個真空的、與過往記憶切割的現在，區隔屬於成人的創傷過去和屬於小孩的未來，拒絕世代之間的對話與任何形式的歷史傳衍。

⁸ 美國官方在大戰方歇時對日美遷徙營的報告，見 Spicer, et al. 這個時期重要的遷徙營相關文學創作包括大久保(Miné Okubo)結合文字與繪畫的《第13660號居民》(*Citizen 13660*; 1946)、山本(Hisaye Yamamoto)的短篇〈笹川原小姐傳奇〉(“The Legend of Miss Sasagawara”; 1950)、曾根(Monica Sone)的《二世女兒》(*Nisei Daughter*; 1953)，以及岡田(John Okada)的《叛國小子》(*No-No Boy*; 1957)。此外，福田(Yoshiaki Fukuda)以日文出版回憶錄，還有白人民俗藝術學者伊藤(Allen H. Eaton)的著述。大戰尚未結束之前，也有著名的地景攝影師亞當斯(Ansel Adams)出版的攝影文集，以及媒體記者麥可威廉斯(Carey McWilliams)的作品。這些著作呈現了官方論述之外，美國媒體與社會菁英對遷徙營的看法。

同樣也已經成爲日裔二戰敘述經典，山本的短篇〈笹川原小姐傳奇〉透過敘述者菊（Kiku）迂迴的敘述模式，戲劇化地呈現日美成員面對遷徙經驗的模稜姿態。菊之所以一直借助不連貫的八卦耳語來說故事，徘徊在別人的想法與自己所聽所見的片段資訊之間，除了有她還尙未成年這個看似方便（但其實是個很表象、而且不盡然成立）的理由，更深層的原因應該是她（以及她週遭大部份的日裔成員）還無法掌握確定的話語和邏輯去評斷主角笹川原小姐，更不用說要如何去評斷整個遷徙營的經歷：遷徙營是美國政府保護日裔居民的措施還是對日裔成員的背叛？是「夏令營」（summer camp）還是「集中營」（concentration camp）？⁹ 假如菊未經任何醫學訓練的好朋友愛兒喜（Elsie）可以在遷徙營中當起護士，還「興高采烈地」（plunged gleefully into the pleasure）領取月薪十九美金的微薄薪水（比打其他零工多三美金）（24），那笹川原小姐在遷徙營裡鬱鬱寡歡、不信任別人（包括醫院）的行爲是「反常」還是「反而正常」？戰爭結束以後，已經搬到費城且埋首學業的菊偶然接觸到笹川原小姐的詩作。雖然詩作所附的作者介紹特別提到笹川原小姐由美國西岸，遭強制遷徙至亞歷桑納州遷徙營的背景，但是菊還是沒能將笹川原小姐的困境和遷徙營的種種連接起來，反而嘗試從另外一個角度理解笹川原小姐。她爲笹川原小姐的行爲暫時找到一個兼具宗教與性別層次的解釋：是笹川原小姐追求宗教超脫、昧於俗世情感的父親帶給她壓迫；真正發瘋的不是笹川原小姐，而是這個全然無視女兒纖細善感心靈的父親。在這裡，藉由菊的說法，山本訴諸了美國主流讀者較能接受的性別壓迫議題。她讓〈笹川原小姐傳奇〉觸及了遷徙營，同時卻又巧妙地拐個彎，繞過了牽涉在

⁹ 日美遷徙營是「夏令營」或是「集中營」，這個爭辯存在於立場不同的美國政論者與媒體之間。詳見 Ito 的報導，標題即爲〈集中營或夏令營？〉（“Concentration Camp or Summer Camp?”）。

遷徙營歷史之中種族與國家公民權等較敏感的議題。

誠然，創傷理論的一個重點，正是創傷總是來得太早。在佛洛伊德理論中，最明顯的例子是性創傷總是發生在幼年早期、性器官尚未成熟的時候。創傷因之必須經歷一段潛伏期，在青春期受到刺激之後才又以徵狀的形式反覆出現。在歷史與文化批判的領域中，創傷則被廣泛定義為來得太早、太突然、太強烈、太超乎預期的事件，以至於在事件發生當下意識無從掌握、理解，事後才以倒敘、夢魘、或其他形式反覆再現、重新詮釋，因此締造了創傷效應與時遞延的特性。¹⁰ 值得注意的是，說「創傷來得太早」，指涉的並不是創傷事件本質或內容的問題，而是創傷相對於認知的一種時間結構。經歷過同一事件的人，不是每一個都會感受到創傷，只有在當事人無法理解此事件、無從言語時，事件才會在往後的時日如影隨形，反覆浮現形成創傷。換句話說，事件之所以成為創傷，是因為事件發生之時，當事人足以解釋創傷的論述邏輯尚未成形，造成創傷時間快過言語時間的結構、創傷催促著語言變化與認知發展的現象。卡露思據此指出，相對於創傷來得太早，所有的精神分析師與歷史文化評論者都「看見得太晚」（*seeing-too-late*）（*Unclaimed Experience* 110）：論述和語言往往是因為創傷反覆地催促，不得不轉向以衍生新的思維與論述。在遷徙營敘述的案例裡，多的是在二戰結束多年之後才說得出的故事。吉妮·休斯登（Jeanne Houston）在《再會了，曼澤納》（*Farewell to Manzanar*; 1973）的前言裡，表示自己在離開遷徙營二十五年之後，才覺得自己終於能提筆寫下她在曼澤納遷徙營（Manzanar Relocation Center）的所見所聞。同樣的，歷史學者魏格林（Michi Weglyn）在十多歲時親身經歷遷徙營，但也是到了二戰結束了二十五年之後，方才體認自己之前的「不成熟與天

¹⁰ 參見 Caruth 在 *Unclaimed Experience* 書中對創傷的定義（91-92）。

真」(immaturity and naïveté) (21)，竟然沉默地接受官方言論，認為日美成員若要證明對美國的忠誠，遷徙是唯一路徑。魏格林影響日美平反運動深遠的著作——《恥辱年代：美國集中營中尚未說出的故事》(*Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps*; 1976)，藉書名直接點出，關於遷徙營，有太多「尚未說出」的史實，或是遭遺忘、或是被忽視，都有待仔細地爬梳、還原。

平反運動的崛起，揭示了日美遷徙營敘述新的模式與動能。為了寫作《恥辱年代》，魏格林本人花費數年，在美國國家檔案室(US National Archives)與羅斯福總統紀念圖書館(Franklin Delano Roosevelt Library)等機構查閱塵封檔案，追究歷史真相，最是意象鮮明地標誌了日美社群對於遷徙營的歷史，已經從「說」與「不說」的拉鋸，進入到對歷史細節鉅細靡遺的考證、與對歷史真相的堅持(Nash)。除了重新出版五、六〇年代大久保、山本、曾根、岡田等之前遭忽略的作品，¹¹ 從七〇年代末迄今，與遷徙營相關的著作文獻與影像記錄大量湧出，除了美國政府在1980年成立「戰時遷徙與監禁委員會」(Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment)，提出研究報告《剝奪人身正義》(*Personal Justice Denied*; 1982, 1983)，¹² 還有歷史學者埃倫斯(Peter Irons)的《戰時正義：日美拘留案例的故事》(*Justice at War: The Story of the Japanese American Internment Cases*; 1983)、市岡雄二(Yuji Ichioka)編輯的《營內視角：日美強制驅離與重新安頓的研究》(*Views from Within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*; 1989)、丹尼爾斯(Roger Daniels)在1981年出版的《北美集中營：二戰期間美國

¹¹ 參見本文註釋8。

¹² 此報告已經由「公民自由公共教育基金」(Civil Liberties Public Education Fund)與華盛頓大學(University of Washington)於1997年重新出版。

與加拿大的日裔居民》（*Concentration Camps, North America: Japanese in the United States and Canada during World War II*）、以及在 1989 年彙集、編纂的一部九冊的《美國集中營：日美遷徙與拘禁紀錄史》（*American Concentration Camps: A Documentary History of the Relocation and Incarceration of Japanese Americans*）等。具自傳性質的文學創作、回憶錄、日記、口述歷史等資料在此階段也備受重視。知名者除了《再會了，曼澤納》，還有內田（Yoshiko Uchida）的《流放沙漠：一個日美家庭的放逐》（*Desert Exile: The Uprooting of a Japanese American Family*; 1982）；山田（Mitsuye Yamada）的《營中手札與其他詩作》（*Camp Notes and Other Poems*; 1976）；立石（John Tateishi）編纂的《全盤正義：日美拘留營口述歷史》（*And Justice for All: An Oral History of the Japanese American Detention Camps*; 1984）；還有江上（Hatsuye Egami）的《營中日記》（*The Evacuation Diary of Hatsuye Egami*; 1995）等；均凸顯了第一手資料見證歷史的價值。¹³

而除了文字出版品，照片、畫作等各種影像出版品，更企圖讓閱聽者親眼看見遷徙營。石鄉（Estelle Ishigo）的《寂寞心之山》（*Lone Heart Mountain*; 1972）；絹森思微（Deborah Gensensway）與羅斯曼（Mindy Roseman）的《文字以外：美國集中營影像》（*Beyond Words: Images from America's Concentration Camps*; 1987）等均是重要的例子。著名的白人攝影師亞當斯（Ansel Adams）以及藍恩（Dorothea Lange）在戰爭期間拍攝曼澤納遷徙營的攝影作品也被重新出版、討論，並且被

¹³ 更詳盡的文獻可參閱 Inada 編纂之 *Only What We Could Carry* 書後所附之推薦書目（431-36）；華盛頓大學圖書館關於日美遷徙營之館藏研究書目，也涵蓋了具代表性的文獻（<<http://www.lib.washington.edu/exhibits/harmony/bib.html>>；2009 年 10 月 26 日登入）。

拿來和日美攝影師宮武東洋 (Toyo Miyatake) 在營中用手製相機拍攝的作品比較。¹⁴ 另外，大量的紀錄片從八〇年代中期陸續問世。¹⁵ 岡崎 (Steven Okazaki) 取材石鄉的傳記與畫作，拍攝紀錄片《等待的日子》 (*Days of Waiting*; 1988)，獲得奧斯卡最佳紀錄短片獎。影片採用畫家石鄉自述的語氣，配合她的營中素描、水彩畫作，刻劃她在位於懷俄明州的「心之山遷徙營」 (Heart Mountain Relocation Center) 艱鉅的生活情形。影片中悲情的氛圍、憤懣的敘述語氣，彰顯了日裔族群遭美國政府背叛的主題。簡言之，遷徙營敘述在這個階段主要訴求兩個重點，一是強調受難者記憶與官方歷史的差異，亦即必須是抗議的歷史，不委曲求全或屈意奉承官方歷史。另一個重點則在於還原、召喚遷徙營歷史的真實性，強調一手資料與檔案研究，務求補足歷史空缺。

遷徙營記憶的創傷結構

時至今日，日美遷徙營早已不該再被視為一頁被淹沒的歷史。一個有趣的問題是，在距遷徙營發生的時間已經超過六十年的現在，日美遷徙營的歷史已經被說完了嗎？遷徙營的題材已經耗竭了嗎？進入二十一世紀以來，關於遷徙營的研究與出版未曾稍歇，¹⁶ 似乎證明了遷徙營敘述的動能，並未隨著時間流逝、或隨著遷徙營史實愈趨完整而消滅。值得注意的是，自平反運動以

¹⁴ 參見 Adams : Gordon and Okihiro ; Adams and Miyatake 。

¹⁵ 其他紀錄片包括 Okazaki, *Unfinished Business* ; Ding ; Yasui ; Tajiri ; Tanaka 等。

¹⁶ Lawson Fusao Inada 針對日美遷徙營書寫所編纂的文集《只許手提行李》 (*Only What We Could Carry*) 在千禧年出版。延續平反運動以來對美國種族主義的批判，企圖更全面地還原二戰期間日美遷徙營史實的著述還有 Kashima : Hayashi 等。另外，口述歷史、遷徙營中的攝影與手工藝創作的介紹與討論也引起更多注意，代表著作如 Hirasuna, Hinrichs, and Heffernan : Dusselier 。

來，重建日裔美國身份認同一直是遷徙營敘述的思考核心。這樣對族裔身份政治的重視，一個不能忽視的原因，當然是七〇年代末期崛起的遷徙營平反運動，主要即受到六〇年代美國少數族裔民權運動、以及七〇年代亞美文學與文化運動的影響。換句話說，將遷徙營敘述的重心放在日美族裔政治之上，是特定歷史情境下的產物——是遷徙營創傷記憶回返，與全球後殖民社會運動及美國族裔運動相遇，衍生而成的論述模式。持續不斷重覆這樣的論述模式，是否反而限制了遷徙營的歷史衝擊力？什麼樣的敘述視角可以讓遷徙營的論述動能由少數族裔政治，渲染至更大的國家、甚至跨國範疇？

