

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫 成果報告

由瑪格麗特·愛特伍德作品透視女人現身問題 (II-II)：女
性歌德的家國想像

計畫類別：個別型計畫

計畫編號：NSC91-2411-H-003-023-

執行期間：91年08月01日至92年09月30日

執行單位：國立臺灣師範大學英語學系(所)

計畫主持人：李秀娟

報告類型：完整報告

處理方式：本計畫可公開查詢

中 華 民 國 92 年 12 月 31 日

行政院國家科學委員會補助專題研究計畫成果報告

計畫名稱：由瑪格麗特．愛特伍德作品透視女人現身問題 (II-II): 女性歌德的家國想像

計畫類別：個別型計畫

計畫編號：NSC91-2411-H-003-023

執行期間：91年08月01日至92年09月30日

計畫主持人：李秀娟

本成果報告包括以下應繳交之附件：無

執行單位：國立臺灣師範大學英語學系

日期：中華民國92年12月30日

行政院國家科學委員會專題研究計畫成果報告

由瑪格麗特·愛特伍德作品透視女人現身問題 (II-II): 女性歌德的家國想像

(The Em-Bodying of Women in Margaret Atwood's Fiction (II-II) :
Imagining Canada in the Female Gothic)

計畫編號：NSC 91-2411-H-003-023

執行期限：91年8月1日至92年9月30日

主持人：李秀娟 國立台灣師範大學英語系

一、中文摘要

本計畫以「女性歌德的家國想像」為主題，在理論層次上關注「家」的建立/分裂與「國」的創建/解構之間複雜的關係。一方面，「國」經常以「家」作為其構型模版，藉由模擬理想家庭中血緣一脈、認同一體的特性，合法化自己作為「國-家」的純粹、單一、與統整性。問題是，在真實世界裡「家庭」往往不是理想中單一、統整、血緣一脈的有機社會單位。在時空遞變中家庭關係可能雜流蔓延，在日常生活裡家庭空間更可能內外不分。透過對家庭跨(族/國)界線之系譜與向外延伸之空間的分析，本計畫探討「家」的書寫如何介入「國」的創建，重繪國-家的疆域與版圖。在文學文本的分析上，由於延續先前國科會計畫中個人對亞美文學的研究，本年度探討的文本除了原訂的瑪格麗特·愛特伍德作品之外，還加入了亞美文學文本，但在研究主題上均以「家國想像」為中心，並且在研究亞美文學時嘗試建立亞美論述與愛特伍德作品的對話，用愛特伍德作品中所揭櫫之(家庭)歌德面相與陰性系譜等角度閱讀亞美文本。計畫執行至今在愛特伍德及亞美研究兩方面都有豐碩成果。

關鍵詞：家國想像、陰性系譜、歌德、心理分析、歷史記憶、空間書寫、瑪格麗特·愛特伍德、亞美文學

二、英文摘要

This project explores the textual imaginations of nations/families in light of the many ideas evoked by female gothic. Theoretically, I study the complicated relationship between the (un-)making of families and the (de-)construction of nations. On the one hand, people tend to connect nation and family. Not only do we usually speak “nations” as “homelands,” “fatherlands,” or “mother countries,” the coining of the term “nation-family” figures nation in the seeming organic unity and genealogical continuity of a family. On the other hand, this nation-family analogy is problematic in that families are not always as unified and continuous as may have been expected. Most families feature (gothic) spaces that introduce others' interventions and generate everyday hybridities. This project therefore focuses on any possible domestic interventions into the making of a nation. As for the texts analyzed, I study Asian American texts alongside the major works of Margaret Atwood. Through dialogues between my analysis of Asian American texts and my study of Margaret Atwood, I explore the former in light of the concepts of domestic gothic and feminine genealogy frequently evoked in Atwood's works. Several research papers on both Margaret Atwood and Asian American studies have been produced out of this project.