辛普森（Caroline Chung Simpson）2001年的著作《缺席的存在：戰後美國文化裡的日裔美國人，1945-1960》（*An Absent Presence: Japanese Americans in Postwar American Culture, 1945-1960*），針對現存的遷徙營敘述，進行了敏銳的反思。辛普森在書中開宗明義點出日美遷徙營敘述的矛盾：遷徙營研究與著述資料之豐富，使遷徙營幾乎成爲亞美論述裡最常被討論的一個單一歷史事件；然而，在美國戰後的主流政治與文化論述中，遷徙營歷史卻經常是缺席的。辛普森援引傅柯（Michel Foucault）《性史第一冊》（*The History of Sexuality, Volume 1*）的主要論點，即話語論述的消音力量，來支撐自己的看法：表面上容許進入論述，但其實「說」，相較於強制緘默的壓抑不給說，是更有效的記憶箝制手段。就日美遷徙營敘述的例子而言，看似欣欣向榮的出版與研究狀況，可能反而遮掩了遷徙營事件在美國國家記憶中缺席的事實。更清楚的說，遷徙營的歷史是被說出來了，但僅止於在日美（或亞美）少數族裔社群政治的範疇裡，在美國國家記憶的層次上，這段歷史卻是被輕描淡寫地略過。遷徙營對日美社群身份認同的影響力已經被廣泛討論了，但是遷徙營歷史對美國戰後政治社會造成的衝擊力，用辛普森的話來說，卻是「令

人驚訝地乏人問津」(a surprising lack of discussion; 2): 看似「存在」(presence), 其實是「缺席」的(absent)。

同樣關懷日美遷徙營再現的問題, 陳福仁與游素玲在〈重繪美國西南: 從空間詩學探討日裔文學的集中營書寫〉(2006)中則由空間政治的角度, 呼籲日裔作家「重新審視美國西南」, 還原遷徙營敘述於具體地域(44)。¹⁷ 辛普森在美國戰後文化裡找尋遷徙營歷史影響力的證據, 陳福仁與游素玲則將注意力轉到遷徙營的敘事模式與結構, 分析其帶來的限制。兩人指出, 著名的日美遷徙營文學作品, 諸如大久保的《第 13660 號居民》、休斯登夫婦的《再會了, 曼澤納》、還有內田的《托帕茲之旅》(*Journey to Topaz*; 1986) 等一系列有關遷徙營的創作, 無不都是以直線時間鋪陳為主軸, 記述遷徙營發生「『之前』、『期間』、與『之後』——也就是強調『家園』、『集中營』、『返回』先後次序的時間架構」(47)。這樣「透過語言將拘留經驗轉換成一個有順序、意義的敘事形式」, 或者有填補創傷, 彌補歷史斷裂感的功用, 但卻忽略了日美社群在遷徙營所在地複雜的生活面向, 遷徙營所在的美國西南也因此淪為日美社群發展中「純粹的背景或舞台」, 一個「既『遙遠』又『抽象』的空間」(48)。陳和游還指出, 在這樣的敘述架構中, 遷徙營往往被理解為一段已經成為過去的歷史, 雖然傷痛, 雖然對美國種族主義與二戰期間所受的不平等待遇表示憤懣, 但是事件可以被畫上句點, 歷史可以由這段錯誤的陰霾中走出, 迎向未來。這令人想起, 吉妮·休斯登曾在《再會了, 曼澤納》的前言中提及, 面對朋友指出遷徙營歷史早已蓋棺論定, 是個「死的事件」(a dead issue)時, 她要反問: 「有多少人曉得遷徙營真正的狀況? 人們頂多把那想成集中營, 然後腦子裡浮現的是波蘭或西伯利亞集中營的影象」

¹⁷ 關於陳/游的論點, 亦見於其英文論文, 參見 Chen and Yu。

(ix)。相較於其朋友想像裡的遷徙營，休斯登夫婦筆下的曼澤納遷徙營也許更為寫實。但是，若借用陳與游的觀點，我們會說，休斯登夫婦其實也未必就已經成功地讓遷徙營的歷史「活」了起來。《再會了，曼澤納》的直線敘述結構將遷徙營收束於歷史的過去，抽象化的空間又將遷徙營由具體的美國西南國家地理舞台抽離。

辛普森和陳福仁／游素玲檢討遷徙營敘述的出發點與論述目的或者不盡相同，卻不約而同注意到現存遷徙營論述的侷限性。更仔細地觀察，兩篇著作在論點的推演中，都暗示了遷徙營記憶跨界的重要性：辛普森希望能在美國冷戰時期的國家政治與政策裡，找到遷徙營歷史的痕跡；她想做的是促成遷徙營歷史在時間上的跨界。談遷徙營歷史，時間並不一定要侷限在遷徙營發生的 1942 至 1946 年，¹⁸ 遷徙營的影響力可以滲透到戰後、到冷戰時期、到民權運動時期、到亞洲崛起的八〇年代、甚至到全球勢力重新盤整的二十一世紀。陳／游的論文在意的，則是遷徙營記憶在空間上能否滲入美國西南，亦即遷徙營記憶在空間上的跨界。更明確的說，遷徙營不應該被侷限為只是日裔社群內部的記憶，不應該只在日裔社群之中被傳遞，更不應該視日裔社群（的崩解與重建）為記憶唯一關懷的空間。事實上，由十個遷徙營分佈的所在地來看，遷徙營不只將原本聚居美國太平洋西岸的日裔居民帶入了美國的西南（有六座遷徙營），還帶他們進入美國西北內陸的愛達荷州以及懷俄明州（各一座遷徙營），以及位於美國南方阿肯色州（有兩座遷徙營）。¹⁹ 二戰結束之後，因為原本

¹⁸ 1946 年 3 月，最後一座遷徙營 Tule Lake Relocation Center 關閉。

¹⁹ 十座遷徙營當中，位居美國西南的是猶他州 Topaz、亞歷桑納州 Colorado River 及 Gila River、科羅拉多州 Granada、加州 Manzanar 以及 Tule Lake；另外，座落於愛達荷州的是 Minidoka，在懷俄明州有 Heart Mountain；阿肯色州兩座遷徙營則分別是 Rohwer 以及 Jerome。

的家園已經殘破或是不復存在，更由於西岸社會持續瀰漫著對日裔人士的敵意，許多日美成員選擇移居美國中西部或東部；還有一些日美成員迫於經濟壓力與工作難求，成為浪跡於美國內陸各州的遷徙勞工。一方面，具有單一地緣特色、生活方式較為統一的日美社群隨著二戰發生崩解了，但是從另一個角度來看，日美社群並未真正消失，而是離散為多元的、發生在美國不同角落、與不同族裔與群體互動的地方居民。小野（Kent A. Ono）將諸如此類因政治與文化迫害，反而衍生出的新社群與社會關係描述為一種「悲劇性的反諷」（tragic irony）：「對日美成員而言，集中營的經驗提供了情境，讓之前想像不到的社群得以發展——成員離散，然後在美國政府控管的不同社會空間裡重新組織——從而衍生社會和政治脈絡」（133）。換言之，遷徙營的悲劇性與破壞力雖無庸置疑，但是由這樁悲劇性的歷史延伸出來的衝擊力，卻促成了日裔成員的空間逾越，足以創造新的社會與政治脈絡。再回到陳／游對具體化遷徙營空間的呼籲，我們應該可以進一步主張，遷徙營的空間要具體化，首要之務正是要破除遷徙營歷史屬於單一族裔，並侷限於單一社群想像的迷思。

簡言之，不管是辛普森所希望的，亦即在戰後美國的政治和政策中找到遷徙營歷史「存在」的痕跡，或是如陳福仁／游素玲所呼籲的，希望將遷徙營歷史寫入美國西南，兩者由不同面向，都希望延展遷徙營記憶的時空外延性，跨越族裔政治界線，讓長久以來侷限於少數族裔政治的遷徙營敘述，變得更加活絡。筆者還認為，像辛普森或陳／游這樣的論述方式，其實正逐漸改變遷徙營敘述的重心和模式，從把遷徙營當作一樁有固定時空的歷史事件，轉而重視遷徙營歷史的創傷結構。仔細推敲，視遷徙營為一樁時空與史實確鑿的歷史事件，與著眼於遷徙營歷史的創傷結構，會引領出兩種不一樣的歷史敘述模式與倫理。前者在時間觀上保留了直線時間概念，區隔過去、現在、和未來；敘述歷史是

一個不斷由歷史的現在回到過去挖掘史實的過程，一個訴求寫實的再現政治。後者的創傷敘事則意在跳出再現政治的侷限，將更多注意力轉移至歷史創傷帶來的衝擊力。除此之外，創傷記憶反覆出現，指向多元時間點的結構，也提供了歷史研究一種新的時間觀。

根據當代創傷理論，創傷的形成或可歸因於歷史外在事件巨大的衝擊力，但是要了解創傷運作的方式，就不能忽視創傷的結構。創傷不只指涉外在事件，更重要的是，創傷的精神結構（*psychic structure*）如何改變遭逢創傷之群體或個人與現實的關係。卡露思認為，從最早甄奈特（*Pierre Janet*）及佛洛伊德的創傷研究開始，創傷就不只是一種病狀（*pathology*），而是一道「精神與現實關係的謎題」（*Unclaimed Experience* 91）。創傷除了造成個人或群體的驚嚇、不知所措和不能言語的反應，還在事件發生之後反覆出現，成爲一種穿越時空的歷史殘留，不斷騷擾現實與認知的界線。用拉卡柏的話來說，創傷「雖然和特定事件相關，卻無法被收束爲發生於特定時間的單一事件。創傷指涉經驗中粉碎性的中斷或休止，其效應延後出現」（186）。卡露思也強調創傷不應僅被理解爲發生在過去一時一地的歷史事件：「創傷的效應正來自於其與時遞延的特性，其拒絕被侷限於一地，以及其堅持跨越單一時空疆界，反覆現身」（*Trauma* 9）。她還指出，「創傷既顯示一樁事件反覆的傷害力，也一次又一次超越事件發生的時空」（*Trauma* 10）。解讀創傷、書寫創傷，因此既是對特定歷史事件的關注，也提供了一個過程，戲劇化地聯繫起不同時空。創傷斡旋者的職責並不僅在於回到過去以還原創傷事件原委，而是要延展創傷穿越時空的效應，連接事件發生的彼時與詮釋事件的此時，避免歷史經驗的孤立。卡露思主張：「要傾聽創傷帶來的危機，就不只是要聽得見事件，而是要聽得見創傷倖存者如何透過言語見證再出發。換句話說，創傷治療者（*analyst*）

面臨的真正挑戰，是如何在聽見之後再出發」（10）。

討論創傷敘事，一般最常被指出來的難題，是「再現創傷」（representing trauma）這個舉動本身無可避免的矛盾與不可能。本文前一個部分已經提過，創傷總是「來得太早」，而歷史學者與文化評論者總是「看見得太晚」。我們還可以再補充說，分析與評論者其實不只是看見得太晚，而且都沒有辦法看見、或說得恰到好處。而之所以「沒有辦法看見、或說得恰到好處」，正因為創傷總是快過言語：往往是創傷推動語言，而語言卻無法完全收編創傷。凱普蘭曾以親身走過九一一事件之後紐約街頭的經驗，生動地描述在馬路上，屬於庶民之混雜的、零散的、不斷在流動的創傷反應，那和新聞媒體極力想鋪陳的宏觀的、統一的論述形成強烈對比：前者難以用任何論述概括，而後者卻極力想用穆斯林世界對美國資本主義與帝國威權之反撲來解釋九一一恐怖攻擊（詳見 Kaplan 15-17）。華勒絲（Isabelle Wallace）也關注創傷與再現之間互為矛盾的關係。在〈創傷再現〉（“Trauma as Representation”；2006）一文的緒論裡，她指出一般人討論創傷再現，總容易落入兩個互相對立的理論爭辯中，要不是認為應該用論述框架去收編創傷效應，要不就是主張創傷根本無法再現。不過，華勒絲緊接著問，「可是所謂再現創傷真的就只是再現嗎？……擺在眼前的事實難道還不夠清楚，其實某些再現本身也是創傷事件？」（4）。說得更明白一點，當「再現」不再只是「再現」，而是具備創傷結構與感染力的另一個創傷事件，歷史書寫／文化評論和創傷的關係就跳出了寫實與否的老問題。其實，一旦在認知上擺脫了寫實主義的桎梏，創傷快過語言、拒絕服膺再現邏輯的特質，正好讓人得以逃脫語言和論述的霸權。舉例而言，班涅特從藝術創作的角度，就力主創傷藝術跳出奉寫實主義為圭臬的再現政治，轉而將注意力放在創傷動能（affective dynamic）的延展：我們需要一種藝術，「反應過程——一種進

入語言的過程——而不是反應創傷敘事的內容」；如此，「我們將不再依據藝術再現既存情境與徵狀的能力來評價藝術，而是讓藝術成爲主體，訴說創傷引爆的、活生生的經驗與記憶」（2）。傳統的創傷藝術，或被要求具有傷痕治癒功能，或被期待要能記錄、還原現實。班涅特則思索著如何建立一種藝術，讓創傷能在時空中延展，盡情說話，也因此豐富語言表意的可能性。前者關注的重點是創傷受害者的療癒，後者則在關注受害者之餘，更致力於創傷經驗的傳衍，讓創傷不只對事件當事人有意義，而是跨世代與族群的情感與認知遺產。

《黑岩喋血記》

延續班涅特的思路，我們要問，什麼樣的遷徙營敘述策略可以讓遷徙營歷史的衝擊力不斷外延？如何在論述與批評創傷經驗的過程中，創造不同歷史時空的相遇？歷史創傷的後延時間如何可以被挪用爲歷史敘述與文化批判的時間？而怎樣的批評模式又可能爲歷史創造直線時間之外的時間層次？在這一個部分，筆者想分析五〇年代好萊塢影片《黑岩喋血記》，更具體地說明遷徙營作爲創傷核心，其跨界與時延的力量。選擇《黑岩喋血記》作爲討論文本的理由有二。第一，不同於大多數以遷徙營爲題材的電影，《黑岩喋血記》並不以遷徙營中發生了什麼爲敘事重點，也不以日美成員爲影片中的主要角色。這部電影以美國西南亞歷桑納州的黑岩（Black Rock）小鎮爲背景，在觸及遷徙營歷史的同時兜了個圈子，搬演遷徙營事件發生之前、之後、與側邊小鎮上白人的故事，卻也因此展現了日美二戰創傷經驗在白人社群中產生的效應及意義。其次，影片中豐富的時間意象，黑岩小鎮居民集體回憶歷史，以對話方式斡旋二戰創傷的情節，凸顯了直線式、刻度化的時間觀與創傷反覆延異之時間觀的差異，

有助於我們理解創傷時間如何介入歷史思維，進而轉化為重繪歷史之文化批判時間。

《黑岩喋血記》在形式上是一部西部懸疑片。故事發生在 1945 年二戰剛結束時，一位甫由戰場退役的白人軍人麥考迪（John Macreedy），帶著軍中日裔美籍同袍的勳章，來到了素昧平生、位居美國西南沙漠地帶、人煙稀少的黑岩牛仔小鎮，想要將勳章交給同袍的父親駒古（Komako），²⁰ 從而揭露了駒古遭黑岩鎮民謀害的歷史。《黑岩喋血記》可以被解讀為一部揭發美國西部小鎮種族主義歷史的電影。電影塑造了一位白人英雄麥考迪，重申美國維護種族正義的決心。麥考迪的二戰退役軍人身份，在二戰甫結束的時空背景中為遭受種族主義私刑的日美族群伸張正義，剛好也能呼應美國從參與二戰一直到影片發行的 1954 年冷戰時期，亟欲建立的民主、反共國際形象。啓人疑竇的是，《黑岩喋血記》雖以揭發一段牽涉日美二戰經驗的種族事件為中心，電影從頭到尾卻沒有出現任何一位日美角色的影像：在義大利戰場拯救過麥考迪生命的駒古之子在電影開始之前已經陣亡，駒古本人在 1941 年珍珠港事變發生隔日，即遭鎮上的白人民史密斯（Reno Smith）射殺，而他曾居住的「泥磚居」（Adobe Flat）遭縱火之後，在影片中呈現的是一片廢墟，僅存一口深井以及些許野花。日裔美國人的影像在影片中全面缺席，讓人懷疑《黑岩喋血記》是不是只是圖個方便，借道取用了日美社群二戰

²⁰ 現存英文文獻多將此名記為“Komoko”（コモコ），片中演員的發音也的確是“Komoko”；不過，影片字幕出現的卻是“Komako”（コマコ）。相關討論見 <http://www12.plala.or.jp/dannys_den/00_151_200.htm>（2010 年 4 月 11 日登入）。本文採用「駒古」（Komako），主要是因為“Komako”作為日文姓氏較“Komoko”常見，而有關《黑岩喋血記》的日文討論也有採用“Komako”漢字「駒古」的範例（參見 <<http://movie.goo.ne.jp/movies/PMVWKP6813/story.html>> 以及 <<http://movie.walkerplus.com/mv6800/>>：皆 2010 年 4 月 11 日登入）。感謝台師大英語系校友陳秀雲小姐與美國華盛頓大學比較文學研究所森田禎（Maki Morita）小姐提供資料與建議。

遭受迫害的經驗，藉以懲處像史密斯這樣的「少數」種族主義者，儀式性地確立美國為堅持種族平權正義的國家。²¹ 黃色面孔在影片中缺席，只留下一枚沒有膚色、抹除文化差異的作戰徽章，正好諭示種族印記由美國國家歷史中消失。這樣的讀法，暴露了《黑岩喋血記》在處理種族議題上的矛盾：電影表面檢討種族主義，骨子裡卻是利用好萊塢為媒介，再一次將日美社群與歷史影像更徹底地推擠到銀幕之外。

的確，從還原遷徙營史實、或強化日美族裔身份認同的角度來看，《黑岩喋血記》肯定不夠稱職。然而，從啟動遷徙營創傷結構的角度來看，筆者認為《黑岩喋血記》不從日美個人的觀點或影像出發，而去刻劃「驅逐日美人」這件事對一個美國西南牛仔小鎮所引發的創傷效應，或許反而開闢了遷徙營敘述另一條思考的脈絡。電影一開始，謀害駒古已經是四年前的事，二次大戰也已經結束了，黑岩卻還沒有走出種族傾軋的陰霾。借用拉卡柏對創傷情境的描述，黑岩這四年來可以說一直處於一種「經驗粉碎性中斷與休止」的創傷狀態之中（186）：拒絕提起過去、拒絕面對種族主義罪行，拒絕回憶，也因此無法進入敘述之流與未來時間。當麥考迪搭乘的火車在黑岩停下來時，黑岩居民無不驚惶不知所以，因為這是四年來第一次有火車在黑岩停下來，也就是四年來第一次有外來者進入黑岩。黑岩自絕於美國地理空間與歷史時間之外的用意非常明顯：為了不讓鎮上居民有機會向外界走漏殺害駒古的罪行，連接外部世界的電話線被切斷了，電報必須過濾，麥考迪在親身造訪黑岩之前，寄來詢問駒古的信函當然

²¹ 影片中，麥考迪曾耐人尋味的說過一句話：「像黑岩這樣的城鎮在美國並不多，但是有一個已經夠了。」這句話有效地強化麥考迪嫉惡如仇的正義形象：即使黑岩的故事在美國歷史中只是特例，美國人仍必須——而且如麥考迪一般義無反顧地——正視種族議題。問題是，像黑岩這樣的城鎮在美國真的不多嗎？麥考迪這句話反映的，不正是美國主流社會亟欲將種族主義視為文化特例，以化解一般大眾日常生活中種族焦慮的自我蒙蔽之辭？

也全被退還。從精神分析的觀點來看，四年以來黑岩一直處在一種類似精神病（psychosis）的狀態，自我封閉，自成威權系統，拒絕與外在現實對話，為的正是抗拒創傷揮之不去、與時遞延的焦慮。射殺駒古、並要求大家噤聲的史密斯掌握鎮上絕對的論述權威，連鎮上理當負責執法的警官提姆（Tim Horn）也聽命於他。麥考迪第一次走進提姆掌管的警局，發現提姆竟睡臥在拘留囚犯的鐵柵之後。警官自我貶低到囚犯的位置，說明了黑岩是一個自我封閉到連律法都進不來的世界。

麥考迪的到來，重啓了黑岩的時空流動性。《黑岩喋血記》一開始就以一系列長達一分半鐘的火車疾行鏡頭，極具象徵意味地呈現影片空間與時間穿越的主題。電影一開始，畫面呈現遠方一列疾駛的列車，穿越一大片看似浩瀚無垠、超越時間與歷史的美國西南荒漠。在大空間中列車一開始小得微不足道，但緊接著幾個攝影機角度切換，列車或是由畫面遠方朝著前方疾駛而來，或是由畫面左下角朝右上方遠馳而去，攝影鏡頭或是鳥瞰、或是水平、或是仰拍，還有好幾秒鐘鏡頭跟著列車頭水平後搖，創造列車迎面而來的壓迫感。《黑岩喋血記》這一系列火車鏡頭創造出來的時間效果，當然已經不只是電影誕生初期盧米埃兄弟（Auguste Lumière and Louis Lumière）用《火車進站》（*L'Arrivée d'un Train en Gare de la Ciotat*）短片希望抓住的時間連續性。

《黑岩喋血記》開場的火車鏡頭不只呈現時間流動，更重要的是透過鏡頭角度不斷的切換，改變列車與畫面背景的相對速度。火車疾行在這裡創造的不是刻度化、單一方向的穩定時間，而是一個不穩定的節奏、不確定的方向，以擾亂觀影者對時間與空間的感覺。列車從一開始作為美國西南荒漠景觀的一部份，變成侵入景觀，無從收束於景觀，由左至右、由後向前、由左下朝右上、或由左上朝右下等四處竄爬，不斷逃離銀幕框界的一股力量。這一系列的火車畫面結束於火車汽笛響起，車速減緩，火車出人意

料地在黑岩車站停下來的畫面。表面上疾行火車橫馳過西南荒漠，掀起的時間躁動是暫停下來了，其實影片是把騷動與不安的情緒巧妙地移轉到了黑岩居民心理。火車停下來的同時，原本或安坐、或杵立黑岩街角，無所事事的居民們全騷動起來了。

麥考迪步下火車時，向列車服務人員表示他只計畫在黑岩停留二十四小時。列車服務人員打趣回道，「在這種地方待二十四小時，跟過一輩子大概沒兩樣吧。」列車服務人員的意思是，在這樣一個偏遠荒涼，百無聊賴的地方，待二十四小時可會是像要熬過一輩子一樣漫長。沒想到，隨著劇情的發展漸趨緊張，麥考迪命在旦夕，想提前離開又苦無交通工具，在黑岩的二十四小時倒真是步步驚險，漫長難熬。值得注意的是，「二十四小時宛如一輩子」，不只可以用來形容麥考迪的黑岩經驗，更貼切地說出了黑岩居民在影片中經歷的時間經驗。麥考迪到來的二十四小時，不只重啓黑岩與外在的空間連繫，他鏗而不捨地追問駒古下落，讓企圖忘卻時間、擺脫記憶侵擾的黑岩鎮民不得不再一次面對那交錯著過去、現在、與未來的創傷時間。對黑岩居民而言，麥考迪帶進來的時間，不應僅僅用刻度計量的一天二十四小時計算。時間如意識流般多元與駁雜交錯的特性，隨著麥考迪穿越空間與重啓歷史記憶的「能動性」(mobility)，在黑岩居民之間蔓延開來。

黑岩居民習於在時間中停滯，在人我社會網絡中定格不動。兼任火車站長與電報收發工作的黑斯汀(Hastings)見麥考迪步下火車，第一個反應是：「我沒接到列車停站的電報，你一定是下錯站了」。而在麥考迪表示他沒弄錯車站時，黑斯汀神情緊張，充滿防衛性地問道：「你認識……，要找什麼人嗎？我是說，你要什麼？」當麥考迪提到自己想尋訪一個叫「泥磚居」的地方，並問起計程車、旅館時，黑斯汀緊張到只能擠出「沒有計程車」幾個字。麥考迪眼見黑斯汀無意提供任何資訊，兀自走向黑岩鎮

上唯一有些店家的馬路。接下來的一大段影片，就是麥考迪不顧兩名牛仔柯力（Coley Trimble）與海克特（Hector David）在旅館前的攔堵，也不管旅館負責人彼得（Pete Wirth）「沒房間了」的謊言，硬是簽名住進旅館，接著拜訪警局，到加油站向彼得的妹妹麗茲（Liz Wirth）租借吉普車，問了方向，逕自開向「泥磚居」。在這段影片中不斷出現的畫面，是停滯不動的黑岩居民在建築物裡或門廊下，窺視著四處走動的麥考迪。影片中有一幕是一向自命清高、不願涉入鎮上糾紛的維利醫生（Doc T. R. Velie Jr.），隔著旅館玻璃窗看著麥考迪大步走過。窗外的景致——高山、荒漠、巨石、黃土路、建築物、拖車等工具——還有麥考迪大步移動的身影，交織投影在玻璃窗上，在銀幕上看起來就像是由外向內，烙印在維利醫生的臉上。無獨有偶，影片中還有另一幕是史密斯率領牛仔同夥，隔著玻璃窗看著麥考迪走向警察局。這次窗外的景致投影在史密斯的臉上、身上，頓時讓他的身體邊緣與外在世界交融成一片模糊。就在此時，身後的維利醫生拋下一句，「你想他會跟警長說些什麼？」，旋即轉身而去，似乎在暗示著維利醫生不再完全聽命於史密斯，也就是黑岩以史密斯為中心的權力結構，隨著麥考迪的到來，以及外在空間（對禁閉在屋內之個人）的入侵，正在慢慢改變。史密斯比誰都還要清楚麥考迪的到來啓動了黑岩創傷的感染力，這也是為什麼他主張對麥考迪殺人滅口。影片中有一段是他反駁彼得認為麥考迪不見得能帶來危險的論調：「這傢伙像個天花帶原者。打從他來，小鎮就發起高燒、染病、病毒四散。黑斯汀發病冒汗，方寸大亂，口不擇言。維利醫生是四年來第一次對我這麼不客氣。你妹妹麗茲呢？活個笨蛋。……居然笨到借給他吉普車。而提姆這沒用的東西突然覺得自己該當起警長了……」。