Key Words: nation/family, feminine genealogy, gothic, psychoanalysis, historical memory, space, Margaret Atwood, Asian American Literature

三、研究成果目錄

本計畫執行至今已有多篇論文發表或正計畫發表，詳列如下：

1. 李秀娟。2003。 簾幕、迷宮、女人虛飾：以瑪格麗特．愛特伍《女祭司》為例看歌德羅曼史消費 。《英美文學評論》7 (2003): 即將出刊。
2. 李秀娟。June 2003。 「無名女人」後裔：亞美女作家作品中的陰性系譜 。發表於第 27 屆全國比較文學會議，東吳大學，June 2003。修定稿已獲《中外文學》審查通過，將刊登於《中外文學》32.7 (Dec. 2003)。
3. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. Nov. 2003. “The Unhomely Home, the Makeshift Family, and the Domestic Intervention in the Works of Cynthia Kadohata and Lydia Minatoya.” Paper delivered at “Negotiating the Past: An International Conference on Asian British and Asian American Literatures,” Institute of European and American Studies, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan. Nov. 27-28, 2003.
4. Lee, Hsiu-chuan. June 2004. “Skinny Ladies, Skinless Women: Eating, Bodily Surface, and Bodily Fluids in *The Edible Women* and *The Blind Assassin*.” Paper Proposal has been accepted by “The Ninth Quadrennial International Conference on Comparative Literature” (第九屆國際比較文學會議), National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan, June 18-20, 2004.

四、研究論文/摘要全文 (依照上列目錄次序，1-3 篇論文均附參考文獻)

I.

簾幕、迷宮、女人虛飾： 以瑪格麗特．愛特伍《女祭司》為例看歌德羅曼史消費

李秀娟

國立台灣師範大學英語系

誰知哪樣故事
能滿足她
誰知何種暴行
已透過她與她們
加諸於她與她們
假自由之名，
假印本之名。

--瑪格麗特．愛特伍(Margaret Atwood), 燠熱
夜晚的歌德教條 (“Gothic Letter on a Hot
Night”)

(歌德羅曼史) 堅持再現女人自虐與主體拋棄的過程，尖銳地點出

〔人類〕文化的失憶症。

--蜜雪兒·馬歇 (Michelle Massé), 《奉愛之名》(*In the Name of Love*)

歌德羅曼史 (gothic romance) 的崛起, 難脫十八世紀中葉以後歐洲中產階級興起, 「美滿家庭」(ideal home) 概念逐漸深植人心的影響。弔詭的是, 歌德羅曼史作為「美滿家庭」神話的附生品, 並不以刻畫「美滿家庭」為職志, 反而不斷暴露婚姻與家庭的黑暗底面, 在每一個凸顯家庭作為社會穩定基石與女人生活堡壘的故事結局前重複上演歌德古堡中的兩性傾軋戲碼。¹ 縱觀歷史, 歌德羅曼史以曲折的家庭羅曼史為情節核心, 以中產階級女人為主要讀者群, 再摻入神話與想像世界中的兩性暴力與鬼魅成份, 不只曾於十九世紀西方文學史上盛極一時, 更在 1960 和 1970 年之間以大眾文學之姿在英、美、加進行一次強勢的反撲, 開展當代女人和歌德羅曼史消費之間複雜的慾望及認同版圖。究竟歌德羅曼史為何風行? 女人為何沈迷於歌德情節? 歌德為何被認定為一「女性」的文類? 女人究竟由歌德羅曼史的閱讀中獲得了什麼? 歌德羅曼史是束縛、還是解放了女人?