麥考迪對黑岩的感染力，最清楚地體現於他與不同鎮民的對話中——他不斷地喚起鎮民們對時間流動的感知。在和旅館負責

人彼得的一席對話中，麥考迪直指彼得停滯的時間認知。麥考迪要求住房，彼得表示，「客滿了」，還不忘補充理由：「現在是1945。外頭還在打仗的。」麥考迪訝異地點出：「戰爭幾個月前結束了，不是嗎？」但是彼得顯然並不想面對「戰爭已經結束」，或時局已經改觀的現實。他堅持：「可是『物價管理局』還是在的」，²² 少於五十間客房的旅館必須定時向管理單位報告旅店的經營狀況。彼得一邊想要振振有詞，一邊不免暴露心虛，因為當他力圖辯解時，麥考迪已經隨手翻開櫃檯上的旅客登記冊，戳破了彼得「旅館已經客滿」的謊言。而彼得當然不是黑岩唯一一個寧可偷安於二戰時間與戰時邏輯的居民。警長提姆第一次碰見麥考迪時，也是自衛性甚濃地希望麥考迪或者只是路過，或者只是買賣牛隻或農產品的販客牛仔，而不是要來挑戰黑岩集體罪行的外來者。不過，在一番與麥考迪的對話之後，他已經可以當著史密斯的面，鼓起勇氣說出自己四年前沒能確實調查駒古命案原委的遺憾：「也許在麥考迪查出什麼之前，我該先著手調查。」

仔細觀察，黑岩居民的時間困境，來自於他們不敢回憶，不願去釐清四年前的種族犯行原委，只能停滯在一種無止境憂鬱與焦慮的情境內，無法讓外在世界的時間和視野進入他們的生活世界。提姆因為在事件發生當下沒能勇敢擔負法律調查的責任，自怨自艾，覺得彼時既然無法維繫法律的尊嚴，之後再做什麼都為時已晚。彼得則因為參與了迫害駒古的行動，身陷不法，唯恐東窗事發。史密斯譏笑他懦弱，不能任事，「只是遁逃的料」；史密斯的手下柯力則更挑明著說，彼得現在是想逃跑都「太遲了。他參與其中，哪兒也甬想去。」彼得的妹妹麗茲沒有參與犯行，理當是自由之身。她告訴麥考迪，自己之所以不肯離開黑岩，是

²² 「物價管理局」，即“Office of Price Administration”；影片中彼得稱之為“OPA”，是美國政府在二戰期間為平抑物價、調節物流成立的單位。運作期間是1940年5月到1946年12月。

因為不想離開彼得：「不管發生了什麼，我都要繼續待在這小鎮。這鎮上的人是我的鄰居、我的朋友」。隨著電影情節的發展，麗茲對史密斯的感情愈加明顯。觀眾可以了解，是情感的牽絆，讓麗茲覺得不管做什麼都已經「太遲」。²³ 在這裡筆者想指出，史密斯控制黑岩鎮民，靠的正是宣揚這種「太遲」的心態：創傷已然造成，做什麼都「太遲」，權宜之計當然就是緊抱史密斯（其實訛誤連連）的歷史與時間論述，以求偷安度日。就像維利醫生所說的：「他們給了一個故事，你只得相信。」可是提姆就反問：「你相信那故事嗎？」「太遲」只是藉口，是託辭。前文提過，創傷總是來得太早，總無法完整再現，但是創傷跨越時空反覆現身的特性，卻讓斡旋創傷的努力永遠不嫌遲。更準確的說，「太遲」的概念建立於過去、現在、與未來截然切割、無從逆反的理念，而創傷帶來的敘述、批判動能卻存在於創傷時間的反覆遞延。創傷雖然不能被取消或弭平，卻可以在時間中被傳衍，在對話中被傾聽，在重述的努力中產生改變歷史進行方向的力量。維利醫生最後決心要幫助麥考迪脫離險境，正因為看清楚了麥考迪的到來，是歷史給了黑岩「第二次機會」（a second chance），他們可以選擇不要讓殺人滅口的創傷在黑岩重演。

不難理解，史密斯與麥考迪交手，一開始也是希望麥考迪能接受「一切都已太遲」的想法，知難而退，放棄打聽駒古的下落。他告訴麥考迪，駒古是「日本農夫，歷史從沒給過他機會。’41年搬來，就在珍珠港事變之前。三個月後，就被送進遷徙營了。」駒古被送進遷徙營當然是謊言。史密斯編造這個故事，一來爲了

²³ 在最後關頭，麗茲選擇聽命於史密斯，出賣麥考迪，卻也因此命喪於史密斯的槍口，成了片中唯一一個真正「沒有未來」的角色。諷刺的是，史密斯曾對麥考迪指出麗茲該是「有未來」的。《黑岩喋血記》拿片中唯一的女性角色麗茲當祭品，以成就麥考迪與史密斯兩雄對決的劇情，可以從西部片以男性英雄主義爲中心的傳統來理解。受限篇幅，在此不贅論。

讓自己脫罪，二來說明駒古為何從黑岩消失。除此之外，這個謊言還反映了史密斯一廂情願的渴望，即「殺害駒古」這件事可以得到美國戰時國家政策的背書：即使自己沒殺害駒古，駒古還是會被送入遷徙營，一樣會消失不見；換句話說，自己只不過呼應美國政府，做了類似政府遲早都會做的事。不過，史密斯的說辭有兩個破綻。首先，史密斯「太早」殺了駒古：他等不及羅斯福總統的 9066 號行政命令，也等不到遷徙營建立，在珍珠港事變隔天就射殺了駒古。史密斯的作為和美國政府的政策，有三個月的時間差。而除了時間上的不一致，史密斯自編的故事不能成立，還有一個更重要的理由：駒古既然在日美太平洋戰爭爆發以前搬到位居亞歷桑納州西北、與猶他州交界附近的黑岩鎮，而亞歷桑納州只有南部被劃為美國西岸的「軍事作戰區域」（military areas），²⁴ 那麼他根本不會遭到美國政府強制遷徙。很明顯的，史密斯並不清楚遷徙營的政策與歷史。他引述遷徙營事件，企圖合理化自己的種族主義，或證明自己的作為與美國政府同步，但其實暴露了自己對外界事物的無知，以及他身處美國西南邊境、被排除於國家政治之外的事實。

深入挖掘史密斯的身份困境，了解他「痛恨日本人」表象情緒之下的精神運作機制，我們可以看見遷徙營在《黑岩喋血記》中作為託辭，日美種族創傷作為徵狀，投射出的其實是美國社會沉痾已久的階級與地域差異的問題。史密斯看起來就像是一個典型的種族主義者，口口聲聲痛恨日本人，拒絕區分日本人與日裔美國人，認為「忠誠日美人」的說法不過「是個笑話」，進而將仇視、殺害日美人的行為合理化為愛國的表現。可是《黑岩喋血記》不只透過麥考迪之口重申「忠誠日美人」不同於「邪惡日本人」的官方版政治正確修辭，還透過麥考迪和史密斯、以及麥考

²⁴ 詳見本文註釋 1。

迪和維利醫生的對話，揭發史密斯迫害駒古更深層的原因。第一、根據維利醫生，史密斯當初賣「泥磚居」給駒古，是因為這塊土地乾涸，無法耕種。史密斯想騙駒古花錢買下一塊無法耕種的土地，萬萬沒有想到，駒古竟然鏗而不捨地在這塊地上挖出了一個深達六十英尺的井，獲得了黑岩居民長久以來夢寐以求的水資源，而史密斯卻也因此對駒古嫉恨在心。第二、珍珠港事變爆發，史密斯滿懷報國熱忱，隔天一早立刻希望加入美軍，沒想到被拒絕了。史密斯在影片中僅輕描淡寫的提到，他被美軍拒絕的原因是「體格因素」(physical)，但無論如何，這個被拒絕的經驗，讓史密斯身處美國西南荒漠，無法融入美國國家政治的身份困境愈加明顯。史密斯痛恨日本人，夥同黑岩居民殺害駒古，絕對不僅僅因為他愛國，要為美國驅逐「日本／日美人」；在更大的成分上，他是將自己的邊緣性投射在駒古身上，藉由堅守種族界限，驅逐異己，以在言語和意識形態上守住自己岌岌可危的美國身份。

而一旦了解了史密斯的身份困境，就不難理解，史密斯之所以必須要強調種族分界，是因為害怕看見自己和日裔美國人在美國政治中相同的邊緣位置。影片中，史密斯有一段話論及了身處美國西南邊陲、作為國家文化中弱勢異己的無奈：「不時有人要到西部這附近找個什麼——對歷史學家而言，這裡是老西部。對作家而言，這裡是西大荒。對生意人來說，這裡是不發達的西部。大家都說我們貧窮、落後，我想也是。我們連水都不夠。但在我們自己眼中，這就是我們的西部，外面的人就請放我們一馬吧。」史密斯痛恨的其實是那些認為西部是落後、蠻荒他者，卻又不斷前來掠奪與剝削資源的外來客。駒古在太平洋戰爭爆發之前搬到黑岩，買地、掘井、耕種，擺明了要在黑岩落地生根；他並不是史密斯口中那種對西部予取予求、得了利益就打算走人的外來客。駒古或者可以成為史密斯的街坊鄰居，他的掘井與耕種技術

或許可以改善黑岩的經濟困境，但是黑岩居民一如史密斯，早就在與外在世界週旋的挫折中，失去了悅納異己的美德。²⁵ 史密斯甚至混淆了自己該痛恨的對象，將自己所遭受的地域、文化、與階級等不平等待遇，加倍複製到與自己膚色不同的日裔美國移民身上，將所有的創傷與憤懣移轉為激進的種族主義。

筆者在此試著分析黑岩種族主義的精神運作底層，說明史密斯的身份困境，當然不是要為種族主義者脫罪，更不是忽視種族主義在日美遷徙營敘述中的核心位置。筆者的用意是要指出遷徙營的歷史創傷，絕非歸咎一個過度簡化的、強調白黃對立的種族主義就能說得清楚。研究日美遷徙營敘述的學者，如田尻（Rea Tajiri）、斯特肯（Marita Sturken）、及司群馬斯（John Streamas）在閱讀《黑岩喋血記》時，多強調《黑岩喋血記》以駒古事件影射日美遷徙營的歷史，訴諸種族正義。²⁶ 這樣的讀法著眼於日美社群在二戰中集體被迫遷移以及種族主義迫害的歷史，並在指出

²⁵ 麥考迪和史密斯有一段很有趣的對話。麥考迪不解為何黑岩居民對他如此不友善，史密斯歸咎「懷疑外人」原本就是「西部傳統」；麥考迪則機靈地回答：「我一直以為西部悠久的傳統是好客睦鄰」。麥考迪的不同觀點，挑戰了史密斯的論述威權，也點出了西部的改變。史密斯與其他黑岩居民應該用心思索：是什麼樣的歷史情境與社會建制，促使西部由「悅納異己」變成「處處設防」？

²⁶ 田尻在記錄片《歷史與記憶》（*History and Memory: For Akiko and Takashige*; 1991）中穿插《黑岩喋血記》裡的對話，巧妙地鋪陳該片如何為日美社群在美國被消音滅跡的歷史立下註腳。影片中，在敘述者宣布自己「要開始尋找歷史」之後，配音響起麥考迪在《黑岩喋血記》中問及駒古下落的對話。斯特肯補充，不只黑岩小鎮的美國西南荒漠場景「像極了曼澤納遷徙營所在的荒漠」（697），整部影片「透過缺席，成功地召喚出日裔遷徙營的文化張力與美國種族的衝突狀況」（699）。司群馬斯在其專論《黑岩喋血記》的論文中進一步指出，黑岩鎮民置日美居民於死地，背後的邏輯和美國政府利用日美遷徙營，讓日美社群在極短時間內，由美國西岸銷聲匿跡的政策邏輯如出一轍，都是為了要將日美社群排除在主流歷史之外：「即使是在一個遙遠荒涼如黑岩的地方，要將一個族群排除於歷史之外，最保險的方法是讓他們消失不見」（104）。黑岩在此被理解為美國社會的縮影，瀰漫黑岩的種族主義也正投影著二戰前後瀰漫美國的種族主義。

日美影像缺席的同時，凸顯了重建與重述遷徙營具體歷史的重要性。但是，《黑岩喋血記》除了彰顯日美影像的缺席，還藉著遷徙營創傷的動力，跨界敘述了環繞著日美遷徙事件的白人經驗，刻畫了黑岩居民的記憶和救贖。而也只有在仔細分析了影片中白人的身份困境，了解其集體涉入種族罪行的創傷，我們方能了解，在遷徙營歷史的底層，以及從遷徙營敘述延展開來的，除了種族主義，還有複雜的美國階級、地域文化與政治位階差異的問題。《黑岩喋血記》透過黑岩居民斡旋創傷記憶，不僅帶來時間流動，還促成了種族界線的內爆：遷徙營反映出的美國政治問題，絕不只是美國人對峙日本人、或白種人對抗黃種人。影片不只教導我們如何區分日本人與日裔美國人，在更深的層次上還提醒我們不要視日裔美國人與白種美國人的界線為理所當然：史密斯和駒古同樣坐困美國國家地理政治的邊緣；麥考迪和駒古之子並肩在義大利作戰；而黑岩居民雖沒有親身經歷遷徙營，卻始終壟罩在日美二戰創傷的陰霾之下。真正的對立在哪裡？跨族、混族同盟真的只是無意義的空談嗎？影片的末了，維利醫生要麥考迪留下駒古之子的勳章，作為黑岩重建的精神象徵。當然，「留下徽章」這個動作容許不同的解讀方式。在這裡筆者想試著這樣理解這段情節：日美二世的二戰徽章不只對日美社群有意義；不只是日美社群可以用徽章證明自己效忠美國，進而確立自己的美國人身份，白人更需要徽章，因為日裔美國人的二戰創傷，和白人社群的歷史與記憶無從切割。遷徙營背後複雜的美國國家政治，絕非只牽涉日美社群，而是大多數美國人必須共同面對的。

在這篇論文裡，藉由對日裔美國遷徙營敘述歷史的回顧，筆者指出遷徙營敘述模式的轉變：由噤聲不說到挑戰官方論述，再由寫實訴求轉而注意遷徙營敘述可能帶來的跨越時空動能。前者意圖從歷史記憶的「缺席」中召喚出「存在」的歷史，後者則探索在歷史已然「存在」的情況之下，如何能不作繭自縛，而去為

創傷幽魂開發出更多文化批判的時空，在歷史記憶反覆出現的過程中創造機會，重繪意識型態的版圖，重建看似不相干之事件與群體的關係。筆者以《黑岩喋血記》為例，試著從這一部在表面上只是「觸及」了遷徙營歷史的好萊塢影片，挖掘遷徙營作為創傷核心，所能引導出之創傷時延與種族跨界的力量。事實上，從挖掘創傷結構的觀點來看遷徙營敘述，許多不純粹從日裔美國受難者觀點出發，也不以再現遷徙營史實為重點，但仍有觸及遷徙營歷史的文本自有其特殊價值。除了《黑岩喋血記》，亞當斯的曼澤納遷徙營攝影文集（1944）；古德森（David Guterson）的暢銷小說《雪落香杉》（*Snow Falling on Cedars*; 1994），以及由希克斯（Scott Hicks）執導的同名電影（1999）；還有伍德渥（Mary Woodward）的《護衛鄰人：華特和蜜利·伍德渥的故事》（*In Defense of Our Neighbors: The Walt and Milly Woodward Story*; 2008）等，也都是值得仔細分析的文本。或許，當我們不再以日美身份政治作為遷徙營敘述的唯一核心，也不再將抽象的種族主義當成遷徙營事件的最終成因，而去了解與搬演遷徙營事件發生之前、之後、或側邊、或周圍的故事，我們會更有效地看見遷徙營在時間和空間的流動層次中，對美國其他社群、國家歷史，甚至日、美跨國文化的衝擊力。

引用書目

- Adams, Ansel. *Born Free and Equal: Photographs of the Loyal Japanese Americans of Manzanar Relocation Center*. New York: U.S. Camera, 1944.
- , and Toyo Miyatake. *Two Views of Manzanar: An Exhibition of Photographs*. Los Angeles: Frederick S. Wight Art Gallery, UCLA, 1978.

- Bennett, Jill. *Empathic Vision: Affect, Trauma, and Contemporary Art*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2005.
- Caruth, Cathy. *Unclaimed Experience: Trauma, Narrative, and History*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1996.
- , ed. *Trauma: Explorations in Memory*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
- Chen, Fu-jen, and Su-lin Yu. “Reclaiming the Southwest: A Traumatic Space in the Japanese American Internment Narrative.” *Journal of the Southwest* 47.4 (2005): 551-70.
- Commission on Wartime Relocation of Internment of Civilians. *Personal Justice Denied: Report of the Commission on Wartime Relocation and Internment of Civilian*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1997.
- Daniels, Roger. *American Concentration Camps: A Documentary History of the Relocation and Incarceration of Japanese Americans, 1941-1945*. 9 vols. New York: Garland, 1989.
- . *Concentration Camps, North America: Japanese in the United States and Canada during World War II*. Malabar, FL: Krieger, 1981.
- Ding, Loni, dir. *Nisei Soldier: Standard Bearer for an Exiled People*. Center of Educational Telecommunications, 1984.
- Dusselier, Jane E. *Artifacts of Loss: Crafting Survival in Japanese American Concentration Camps*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2008.
- Eaton, Allen H. *Beauty behind Barbed Wire: The Arts of the Japanese in Our War Relocation Camps*. New York: Harper, 1952.
- Egami, Hatsuye. *The Evacuation Diary of Hatsuye Egami*. Pasadena, CA: Intentional Productions, 1995.
- Fukuda, Yoshiaki. *My Six Years of Internment: An Issei's Struggle for Justice*. Trans. Konko Church of San Francisco. San

- Francisco: Konkō Church of San Francisco, 1990.
- Gesensway, Deborah and Mindy Roseman. *Beyond Words: Images from America's Concentration Camps*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1987.
- Gordon, Linda and Gary Y. Okihiro, eds. *Impounded: Dorothea Lange and the Censored Images of Japanese American Internment*. New York: Norton, 2006.
- Guterson, David. *Snow Falling on Cedars*. New York: Harcourt Barce, 1994.
- Hayashi, Brian Masaru. *Democratizing the Enemy: The Japanese American Internment*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2004.
- Hicks, Scott, dir. *Snow Falling on Cedars*. Universal Studios, 1999.
- Hirasuna, Delphine, Kit Hinrichs, and Terry Heffernan. *The Art of Gaman: Arts and Crafts from the Japanese American Internment Camps, 1942-1946*. Berkeley, CA: Ten Speed, 2005.
- Houston, Jeanne Watatsuki and James D. Houston. *Farewell to Manzanar*. New York: Random, 1973.
- Ichioka, Yuji, ed. *Views from Within: The Japanese American Evacuation and Resettlement Study*. Los Angeles: Resource Development and Publication, Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, 1989.
- Inada, Lawson Fusao, ed. *Only What We Could Carry: The Japanese American Internment Experience*. Berkeley: Heyday, 2000.
- Ishigo, Estelle. *Lone Heart Mountain*. Los Angeles: Anderson, Ritchie & Simon, 1972.
- Ito, Robert. "Concentration Camp or Summer Camp?" *Mother Jones* 15 Sept. 1998. 1 Nov. 2009 <<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/1998/09/concentration-camp-or-summer-camp>>.
- Kaplan, E. Ann. *Trauma Culture: The Politics of Terror and Loss in Media and Literature*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2005.

- Kashima, Tetsuden. *Judgment without Trial: Japanese American Imprisonment during World War II*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 2003.
- LaCapra, Dominick. *Writing History, Writing Trauma*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2001.
- McWilliams, Carey. *Prejudice—Japanese-Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1944.
- Nash, Phil Tajitsu. "Michi Weglyn, 1926-1999." *Asian Week* 20.35 (19 Apr. 1999). 1 Nov. 2009 <http://asianweek.com/042999/news_weglyndies.html>.
- Okada, John. *No-No Boy*. 1957. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1995.
- Okazaki, Steven, dir. *Days of Waiting*. Farallon Films, 1988.
- . *Unfinished Business: The Japanese American Internment Case*. NAATA, 1984.
- Okubo, Miné. *Citizen 13660*. New York: Amo, 1978.
- Ono, Kent A. "Re/membering Spectators: Meditations on Japanese American Cinema." *Countervisions: Asian American Film Criticism*. Ed. Darrell Y. Hamamoto and Sandra Liu. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2000. 129-49.
- Irons, Peter. *Justice at War: The Story of the Japanese American Internment Cases*. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.
- Simpson, Caroline Chung. *An Absent Presence: Japanese Americans in Postwar American Culture, 1945-1960*. Durham: Duke UP, 2001.
- Sone, Monica. *Nisei Daughter*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1979.
- Spicer, Edward H. *Impounded People: Japanese Americans in the Relocation Centers*. 1946. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 1969.
- Streamas, John. "'Patriotic Drunk': To Be Yellow, Brave, and Disappeared in *Bad Day at Black Rock*." *American Studies* 44.1-2 (2003): 99-114.

- Sturges, John, dir. *Bad Day at Black Rock*. Turner Entertainment, 1954.
- Sturken, Marita. "Absent Images of Memory: Remembering and Reenacting the Japanese Internment." *Positions* 5.3 (1997): 687-707.
- Tajiri, Rea, dir. *History and Memory: For Akiko and Takashige*. Women Make Movies, 1991.
- Tanaka, Janice, dir. *Who's Going to Pay for These Donuts, Anyway?* Women Make Movies, 1992.
- Tateishi, John. *And Justice for All: An Oral History of the Japanese American Detention Camps*. New York: Random, 1984.
- Uchida, Yoshiko. *Desert Exile: The Uprooting of a Japanese American Family*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 1982.
- Wallace, Isabelle. "Trauma as Representation: A Meditation on Manet and Johns." *Trauma and Visuality in Modernity*. Ed. Lisa Saltzman and Eric Rosenberg. London: UP of New England, 2006. 3-27.
- Weglyn, Michi. *Years of Infamy: The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps*. New York: William Morrow, 1976.
- Woodward, Mary. *In Defense of Our Neighbors: The Walt and Milly Woodward Story*. Bainbridge Island: Bainbridge Island Japanese American Community, 2008.
- Yamada, Mitsuye. *Camp Notes and Other Poems*. San Lorenzo, CA: Shameless Hussy, 1976.
- Yamamoto, Hisaye. "The Legend of Miss Sasagawara." 1950. *Seventeen Syllables and Other Stories*. Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2001. 20-33.
- Yasui, Lisa, dir. *A Family Gathering*. New Day Films, 1988.
- 陳福仁、游素玲。〈重繪美國西南：從空間詩學探討日裔美國文學裡的集中營書寫〉。《中外文學》35.1（2006年6月）：41-57。

This essay examines *Dream Jungle's* intervention into the imaginary configuration of the Philippines. Lacan's elaboration on "purloin" prompts a reading of the Philippines as not simply "stolen" by imperialism but "prolonged"—via Hagedorn's fictional creativity—into a community evolving through imperial intrusions, translocal displacements, and encounters.

The Remains of Empire and the "Purloined" Philippines: Jessica Hagedorn's *Dream Jungle*

HSIU-CHUAN LEE

Jessica Hagedorn's third novel, *Dream Jungle*, derives primarily from two events that took place in the Philippines during the 1970s: the discovery of the Tasaday tribe and the filming of *Apocalypse Now*.¹ Upon seeing the obituary of Manuel (Manda) Elizalde Jr., the "discoverer" and "protector" of the Tasaday in 1997, Hagedorn decided to juxtapose these two events in a novel, not in order to pass judgment on the anthropological discovery (or fraud) or on Francis Ford Coppola's epic film, but, in her own words, "to capture moments in time": "these really interesting events all come together between 1971 and 1977. I just really wanted to capture the decadence and turbulence of it, the scholarly back-and-forth about it, the arguments, the mysteries, and sheer excitement" (Aguilar-San Juan 6). To what extent Hagedorn successfully "captured" these moments of the Philippines, in what way, and what this might contribute to the conception of the Philippines in relation to its imperial legacies are questions pertaining to the larger issue of the relationship between literature and nation-building.