加拿大作家瑪格麗特·愛特伍 (1939--) 關懷歌德羅曼史制式情節對當代女性讀者的影響, 不斷在她的作品中思考、討論、重寫、甚至反寫傳統歌德羅曼史中重要的意象及情節。代表作如《秀色可餐》(*The Edible Woman*, 1969)、《黑暗謀殺》(*Murder in the Dark*, 1983)、《貓眼》(*Cat's Eye*, 1988)、《強盜新娘》(*The Robber Bride*, 1993) 等都展現愛特伍對歌德羅曼史書寫傳統的熟悉以及她揭露當代兩性關係中歌德底面(the gothic underside of gender relations) 的犀利視角。² 其中 1976 年的長篇小說《女祭司》(*Lady Oracle*) 以虛構暢銷歌德羅曼史女作家「瓊」(Joan Foster) 自述其生命、情慾、與創作經驗於歌德羅曼史的生產與消費之間, 促成了愛特伍作品與歌德羅曼史消費市場最直接生動的交鋒。愛特伍曾在訪談中提及她對歌德小說的興趣, 思索歌德風行的成因:

我對歌德小說感興趣因為歌德在極大成份上乃一女性形式。為何這些在本質上傳遞「你的丈夫想殺了你」訊息的故事會享有廣大讀者青睞? 讀者不會偶然愛上某一類大眾文學作品。一定是這些作品牽動了讀者生命中某些真實的面相。(Hammond 107)

她接著討論歌德小說究竟在那一層面上牽動讀者內心的「真實面相」。首先, 歌德羅曼史吸引人可能因為它提供女性讀者異性戀婚姻願望實現(wish-fulfillment) 的夢境。在小說的虛構世界裡婚姻難題終將解決、凡事歡喜收場、作為解救者的真命天子最後也將現身。歌德小說因此直探女人願望, 提供逃避現實捷徑, 讓讀者透過文字敘述, 或更正確的說 透過被動的旁觀文字景觀, 輕易通過小說女角必須經歷的嚴酷試煉, 毫髮無傷的到達故事終站。但值得注意的是, 歌德羅曼史不只帶來安慰與逃避。愛特伍指出歌德緊扣女人心弦, 除了因為其為婚姻願望實現提供庇護, 更因其情節氛圍不斷爬梳女性讀者面對婚姻和父權的恐懼。在情節到達象徵與父權達成和解的異性戀婚姻之前, 歌德閱讀更多時候牽繫女性讀者對失敗婚姻的關注, 對遭婚姻體制淘汰之女人情不自禁的認同:

《簡愛》(*Jane Eyre*) 的故事揮之不去, 包括故事中的四個角色。故事裡頭發瘋的妻子也揮之不去。想問的是, 在哪一個時間點上那孤兒會變成瘋了的妻子? 在她嫁給羅徹斯特先生(Mr. Rochester) 多久之後她就會變成那個瘋了的妻子? (Hammond 108)

歌德羅曼史牽絆女人的究竟是異性戀婚姻結局還是故事中被除名、凌虐的女人? 歌德小說在重建美滿家庭秩序和滿足女性異性愛戀的表象下, 是否挑起女人對在父權婚姻

¹ 有關「美滿家庭」神話和歌德羅曼史崛起相關性的探討, 參閱 Ellis。

² 愛特伍作品中的歌德成份已有許多學者討論, 參見 Mandel、Rosowski、Howells, “Atwoodian Gothic”、Becker 和 Liungberg。

建置裡自己所必須扮演的角色更多的疑慮和不滿？

本論文以歌德小說對女性讀者模稜不一的影響力為出發點，由分析《女祭司》思考歌德羅曼史消費的問題。簡單的說，《女祭司》以後設手法書寫歌德羅曼史消費，它的創作本身就串接了流行文化的機械複製與嚴肅文化的反思辯證，打破大眾與高蹈文化的楚河漢界，使歌德羅曼史消費成為可以被嚴肅反省的素材。另外，愛特伍在書中創造了既是流行文化性別迷思追隨者、又是暢銷歌德羅曼史小說制服式情節複製者的女主角瓊，藉由穿插瓊自傳式的口述與她的歌德羅曼史創作，並置寫實自述 (realist confession) 與歌德文類，創造了《女祭司》一邊複製歌德羅曼史樣版，一邊將此樣版暴露於現實底下的繁複景致。小說由描述歌德情節對瓊生活現實認知的制約寫到瓊以其生活經驗改寫歌德樣版，由複製、應用，進而挪用、反用歌德羅曼史傳統。在接下來的討論中，「歌德消費與簾幕迷思」反省歌德羅曼史的逃避主義，質疑其作為遮蔽現實之簾幕 (screen) 的迷思；「歌德空間與迷宮 (反) 消費」探索歌德多層次空間，解剖歌德小說中女人如迷宮 (maze) 般迂迴糾結的慾望；「女人虛飾與神諭發聲」則思考歌德羅曼史消費所形構的「女人虛飾」 (the female dissimulation) 空間，討論女人藉消費之名行建構之實，藉擔任祭司傳遞神諭之名開展自我聲音、搜尋女性主體的可能性。