The affinity between literature and the making of the Philippine nation can be traced back to the writings of José Rizal during the Spanish colonial era. Featuring social commentaries that inspired collective dissent against Spanish authorities, Rizal's writings have been considered foundational to the rise of Philippine national consciousness and taken as models for "the Great Filipino Novel" during the American colonization period (Gonzalez 962). Hagedorn's novels, however, deviate from this nationalist tradition. Born in the Philippines, Hagedorn moved to San Francisco with her family in 1963, and has since maintained a double affiliation with both the United States and the Philippines (Hagedorn, "Exile" 181). Her position as an expatriate Filipina accounts for her ambiguous relationship with the nationalist project of the Philippines. Her postmodern writing strategy, as demonstrated in her first novel *Dogeaters*, is further manifested in *Dream Jungle*: the mixture of real-life and fictitious elements, disjointed narrating voices, and gossip-driven fragmentary style distinguish her work from the realistic appeal and epic scope of nationalist writings.

Given the inadequacy of trying to understand Hagedorn's writings based on a narrowly defined "national allegory," this essay sets out in search of another model to characterize literature's engagement with nation. Of pertinence is Neferti Xina M. Tadiar's attention to literature's non-realistic experimental power. In *Things Fall Away*, Tadiar proposes to look to literature not "for typicality or representable realities," but for its "creative possibility" that "recasts lived experience so that it no longer takes the form of incontrovertible social fact but instead takes on the experimental character of literature itself" (17). Moreover, she associates this creative force with literature's capability to capture "historical experiences that 'fall away' from global capitalist and nation-state narratives of development as well as from social movement narratives of liberation" (5). Literature is compared to "cultural software" (16) that processes the subaltern, the supplementary, and the diminished—experiences exceeding and escaping the structure of the imperialist, the nationalist, and the social liberationist—with a view to making "other social relations available as potential bases of new political movements" (11).

Tadiar does not include Hagedorn in her discussion. Yet Hagedorn's attempt to appropriate historical events into fictional juxtaposition and imaginative transposition makes *Dream Jungle* a tangible example of what Tadiar describes as literature's "tangential" engagement with the Philippine "hegemonic and counterhegemonic forms of political agency" (5). In fact, the title "dream jungle" resonates with Tadiar's emphasis on the force of "dreams" in structuring social realities (*Fantasy* 22-24). To grasp the mechanism and consequences of Hagedorn's "dreams," this essay draws on the idea of "stealing," more precisely "purloining," to comprehend *Dream Jungle's*

imaginative intervention into the configuration of the Philippines. I allude to the concept of “stealing/purloining” at three levels. First, the national status of the Philippines has been “stolen” by imperial forces not only during the years of colonization but also after the Philippines has formerly declared independence. Second, the Philippine archipelago has been known for its thieves that constitute a perpetual, albeit marginalized, “banditry” force against colonial control (Ileto 115-16). Being aware of and weaving these two “stealing” forces into her text, Hagedorn demonstrates her resistance to both imperial ideology and nationalist constraint by further “purloining” a striking moment of Philippine “neo-coloniality” in her novel. Jacques Lacan’s reading of Edgar Allan Poe’s “The Purloined Letter,” which elaborates “purloining” not simply as “stealing” but as “prolonging” and “extending” through displaced social relations and shifting discursive structure, offers a critical light to see the Philippines as not simply stolen by empirical forces, but rather “prolonged”—extended—through a complex series of imperial intrusions, translocal displacements, and encounters.

The constitution of the Philippines has been inseparable from its colonial histories. The result of three centuries of Spanish colonization, a half-century of American rule, and the Japanese occupation during World War II, the Philippines and its people, in the words of Vicente L. Rafael, are “permeated with foreign origins, their historical realities haunted by the ghosts of colonialism” (9). In the 1970s, the Philippines still struggled under the remains of empire. Not only did the Marcos government rely heavily on the United States’ monetary and military assistance, but Philippine society was permeated by imported Western media and commodities. Also part of this “imperial haunting,” though less obvious than the neo-colonial presence of the West, is the fact that the idea and contour of the Philippine “nation” is itself an imperial inheritance. First, it was Spanish rule that gave the initially disparate islands a cartographical unity, not to mention that the archipelago was named after King Philip II of Spain. Besides, American imperialism, under the guise of benevolent tutelage, instilled in Philippine national formation a “mimicry” nature. Nationalism became an ideal because it was taken as a norm of modernization, a sign of civilization.

The complicity of imperialism and Philippine nationalism vividly played out in the events of the *Tasaday* and *Apocalypse Now*. Claimed for a time as a previously unknown “Stone Age” tribe discovered in the remote Mindanao rain forest in 1971, the *Tasaday* became an overnight sensation, its images widely distributed to an international audience, most notably through NBC News, *National Geographic’s* pictorial report, and journalist John Nance’s best-seller *The Gentle Tasaday*. Yet the discovery also raised questions and doubts. Elizalde, the alleged “discoverer” of the *Tasaday* and

the head of the Private Association for National Minorities (PANAMIN), strictly regulated outsiders' entry into the rain forest. In 1972 Marcos ordered a 46,299-acre patch of jungle closed as a reserve for the Tasaday, and public access to the tribe was completely forbidden after 1974. Immediately after the overthrow of the Marcos regime in 1986, the Tasaday again grabbed international attention, this time no longer as the anthropological find of the century, but as an elaborate hoax perpetrated by PANAMIN and the Marcos administration. The question of whether the Tasaday formed an isolated, cave-dwelling Palaeolithic group or were local people hired to portray the ultraprimitive has since become a matter of debate in the field of anthropology, in the media, and among politicians.²

In hindsight it becomes clear that it is too reductive to try to prove that the Tasaday were either genuine or fake. Since its beginning, the Tasaday event has been more than an anthropological inquiry into a tribal minority. At stake was the complicity between the Marcos administration, the United States government, and the global media. First, the discovery of the primitive tribe, and the ensuing Philippine governmental policy to protect the tribespeople, effectively bolstered the "human face" of the Marcos administration and distracted international attentions from the martial law declared in 1972 (Hamilton-Paterson). Second, by proclaiming a reserve around the Tasaday, Marcos might secure, in the name of protecting minor tribes, his and Elizalde's "exclusive rights" to the natural resources of the area (Berreman 31). Most essentially, the Tasaday as a "pure" Filipino indigenous group "untouched by all foreign influences" was utilized as "a rallying point for cultural supernationalists" (Lynch and Llamzon 12). Marcos and Imelda were known for their fascination with anthropology and tribal Filipinos: they were "obsessed with the search for a common Filipino identity, a link with an ur-Filipino" (Hemley 83). The idyllic image of the "gentle Tasaday" that lived in "a Garden of Eden" (Lindbergh ix), with no hunting skills and no concept of war, became the perfect embodiment of the nation—"the ideal 'Filipinitude'" needed for conceiving a Philippine identity free from the archipelago's long-term colonial history (Dumont 265).

Ironically, the construction and distribution of this "ur-Filipino" image of the Tasaday was largely the work of Western media. Known and usually criticized for his "hunger for publicity" (Hemley 36), his taking press as "more important than the scientists" (39), Elizalde brought news crews and celebrities such as the aviator Charles Lindbergh and the Italian actress Gina Lollobrigida into the rain forest, generating a "media rush": "A television crew had already arrived, soon followed by a myriad of snapshotters, newshounds, special correspondents and free-lancers of all varieties" (Dumont 263). Or, as Robin Hemley describes, "by 1972 camera crews had chopped

in with dizzying frequency to the Tasaday's forest enclave, reporters sometimes outnumbering the small group of cave dwellers" (7). Displacing anthropological studies, journalists' languages dominated the scene and reduced the Tasaday to sellable images and recognizable icons.³

In addition to being fodder for international media, the Tasaday also appealed to American interests in Asia. Jean-Paul Dumont observes that the whole publicity of the event took "American opinion" as "the intended target" (266). Not only was the Tasaday cast as the United States' humble, self-satisfied, and peace-loving Asian other in contrast to the war-mongering Vietcong, but Dumont also notes the temporal synchronization of the discovery of the Tasaday and the American intervention in Vietnam: "Elizalde encountered the Tasaday for the first time on June 7, 1971. Then, on June 13, 1971, the *New York Times* began publishing the 'Pentagon Papers,' which unveiled the plans of the American intervention in Vietnam. In March and April of 1972, when the American reporters were at work on Mindanao among the Tasaday, the aerial bombing of North Vietnam was about to be resumed [...] In 1975, Nance's book was published, the year when South Vietnam fell, an event the American public witnessed on television." The media's representation of the two events fed on each other so well that Dumont claims that there was "more than a mere coincidence" (267). The United States government welcomed the news of the Tasaday for diplomatic and military strategic reasons. First, the news of the Tasaday diverted the world's attention from the ongoing unrest in the Philippines, which would otherwise bear witness to the failure of American tutelage. Second, given the fact that the Philippines had turned into an ally of the United States in the latter's military venture in Vietnam, "domestic unrest in the Philippines looked almost as bad for Washington as for Marcos" because the United States needed the Philippines to be "a loyal, stable aircraft carrier moored within easy reach of Vietnam" (Hamilton-Paterson).

The media's Tasaday zeal faded after 1975. The same year witnessed the end of the Vietnam War. The Philippines nonetheless remained a part of the American popular imagination, this time most dramatically through the archipelago's collusion with Hollywood in the filming of *Apocalypse Now*. The helicopters in this American film were provided by Marcos himself. The monetary deal between Coppola and Marcos is described in *Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker's Apocalypse*, a documentary by Eleanor Coppola: "The production will pay the military thousands of dollars per day, as well as overtime for the Philippine pilots. In return Francis can use Marcos's entire fleet of helicopters as long as they are not needed to fight the communist insurgency in the South." This deal underscored the Philippines' subsidiary position vis-à-vis the billion-dollar Hollywood industry. The fact that the president's helicopters were

instruments of both domestic political cleansing and imperial cultural invasion pushes one further to comprehend these as two sides of the same coin.

For Americans, the Philippines proved a convenient extension of their Hollywood film studio. The archipelago provided the backdrop, the props, and its people as cheap extras. A cinematic adaptation of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness*, *Apocalypse Now* is known for its brilliant conjunction of Conrad's critique of European imperialism in Africa and the questioning of the American military intervention in Vietnam. One irony, however, is that the film and Eleanor Coppola's documentary reflect little on their own participation in the American imperial project in the Philippines. As Amy Kaplan points out, "Coppola might be seen to counter American exceptionalism, by scripting the war through Conrad's text, and placing the Vietnam War in relation to the history of European imperialism. The documentary on the making of the film, however, which stands awkwardly between an exposé and a publicity reel, refuses recognition of the film's complicity with the imperial context that enables its production" (18).

The Coppolas's criticism of American imperialism has its limits. It illustrates what Alan Punzalan Isaac observes as the "unrecognizability of the Filipino and the Philippines" in the American racial and imperial imaginary (xvi). Indeed, the Coppolas not only remained silent about the American imperial history in the Philippines, but also rendered the archipelago invisible by figuring it as a geographical substitute for Vietnam/Cambodia. This invisibility, at first sight, is very different from the hyper-visibility the Tasaday discovery gave to the Philippine indigene. A careful scrutiny of the two events nonetheless reveals that both Hollywood and the Western media were self-serving in representing the Philippines. As Coppola transformed, through cinematic power, the intractable Philippine landscape into a scenic jungle highlighted by special napalm explosion effects, the media involved in the Tasaday controversy reduced the archipelago's indigenous cultures to simplistic signs and one-dimensional identities.

Weaving the Tasaday discovery and the filming of *Apocalypse Now* into *Dream Jungle*, Hagedorn is fully aware of the imperialism evoked by the two events. *Dream Jungle* tackles the ugly side of imperial forces. Created after the image of Elizalde, Zamora López de Legazpi is a colonizer, albeit a belated and ambivalent one. He is known for his bad reputation as a playboy, mixing with different women and wielding power with money inherited from his father. The President in the novel, moreover, is a cruel and calculating politician, who enjoys "silly TV shows" and continues to "believe in the democratic process," despite the corruption of his government and the unrest of

society (56). Like the real-life Marcos, he turns Zamora's discovery of the Taobo (read: "Tasaday") into "a public-relations coup" by establishing "the President's Indigenous Minority People's Foundation" (59). In addition to the descendant of Spanish tycoons and the domestic despot, the "genius" director Tony Pierce and his filming crew are presented as arrogant media imperialists (213). Producing the Hollywood hit film *Napalm Sunset*, a fictionalized version of *Apocalypse Now*, the Hollywood filmmakers "walk around here like they own the place," among whom "Pierce is the worst. Think this country's nothing but a backdrop for his movie. The people don't matter, except when they service him and his family" (179).