歌德消費與簾幕迷思

歌德羅曼史作為流行文類，最被文化批評者所詬病的無非是其逃避現實的傾向。一如夢境提供背離現實制約的「慾望實現」 (wish-fulfillment) 空間，歌德羅曼史之所以風行和其透過儀式般 (ritual-like) 的反覆敘述除魔驅邪，締造「慾望實現」假象的努力密不可分。引用馬歇 (Massé) 的話，

經由確定焦慮來源 或者是母親、自我、老一代、同性戀、性別原型、或者更直接了當的就是生殖器性行為 我們限制歌德迷宮的空間並找到其出口，因此肯定我們對不受恐懼干擾、公正且理性之「真實」世界追求的慾望。(11)

歌德羅曼史透過簡化了的虛構空間使迷宮出口一目了然，藉由夢境跳接、隱喻、移轉的機制使願望實現理所當然。和夢境一樣，歌德羅曼史具有以想像中的圓滿結局取代真實不滿、作為簾幕遮掩現實齟齬的功能。碧姬·佛勒 (Bridget Fowler) 同樣強調羅曼史的簾幕功能，但更進一步指出羅曼史簾幕除了提供逃避，更有與虎謀皮、為主流價值作嫁的問題。根據佛勒的看法，大眾市場中廉價的羅曼史表面勾勒理想國，在行文間「暫時終止社會暴力」 (48)，骨子裡卻和資本主義父權所強調的女性「居家化」 (domestication) 相倚相生。佛勒指出羅曼史以虛構美滿愛情粉飾現實性別暴力，高舉文明大蠱模糊女人憤懣，進而蟄縛女人對於家庭神話的依賴，為 1840 和 1850 年代英國反女性主義和社會主義的保守力量奠立基礎。羅曼史中的理想國因此不具正面批判力量。它充其量只是一個女人退居家庭的「退化理想國」 (regressive utopia) (Fowler 17)。羅曼史透過對女性讀者「殖民式」的洗腦，使現實批判不可能，甚至不必要 (Fowler 175)。

當然，這樣對歌德羅曼史的強烈抨擊，視大眾文學消費為由上至下單向制約的論述未免失之極端。傑瑞·鮑摩 (Jerry Palmer) 就點出羅曼史回應現代社會 (modern society) 再現系統的不完足，體現現代社會主流論述縫隙與情緒殘留 (emotional) 的價值，進而主張挖掘羅曼史多元的閱讀視角 (166, 171)。而影響鮑摩論點的主要人物之一珍妮思·雷德葳 (Janice Radway) 早在其 1984 年的著作《閱讀羅曼史》 (Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature) 書中即提出大眾文學消費的反動潛能。雷德葳最重要的論點是：即使大量生產的羅曼史不斷服膺制式情節與複製主流價值，閱讀動作本身也可能是反動的。首先，閱讀的慾望可能就已經反應了讀者對現實的不滿。其次，即使故事的結局宣示主流教條，讀者可能早已藉由閱讀過程歧出教條、混淆身份認同、探索現實表象下的黑暗鬼域，由被動消費轉為主動介入。誠如雷德葳所言，羅曼史讀者一邊「肯定他們對傳統價值的依附，」同時卻已經在「進行一項本身即顛覆這些價值的行動」 (118)。