Dream Jungle teases out the neo-colonial dilemma confronting the Philippines. Yet the novel does not stop at a critique of imperialism. Instead of writing within the binary confine of the colonial versus the postcolonial, or the imperial versus the national, Hagedorn fleshes out the events of the Tasaday and *Apocalypse Now* with fictional details of the local and the subaltern. While every party involved in the two events attempted to "steal" a piece of the Philippines for its own benefit, Hagedorn in a way also "steals" the two events, yet hers is not so much an imperial "stealing" as an imaginative "purloining." To clarify the word "purloin" as it is used in Poe's short story, Lacan draws on the Oxford English Dictionary to elaborate on the meaning of the word's two parts. The first part is the prefix "pur-" as found in "purpose," "purchase," and "purport"; it derives from the Latin "pro-," carrying the meaning of "located in front of," "projecting," or "substituting for." The second part, "loin," is from the Old French word *loinger*, which, according to Lacan, does not mean *au loin* (far off), but *au long de* (alongside). To "purloin" is thus "*mettre de côté* (to set aside) or, to resort to a colloquialism which plays off the two meanings, *mettre à gauche* (to put on the left side [literally] and to tuck away)" ("Seminar" 20, *emph. Lacan's*).⁴ Change of location is essential to Lacan's conception of "purloin."

When something is "purloined," it is tucked away, no longer clearly available or visible, because it is taken out of its original place, "displaced" or perhaps "misplaced." An object usually "disappears" not because it is "gone" (no longer existing), but because it is "misplaced," not put in the location where we assume it should appear. Lacan explains this by giving the example of a mislaid book in library: "Even if the book were on an adjacent shelf or in the next slot, it would be hidden there, however visible it may seem there" ("Seminar" 17). The seeming disappearance of the book is due to the change of its structural relationship with other books. Similarly, it is by transposing the Philippines into new imaginative contours that Hagedorn "purloins" the Philippines.

Dream Jungle juxtaposes materials, links up characters, and relocates plots. The importance of structure or “syntax”—where an object is, what it is next to, and how it is linked to others—is as clear in *Dream Jungle* as in Poe’s “The Purloined Letter.” The experienced Prefect in Poe’s story believes that he has searched “every where” (435, emph. Poe’s)—“every nook and corner of the premises in which it is possible that the paper can be concealed,” but the letter is nowhere to be seen (434). The problem is not that it is no longer inside the apartment of the already-identified thief, Minister D, but that one cannot really discover or “grasp” a space without first understanding its “syntax,” which is in turn determined by Minister D’s logic, his way of placing one thing next to another. In this case the letter is in effect not “concealed” but put in a letter-rack, a place so obvious that it is never expected or imagined by the Prefect. According to Lacan, the Prefect fails to see the letter because he sticks too much to his previous experiences, that is, because of his “lack of imagination” (“Seminar” 12).

Concerning the power of imagination, it is worth pointing out that, in addition to being an ingenious player of political power games, Minister D is both a poet and a mathematician. As a poet, he is taken by many as being “only one remove from a fool” (435). Yet apparently it is because he is a poet, or more precisely because he is at the same time a poet, a mathematician, and a politician, that he is able to “purloin” the letter through his discipline-crossing conceptual model.⁵ In like manner, Hagedorn attempts a discipline-crossing project in her effort to fictionalize historical events. In Lacan’s reading of “The Purloined Letter,” the letter moves not from one person to another, but from one thinking structure to another. In *Dream Jungle*, similarly, the conception of the Philippines shifts not from colonialism to post-colonial nationalism but rather into an incessantly extending community of individuals moving across racial, class, and national boundaries.

Discussing Poe’s short story, Lacan has in mind not just the letter as “a written or printed message addressed to a person or institution,” but also the letter as a linguistic element: “the material medium [*support*] that concrete discourse borrows from language” (“Instance” 139) or “the essentially localized structure of the signifier” (144).⁶ “Letter” constitutes the materiality of a signifier. It is an element with energy and agency. The French word *instance* in “the instance of the letter” takes on meanings ranging from “urgent or earnest solicitation, entreaty or instigation, insistence, lawsuit or prosecution, argument, example or case” to “authority” and “agency” (Fink 334), thus casting into relief the force of the letter to drive forward the sliding of signifiers. Not coincidentally, Poe’s story begins with an intrusion of a “letter” into the political structure, causing the subsequent drama of power. To “purloin a letter” is to make possible a change, or changes, in signifying directionality. Following the same logic, to “purloin a nation,” as in

the case of *Dream Jungle*, is to enact a new imaginative directionality of the Philippines through fiction writing. Drawing on the Tasaday discovery, Hagedorn demonstrates little interest in contriving a myth of Filipino nativism or tracing the national origin of the Philippines. Far more significant than looking for a pure Philippine identity is to allow—to play out, alongside the Tasaday debate—the rhizomic branching of Filipino/as, most of them disprivileged and marginalized like the Tasaday. Similarly, the shooting of *Apocalypse Now* in *Dream Jungle* is taken not simply as an example of Western media's invasion into the Philippines. Hagedorn fills up the filmmaking process with a circuitous series of local stories that go unbounded by the Hollywood project.

Although Hagedorn does not use the word “purloin,” the image of “thief” recurs in *Dream Jungle*. In a way to invoke the “banditry” tradition of the south-western-Pacific islanders, the novel begins with excerpts from Antonio Pigafetta's account of the Portuguese navigator Ferdinand Magellan's first voyage around the world, in which the Mariana Islands to the east of the Philippine Sea are designated as “islands of thieves”: “Those people are poor, but ingenious and very thievish, on account of which we called those three islands the islands of Ladroni (i.e., of thieves)” (3). Following this opening, Zamora is cast into the role of a “thief” who has “stolen and claimed” to be his own the Taobo translator Duan's dream (5). Or, it is perhaps more correct to say that Duan as a translator steals Zamora's authority. Zamora admits that he has no control over Duan's tongue: “Perhaps he said that we meant the Taobo no harm, or perhaps that we were shit-eating bastards from a faraway kingdom, not to be trusted. . .how would we ever know?” (66-67). In the eyes of Amado Cabrera, the anthropologist invited by Zamora to study the Taobo, Duan is “quite imaginative at spinning tales” (102). From time to time he becomes “poetic and eloquent” in his translation and Cabrera doubts his reliability as a translator (101). Like Dupin and Minister D in Poe's story, Duan is a kind of poet. Through translation he can “purloin” words and hence mediate the power relationship between white discoverers/invaders and the Taobo.⁷

As the daughter of Zamora's cook, the female protagonist Rizalina Cayabyab is also portrayed as a thief who keeps sneaking into Zamora's study to steal books and steals hair ribbons from Zamora's daughter Dulce. Curiously enough, her mother once scolds her by pointing out that “no one steals” in their family: “Your father may have been many things, but he was not a thief” (77). It is questionable, however, whether “not stealing” is a virtue worth preserving. Rizalina's father, for example, though handsome enough to be a movie star, remains a drunkard and dies in a shipwreck, his body eaten by sharks. Moreover, the women of Rizalina's family, despite their honesty and hard work, have for generations not risen above their position as servants of rich families. Rizalina's mother laments:

My *nanay's naynay*, my Lola Isay, worked as a servant all her life. She keeled over dead while washing her master's dirty underwear. And my great-grandmother was a *yaya* who cared for rich people's children. And so on and so on. Washerwomen, *yayas*, cooks, house-cleaners, gardeners who toiled in Manila or Cebu [. . .] Just like my mother, they sent home every peso and centavo they earned for the education and betterment of. . .

Ha.

You see how far that got any of us. (15)

Being the only thief in her family, Rizalina is also the first female to escape from what seems to be the perpetual destiny of the women in her family. In 1973, at the age of twelve, she runs away from Zamora's house with two thousand pesos, "half of which she had stolen from her mother" and the "the other half from Zamora" (118). "Stealing" here is a strategy of survival and self-investment.

Since its beginning, Rizalina's story has been dominated by the question of what she would become in the future. A girl born with a "strange intelligence" when it comes to reading and writing, besides being the only survivor of a devastating shipwreck that takes the life of her father and two brothers, Rizalina is expected by her mother to "become a something" (14). It is difficult, however, to know what this something might be. Her mother knows there will be a change in her family's fortune or destiny, yet she cannot think beyond her immediate experience or frame of reference: "Your future is'—my mother paused, thinking hard—'filled with hope. You could become a nurse, Lina. Or a bank teller. There's a bank in the next town, *di ba?* Or maybe a teacher like that woman you admire so much. . .what's her name? Miss Angway'" (14, *emph.* Hagedorn's).

Compared with her mother, Rizalina has a wider perspective on the world, a wilder imagination. As a child, she reads Pigafetta's *The First Voyage Around the World* and has developed a kind of worldview: "I know the capital of Brazil, the capital of France, the capital of Japan, and the capital of California!" (41). Her greatest desire on her eleventh birthday is to write her "life story" with the Bic pen and pink notebook she purchases with the money saved from her first month's salary at Zamora's, the notebook's cover featuring the "sweet, long-suffering face" of the well-known Filipina actress, singer, and producer Nora Aunor (73). Rizalina is also a lover of Tagalog movies at a time when Hollywood productions dominate the local cinema market. One episode of the novel indicates how people have grown tired of seeing the same old Tagalog movie screened from time to time at Rizalina's school. Eventually Rizalina becomes the only audience member: "Hardly anyone ever bothered going inside to watch anymore, except for Rizalina" (80). Significantly, Rizalina's favourite movie is

The Enchanted Forest, which stars another Filipina actress, Nida Blanca, as a “flying superheroine” that comes to rescue the disempowered (79).

Indeed, Rizalina’s life shows a point of convergence of several important oppositions that define the post-independent Philippine society: the imperial legacy and its correlative discontents of ordinary people, the global-cultural infiltrations and the collective local experience of survival, the constraining everyday reality and the temporary escape through cinematic fantasies. It is not coincidental for Hagedorn to name Rizalina after the Philippine “national hero, poet and novelist” José Rizal (14). Although Rizalina (i.e., “little Rizal”) falls short of becoming a national hero, poet, or novelist, through a series of self-dislocation she drives the novel’s plot forward and compels the formation of a Philippine community that is continually evolving, self-differentiating, and dispersing. In the second part of *Dream Jungle*, Rizalina re-emerges, in 1977, as an enticing stripper named Jinx in a bar called Love Connection. There she encounters the American movie star Vincent Moody, reclaims her identity as Rizalina, and joins the local labour force for the production of *Napalm Sunset* before relocating to Santa Monica, California. The novel does not provide any clear ending point or a teleological summing-up to Rizalina’s life story. Instead, it leaves her story within a whirlwind of ongoing incidents and characters, bringing the reader to comprehend the significance of Rizalina in terms not of who she is or what she has become, but of the more or less chaotic social flows, interpersonal connections, and power shifts that sprawl around her.

In addition to Rizalina, the other female protagonist, Paz Marlowe, also experiences her life as a series of thefts and flights. She first steals away from the Philippines to Los Angeles and then from a dissatisfied marriage to journalism, eventually turning into a migrant who “wander[s] the planet,” like “some cosmic detective without grounding or direction” (285). Like Hagedorn, Paz is an expatriate Filipina and a migrant between the United States and the Philippines. Also like Hagedorn, Paz is equipped with the power of language. Her surname, Marlowe, suggests that she may be, like Conrad’s Marlow in *Heart of Darkness*, the ultimate witness of the novel. Curiously, her first name, Paz (“peace” in Spanish), carries an anti-war implication that reminds one of the Tasaday as a “peace symbol.” Yet, while the Tasaday (or “Taobo” in the novel) were disempowered by their illiteracy and remained trapped in the Mindanao rain forest, their anti-war image imposed from the outside, Paz engages with imperialism, colonialism, and nationalism with her language power and global mobility. She flies from the United States to the Philippines to work on journalistic stories about Zamora and Pierce, in a way bearing witness to the Philippines by turning her personal “sobs” into “words” (150).⁸

Featuring recurrent motifs of stealing/flight, *Dream Jungle* as a whole could be interpreted as a literary attempt to “purloin” the imperial legacy and transpose it into the origin of Philippine community-making. Entitled “Discovery and Conquest,” the first part of the novel recasts the Spanish discovery and conquest of the Philippines as not simply ushering in Western colonial power, but also initiating the vicissitudes of Philippine history. Similarly, Zamora’s “discovery and conquest” of the Philippines does not merely mark his exploitation and appropriation of the Taobo and the locals. His experiences also set the stage, however incidentally, for movements, communications, connections, and conflicts.

Indeed, Zamora in *Dream Jungle* is not as much an all-powerful neo-colonialist as a belated imperialist, whose father “once owned and controlled the profitable silver and copper mines” in the Philippines (7). Being Mestizo, with “Basque, Negrense, a dash of North American Irish” (122) from his mother, moreover, he is racially inferior to his “Teutonic goddess” wife (43). The chapter “Her Last Night” delivers a vivid image of Zamora’s crumbling empire after his wife leaves him: “Everything coated with dust. The room a mess. The whole fucking house a mess, since the wife and children had left” (115). This disempowerment, however, draws Zamora closer to his Filipino servants. Zamora identifies his situation with that of Rizalina’s mother, who is sad and lonely in the wake of her daughter’s departure. And as if in response to Zamora’s feeling, Rizalina in “True Romance: 1973” expresses the household staff’s sense of connection to Zamora: “We were his family now: Mama and me. Sonny. Peping the gardener, Benny the driver. Skinny and Fatso, the guards. Sputnik, Gloria. And Celia, who crept off to the master’s bedroom when she thought the rest of us were all asleep” (111).