雷德葳提醒我們不能只閱讀文本商品的表象意義，而應探索消費者和文本互動所激發的各種可能。在 1960 和 1970 年歐美的「歌德風潮」(Gothic Boom) 裡，我們可以再一次看見歌德羅曼史生產與消費意義的不確定性：究竟歌德風潮的興起是美國 1950 年「家庭崇拜」(cult of domesticity) 的遺緒還是反動？是呼應同時在進行中的女性主義與少數族裔運動還是為百家爭鳴、雜音湧現的文化場域除邪驅魔？是重建「女人迷思」(feminine mystique) 還是挖掘深藏不露的「女人力量」(women's power)？³蘇珊·貝克(Susanne Becker) 指出，歌德閱讀跳出保守與反動的二元對立，揭示在二元之間之外的思考空間：

觀察席卷女性市場的流行恐怖小說，亦即在大眾消費市場中狂賣的「歌德」使人了解女性文化，以及其位處嬰兒潮與胸罩焚燒、超保守女性教條和激進女性主義之間所壓抑的慾望與恐懼感。(81-82)

貝克不認為歌德羅曼史全然是主流文化體制的附庸，卻也不主張歌德正面積極的反動力量。她強調的是歌德介於服膺教條與反抗權威之間的中介位置。歌德讀者在虛構情節的保護中窺探現實的暗底鬼域，在文化商品消費旗幟的掩護下偷嘗踰矩快樂，歌德羅曼史可說是主流社會體制箝制下情感遺緒集結而成的徵狀(symptom)。無怪乎傅萊(Northrop Frye) 主張羅曼史攸關社會中「慾望的流離」(wandering of desire) (Hoepner 79)，而愛特伍更直言「流行藝術作為嚴肅藝術的素材猶如夢境〔作為人類慾望研究的素材〕」(qtd. Becker 192)。

仔細推敲，愛特伍將流行文學比喻為夢境，其實已點出歌德羅曼史相對於主流社會價值觀與個人慾望的模稜位置。首先，流行文學和夢境均有慾望實現與逃避現實功能。其次，一如夢境提供潛意識向意識發聲的庇護，歌德羅曼史在其妥協形式之下未嘗不夾帶徵狀與禁忌，使被壓抑的慾望與創傷得以再現。⁴最重要的，愛特伍喻流行文學於夢境，她強調的是歌德的徵候特質，主張流行文學一如夢境應該被解讀、分析。套用心理分析的術語，若責怪歌德以戲劇化誇張「演出」(acting out) 情感為賣點，不能深入思考情感背後的諸多糾結⁵，對歌德羅曼史有意識的消費則揭示「釐清」(working through) 徵候的努力。夢境在分析後可以暴露先前不為人知的潛意識語言，歌德羅曼史在經歷反思過程凸顯的可能是故事中一般不被正視的性別暴力和女性慾望。由這一點看來，夢境和歌德羅曼史都不只是遮蔽現實的簾幕，它們有擴大、複雜、甚至顛覆現實想像的功能。

《女祭司》作為一部思考歌德羅曼史消費的嚴肅創作，以反省歌德小說的簾幕迷思為其故事主軸。在許多層面上，小說中的敘述者兼主角瓊可以說就是對歌德羅曼史逃避思維堅定的信奉及宣揚者。瓊不諱言歌德羅曼史提供逃避的功能，大聲疾呼對「生活如此艱辛且不曾反擊」的女性讀者而言，「逃避不是奢侈，而是必要」(31)。瓊身兼歌德羅曼史暢銷作家，矢志扮演廣大讀者群的「神話教母」(fairy godmother)，讓所有對自己外型及生活不滿的讀者都能經由閱讀她的作品享受「南瓜變真金」的魔法，還不吝於提供「城堡」、「惡魔」、和「王子」，鋪陳善惡分明、貞潔與真愛獲得最後勝利的歡喜結局(32)。瓊直言她對喜劇結局的期待：「我期待喜劇結局，我需要凡事均獲解決的放鬆感，然後我就可以將喜悅像米粒般遍撒書中角色，用歡樂打發她們」(320)。而事實上瓊不只利用制式的喜劇結局打發書中虛構角色，在生活裡她也無時不冀望以簡易繁，以歌德「快樂唾手可得、傷痛只是儀式過渡」的承諾取消嚴肅思考可能帶來的麻煩和危險(284)。在《女祭司》的一開始，瓊即訴說其以假自殺作為簾幕掩蓋現實生

³ 有關 1960 年代「歌德風潮」的歷史背景分析，見 Becker 79-84.

⁴ 參閱 Punter 的說法，歌德小說玩的是一種「雙面遊戲」(double game)，在內容中反動，描寫「律法之下的深層空間」，但形式上保守，與「儀式與祝典」掛鉤，而「一切儀式與祝典本質上都是拒絕，一種對改變的拒絕」(Gothic Pathologies 208)。

⁵ Howells 就認為歌德讀者多為被動「窺視者」(voyeurs)，「注視過膾情感卻對其一無了解」，觀賞「情緒演出」卻缺乏對「這些情感複雜性的任何洞見」(Love, Mystery, and Misery 16)。

活難題，使自己由現實困境中全身而退的企圖：

我謹慎計畫自己的死亡，務必使它不同於我那由一物迂迴至另一物、無視於我對控制它所作努力的生命。我的生命有向外延展的傾向，像巴洛克鏡框一樣時或屈曲、時或捲折、時或垂墜花綵，總順著阻力最小的路線行進。和這相反，我要我的死乾淨簡單〔 〕。（3）

瓊彷彿操弄小說人物般熟練地以虛構情節打發自己的生命，以捏造的死亡逃離現實超乎羅曼史想像的複雜，將歌德小說逃避現實的精神在自己的生活裡發揮到淋漓盡致。

的確，生命過於繁複，總不及歌德制式情節來得簡單俐落易於操控；現實發展難以逆料，總也不及羅曼史中遲早要來的喜劇結局令人安心。不管是以喜劇結局一筆勾消書中角色恩怨或是以捏造自殺逃避蜿蜒生命，瓊都恪遵歌德羅曼史的情節樣版。正如她坦言，「我一生中沒有一刻不緊扣情節」（310）：以自殺之名逃至義大利時想像自己是坐困地中海蔚藍海岸等待英雄救援的美女；哭泣流淚時必須躲在盥洗室因為一直沒能哭得像漫畫中女角那麼正點；為呼應自己在丈夫亞瑟（Arthur）面前扮演的角色不惜捏造自己的過去；當然，瓊的名字，取自電影紅星瓊·克勞馥（Joan Crawford），似乎也諭示著瓊和流行文化腳本剪不斷、理還亂的關係。

瓊依賴簾幕、複製簾幕；然而《女祭司》不只藉由凸顯女人對逃避的渴望間接批判社會現實，更直接反省歌德羅曼史的簾幕迷思。愛特伍不只描述瓊是多麼努力的想根據羅曼史情節來建構自己的生命，更揭發不管瓊多麼努力，她的生活老是背離樣版的事實。舉例而言，在面對母親時，瓊知道除非自己「變成別人」（51），將永遠無法取悅母親；在舞蹈表演中她被迫放棄期待已久的蝴蝶角色而改跳樟腦丸；即使在減肥之後瓊已擁有理想身材，但她仍擺脫不了自己「錯誤的過去」如影隨形的糾纏（157）。另外，在面對丈夫亞瑟時她自忖「亞瑟鐵定鄙視我，我從來不是他所要的」（246）。她還承認自己「從沒能在正確時機表達正確情緒」（11）。最後，瓊擔心自己若真被寫進童話「藍鬍子」（Bluebeard）的故事裡，充其量她也只能當那不夠聰明以致惹來殺身之禍的姊姊。瓊或許將自己角色扮演的失敗歸咎於「自我乏於自制」（151）。仔細觀察瓊，我們卻不難看出她真正的問題是在於混淆了生活現實與歌德情節傳統，對後者的過分仰賴使她無法有效打理前者的駁雜。芭芭拉·瑞格妮（Barbara Hill Rigney）就指出瓊「意圖以『書寫』世界擺脫現實與承諾。她經由鏡像、經由自我蒙蔽的小說創作進入童話與神話領域，沒能脫逃，反倒被她致力創造之世界的表象給困住了」（62）。愛特伍在一次訪談中對瓊的問題闡釋得更為透徹：