Zamora’s relationship with his servants is not fixed or rigid; nor is his relationship with the Taobo. The chapter “Zamora: 1971” details Zamora’s ambivalent position as a neo-colonial explorer: Zamora “stood in the shadow of the spectacular cordilleras surrounding Lake Ramayyah. Dense, rugged, green with trees, chains of dark mountains loomed in the clouds. That day he was a conquistador without an army, a rich man without his usual posse of bodyguards, photographers, doctors, PR flacks, cooks, and servants. That day his only friend was Duan, a man he did not trust” (6). Stripped of his imperialist ostentation and extravagance, Zamora is an individual, following the guidance of his “only friend” Duan. The power relation between the imperial and the local is reversed: it is not the Philippines that are under the shadows of empire but Zamora, who is captured by the shadows of Mount Taobo—his body dislocated, incorporated by the Philippine landscape. Intriguingly, Zamora does not feel threatened; what he feels instead is “oddly liberating” (6). In another passage

Zamora is described as having collapsed “on the muddy jungle floor and flung out his arms in joyful surrender. *All that green*” (8, *emph.* Hagedorn’s). He is so drawn to the Mindanao rain forest that he would rather die with the local people there: “I smelled the red earth of the mountain’s side, felt it scraping against my face. I could die here, alone among these people” (123).

In addition to Zamora, Pierce—the fictional incarnation of Coppola—and his Hollywood film crew are also “dislocated” in the Philippines. Like the real-life Coppola, Pierce initially intends to take the country only as a convenient backdrop, an available and affordable “jungle” needed for the making of his film. Yet, as with Coppola and his team, Pierce’s filming project is gradually moored, trapped in—literally “prolonged” by—the place.⁹ The weather is one key factor: “Tony God hadn’t calculated on the combination of paralyzing heat and wicked typhoon season in the Philippines” (186). The civil war taking place in Mindanao is another factor. Pierce plans to make a film on war but does not expect that they would be caught “in the middle of the real war” (276). At one point everyone but Moody, the only one on the crew to recognize that Sultan Ramayyah is “sacred ground, swarming with restless spirits” (185), is “down with either the flu or diarrhea or something” (211).

Following the example of Eleanor Coppola, Peirce’s wife Janet produces a documentary about *Napalm Sunset* from the Hollywood crew-centred perspective. Writing about the same shooting process, Hagedorn nonetheless turns it into a Philippine story. First, *Dream Jungle* dwells little on the subject of the film, or on Pierce’s adventurism and heroism as a world-renowned director. It introduces instead a sarcastic tone when describing the filming project. Without knowing what the film is about, for example, local people are “awestruck by the lavish audiovisual feasts of destruction”: “Futuristic helicopters swooped down from the sky in a sinister ballet set to loud, pompous music,” and “movie stars were shot and stabbed, their wounds rendered in loving detail by sweating makeup artists with clenched teeth” (219). Moreover, unlike Coppola’s journey into the Philippines, which is described as a great director’s heroic adventure in Eleanor Coppola’s documentary, Pierce’s journey is cast as senseless drudgery: “It took blood, sweat, guts, tears, and my own goddamn money to move this fucking mountain and get all the way here” (174).

Dream Jungle also foregrounds the reactions and participation of local people in the filming process. The making of a Hollywood hit generates such a sensation that “all the filmmakers in Manila are talking about it” (162). For the people of Sultan Ramayyah, the Hollywood movie has replaced Zamora’s discovery of the Taobo as the focus of their community. Although the older population “kept their distance” (219), some even considering the movie “a bad thing” that will “bring trouble” to their

place (260), children play “fallen, bloody corpses or extras in crowd scenes with humor and enthusiasm” (219). Aling Belén, the guardian, caretaker, and, to an extent, the surrogate mother of Rizalina, is right in pointing out that it is unrealistic for young people like Rizalina to think that the movie will change their “sorry lives” (260). Yet *Dream Jungle* envisions ambiguous consequences to making *Napalm Sunset*. The transnational romance between Rizalina and Moody is one example. More significantly, *Napalm Sunset* launches the Filipino local director-to-be Pepito Ponce de León into a new career: he teams up with some of Pierce’s film crew to produce the film *Taghoy ng Pating* (*The Shark’s Lament*), starring Moody and Rainbow Reyes (a former Miss Philippines). Pepito claims that the film is “a combination” of two Hollywood hits, *Jaws* and *Deep Blue Sea*, done in “Filipino style” (314). From “purloining” Pierce’s film crew and Hollywood plots does Pepito develop his “Filipino style.”

Transposing the processes and products of imperialism into the very constituting fabric of a Philippine community, Hagedorn in *Dream Jungle* resists the remains of empire not through nationalism, but through a subtle deployment of the shifting relationships in a neo-colonial context of hybrid mixture and border-crossings. The novel concludes in the year 2000, three years after Zamora’s death. The setting is an apartment on New York’s Upper East Side. The narrator is the spirit of Zamora, who speaks from the urn containing the ashes of his body—a quintessential, if ironic, embodiment of the “remains of empire.” Projected as a dream vision of Zamora’s spirit, the scene stages the reunion of Zamora’s daughter Dulce, who has relocated from Manila to New York, and her mother Ilse, who has lived in Germany since running away from Zamora in the seventies. Happy in their reunion, as Zamora’s spirit indicates, these two women totally forget the existence of the urn: “The girls are having fun. And not once does my name come up” (325)—there is “no mention of my glamorous photo and the lengthy obituary published in newspapers around the world” (324).

Intriguingly, the remains of an imperialist father have been forgotten. They are “purloined” and ignored by his former wife and daughter. By contrast, the memory of Manila strikes vividly in a city far away from the Philippines. In Dulce’s New York apartment are paintings that used to hang in their Manila house, which give rise to “a flood of memories” in Ilse’s mind (323). Dulce has also stored “cases” of Flor de Manila in her pantry and has a half-full bottle sitting in front of her (325). She asks casually: “Want some churros, Mama? There’s a new Spanish bakery on the Upper East Side. Not exactly like Manila, but. . . .” Dulce stops, realizing that she should not mention Manila, a place that could evoke untoward memories for her mother. Yet Ilse

responds: “I never expect anything to be exactly like Manila, Schatzi [. . .] How I’ve missed you.” Stealing Zamora’s narrating voice, Hagedorn ultimately enacts in her novel the indispensable position of Manila, the “capital of desire and longing, that loaded word” (323), and seeks in the memory of it a link between the German mother and her Spanish-Filipina-American daughter. The age-old Philippine story—its imperial memories and subaltern dreams included—has been “prolonged” into another place, time, and international mix.

NOTES

- 1/ “The Remains of Empire” refers to a panel organized by Guy Beauregard and Chih-ming Wang for the 2009 Association for Asian American Studies Annual Meeting held in Honolulu, Hawaii, at which an earlier version of this paper was presented. I am also indebted to the input of Frank Stevenson, Christopher Lee, Rob Wilson, and Shu-ching Chen.
- 2/ Three major scholarly meetings were held on the issue, in addition to other anthropological and political disputes. See Thomas N. Headland, *The Tasaday Controversy: Assessing the Evidence* (Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1992. Print).
- 3/ There are four major iconic images of the Tasaday: an “evolutionary symbol” of cultural primitivism; an “ecological symbol” untainted by civilization; a “political symbol” of Marcos’s project of national preservation; and a “peace symbol” antithetical to the image of the Vietcong. See Leslie E. Sponsel, “Our Fascination with the Tasaday: Anthropological Images and Images of Anthropology” (*The Tasaday Controversy: Assessing the Evidence*. Ed. Thomas N. Headland. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1992. 200-12. Print).
- 4/ Fink preserves Lacan’s phrases *mettre de côté* and *mettre à gauche* in his translation and adds English explanations within parentheses and square brackets.
- 5/ Dupin becomes the only person able to decipher Minister D’s ploy because Dupin is also a poet: he admits that he himself has been “guilty of certain doggerel” (435).
- 6/ Lacan uses the word *support* in his original French text; Fink adds it into his English translation within square brackets.
- 7/ Translation also posed an important problem for scientists studying the Tasaday. See Robert B. Fox, “Peoples of the Philippines: The Tasaday” (1974. *A Tasaday Folio*. Ed. Jerome B. Bailen. Quezon City, PH: Philippine Social Science Center, 1986. 65-67. Print).
- 8/ Paz’s experience of interviewing Zamora is adapted from Hagedorn’s meeting with Elizalde in 1974. See Aguilar-San Juan, “Who’s Discovering Whom?” (*Women’s Review of Books* 21.6 [2004]: 5. Print).
- 9/ Coppola planned for a four-month shoot in the Philippines. Typhoon Ruby destroyed the set and filming was discontinued. *Apocalypse Now* was eventually shot over a fifteen-month period, from February 1976 to May 1977. See James Clarke, *Coppola* (London: Virgin, 2003. 96-99. Print).

WORKS CITED

- Aguilar-San Juan, Karin. “A Conversation with Jessica Hagedorn.” *Women’s Review of Books* 21.6 (2004): 6. Print.
- Berreman, Gerald D. “The Tasaday: Stone Age Survivors or Space Age Fakes?” *The Tasaday Controversy: Assessing the Evidence*. Ed. Thomas N. Headland. Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association, 1992. 21-39. Print.
- Coppola, Eleanor, dir. *Hearts of Darkness: A Filmmaker’s Apocalypse*. ZM Productions, 1991. Film.

- Dumont, Jean-Paul. "The Tasaday, Which and Whose? Toward the Political Economy of an Ethnographic Sign." *Cultural Anthropology* 3 (1988): 261-75. Print.
- Fink, Bruce, trans. "Notes to 'The Instance of the Letter.'" *Écrits: A Selection*. By Jacques Lacan. New York: Norton, 2002. 334-38. Print.
- Gonzalez, N.V.M. "The Filipino and the Novel." *Daedalus* 95.4 (1966): 961-71. Print.
- Hagedorn, Jessica. *Dream Jungle*. New York: Penguin, 2003. Print.
- _____. "The Exile Within/the Question of Identity." *The State of Asian America: Activism and Resistance in the 1990s*. Ed. Karin Aguilar-San Juan. Boston: South End P, 1994. 173-82. Print.
- Hamilton-Paterson, James. "Found and Lost." *The Guardian* 23 June 2003. Web. 24 May 2011.
- Hemley, Robin. *Invented Eden: The Elusive, Disputed History of the Tasaday*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2003. Print.
- Ileto, Reynaldo C. "Outlines of a Nonlinear Emplotment of Philippine History." *The Politics of Culture in the Shadow of Capital*. Ed. Lisa Lowe and David Lloyd. Durham: Duke UP, 1997. 98-131. Print.
- Isaac, Allan Punzalan. *American Tropics: Articulating Filipino America*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2006. Print.
- Kaplan, Amy. "'Left Alone with America': The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture." *Cultures of United States Imperialism*. Ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. 3-21. Print.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Instance of the Letter in the Unconscious, or Reason Since Freud." 1957. *Écrits: A Selection*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 2002. 138-68. Print.
- _____. "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter.'" 1956. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. Trans. Bruce Fink. New York: Norton, 2002. 6-48. Print.
- Lindbergh, Charles A. Foreword. *The Gentle Tasaday: A Stone Age People in the Philippine Rain Forest*. By John Nance. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1975. ix-xi. Print.
- Lynch, Frank, and Teodoro A. Llamzon. "The B'lit Manobo and the Tasaday." *A Tasaday Folio*. Ed. Jerome B. Bailen. Quezon City, PH: Philippine Social Science Center, 1986. 11-13. Print.
- Poe, Edgar Allan. "The Purloined Letter." 1844. *Great Short Works of Edgar Allan Poe*. Ed. G.R. Thompson. New York: Harper & Row, 1970. 430-51. Print.
- Rafael, Vicente L. *White Love and Other Events in Filipino History*. Durham: Duke UP, 2000. Print.
- Tadiar, Neferti Xina M. *Fantasy-Production: Sexual Economies and Other Philippine Consequences for the New World Order*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong UP, 2004. Print.
- _____. *Things Fall Away: Philippine Historical Experience and the Makings of Globalization*. Durham: Duke UP, 2009. Print.

HSIU-CHUAN LEE is Associate Professor of English at National Taiwan Normal University, where she teaches Asian American literature, women's literature, psychoanalysis, and film theories. She has published with *Concentric: Literary and Cultural Studies*, *EurAmerica*, and *Short Story Criticism*. An earlier article on Hagedorn's *Dogeaters* appeared in Chinese in *Chung-Wai Literary Monthly*.