毋庸置疑許多複雜的問題並非肇因於她是受害者或倖存者，而是因著她的羅曼史主義。她是那種人，想在絲毫不羅曼蒂克的世界裡演出身為女人的我們都知道的羅曼史神話。（Hammond 107）

瓊曾自誇能劃清現實和幻想的界限，但是她必須製造假自殺以逃離加拿大生活的這件事已經說明了即使是自詡為「幻想專家」的她也難逃自己辛苦建構生活表象被揭穿的危險：「我假裝死亡因為只有那樣我才能活，那樣我才有新生命」（315）。當一段已經發展得過分駁雜、超出羅曼史樣版的故事演不下去了，瓊只好另起一段新的，重新創造一個我。但是另一個新的故事很快又要背離歌德小說軌道。用琴·渥爾辛頓（Kim Worthington）的話來說，瓊已經陷入「由數不完的陷阱中脫逃得救的循環情節」（291）。

很明顯的，「重複」（repetition）成了將現實歌德化的瓊的宿命。因為現實屢屢溢出歌德制式情節，瓊就只能一次又一次重新開始。「重複」也是歌德羅曼史甚至包括所有大眾文學市場消費現象的本質。因為每一次消費所帶來的慾望滿足都是暫時的，消費者只能無止境的重複消費。當然，「重複」也是歌德羅曼史創作的特色。即使觸碰鬼域禁忌，歌德羅曼史也能透過儀典式的情節包藏慾望踰矩，藉由「重複」傳統情節維持形式上的中規中矩。⁶但是，過度「重複」卻不免使文本「過贖」（excess），進

⁶ 關於歌德羅曼史應用儀典式情節包藏踰矩內容的保守特質，參見 Punter, “Ceremonial Gothic”。

而透露歌德羅曼史作為「徵狀」的玄機。根據心理分析理論，「重複」正是辨識徵狀的不二法門。歇斯底里患者以徵狀作為真實慾望滿足的想像替代。他們發展「歇斯底里性感軀體」（hysterogenic body）以取代、遮掩「真實性感軀體」（erotogenic body）慾望受挫的現實，透過「徵狀重複」獲得愉悅假象。⁷問題是，徵狀之必須重複暴露了每一次取代、遮掩的不完足。「重複」因此不只帶來逃避的愉悅，更勾起原來問題如影隨行的焦慮。佛洛伊德因此視「重複」為喚起「詭異」（the “uncanny”）的基本元素。⁸可以想見的是，歇斯底里患者在憑藉「重複演出」（repetitively acting out）徵狀以維繫慾望滿足假象的同時勢必充滿焦慮，正如瓊在重複編造自己脫逃情節、享受歌德羅曼史簡約世界的同時不由心生恐懼。利用歌德羅曼史之「重複」作為簾幕的矛盾就在於簾幕不只遮蔽慾望黑洞更暗示幕後因受壓抑隨時可能反撲的慾力。消費意圖滿足慾望卻挑起更多質疑。藉由消費歌德羅曼史以獲得逃避因此演變成沒有終點的逃避。瓊的疑問「為何我所有的幻想情節都淪為陷阱？」（334）最是鮮活地揭穿歌德羅曼史消費的簾幕迷思。⁹

這樣指出歌德羅曼史的「徵狀」特質，提示大眾文學消費的矛盾，當然是要強調歌德羅曼史在其保守制式情節覆蓋下具顛覆性的一面。的確，除卻在形式上力求穩定，歌德羅曼史在敘述過程中大膽煽情、觸碰禁忌。費德·柏亭（Fred Botting）在題為《潛意識歌德現形論》（“The Gothic Production of the Unconscious”）一文中描述，「壓抑和禁忌直逼歌德文本表層：創傷、歇斯底里、情色、以及充斥各類原罪想像、閹割恐懼、和亂倫議題的家族羅曼史極少遭避諱、隱瞞、或壓抑」（18）。歌德羅曼史道貌岸然的外表包被的是性慾乖張（perverse）的文本軀體（textual body）。或者說，正因為文本軀體太過性慾乖張了，外表道貌岸然愈是變得不可或缺但也不時捉襟見肘。瓊的困境便在於此。在逃離加拿大脫韁的生活、到達義大利展開新腳本的第二天，瓊已經開始對茫無頭緒的新生活感到恐懼，督促自己要「恢復鎮靜」（9）；到了第三天，瓊甚至發覺自己又變成了那麼龐雜失序以致必須「列下清單」以強制生活秩序（21）。坦白說，在一次又一次嘗試將生活「羅曼史化」失敗之後，羅曼史的歡喜結局不免顯得無稽，倒是在到達結局之前故事中瀰漫的歌德式恐懼與暴力「詭異地」（uncannily）投射出瓊現實生活的蕪蔓糾結。

由一味專注歌德羅曼史複製父權神話的力量到關懷歌德的「詭異」面相可能是瓊由被動消費歌德羅曼史轉而主動以乖張身體、蕪蔓現實介入歌德羅曼史消費的關鍵。當撰寫（可能是）她的最後一部歌德羅曼史作品《被愛跟蹤》（*Stalked by Love*）時，瓊顯然無法再盲目複製羅曼史制式的美滿婚姻結局。¹⁰在處理雷德曼（Redmond）、其元配菲麗莎（Felicia）和新歡夏洛特（Charlotte）的三角關係時，她發現自己無法安排讓理當象徵邪惡淫蕩的菲麗莎發瘋死亡，無法接受雷德曼在故事最後頓然醒悟展現真情成為拯救夏洛特英雄的轉折，當然也就無法寫成年輕女孩夏洛特在歷經千辛萬苦試煉後終於和雷德曼結合的婚姻結局。瓊由一開始認同夏洛特轉而認同菲麗莎，由在意故事的異性戀婚姻喜劇結局轉向關注敘述過程凸顯的女人情慾與性別暴力。歌德羅曼史的制式結局至此遭翻轉而暴露鬼影幢幢，瓊一直以來所執迷的羅曼史消費戲劇化的遞演成為一場

⁷ 有關心理分析中以「重複」辨識症狀的理論與實際，參見 Freud，“Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria”，即「朵拉」（Dora）病例以及“Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through”一文。有關「hysterogenic body」與「erotogenic body」之立論，參見 David-Ménard。

⁸ 根據佛洛伊德，「任何勾起吾人內心『重複衝動』記憶的就是詭異」（“The ‘Uncanny’” 238）。

⁹ 瓊的問題放在拉崗的慾望圖解（the Graph of Desire）系統裡，就像是個人質疑他者（The Other）領域中意義裂縫的「你要什麼」（“Che Vou?”）。在拉崗理論中，「你要什麼」問題的出現暴露了「想像腳本」（fantasy）作為簾幕之不足，無法再成功遮蓋「他者領域的意義缺漏」（the lack of the Other）。關於拉崗的慾望圖解及其分析，見 Lacan 和 Žižek。值得注意的是，在《女祭司》中，瓊一直以來奉為圭臬的歌德羅曼史情節腳本在作為現實簾幕的功用上像極了拉崗理論中的「想像腳本」。

¹⁰ 有關瓊撰寫《被愛跟蹤》的過程以及她所寫出的多種版本結局，Worthington 292-300 有詳盡分析。

「迷宮（反）消費」。

歌德空間與迷宮（反）消費

歌德式小說以創造迷宮（maze）聞名。傳統歌德羅曼史經常以「女性追尋小說」（female quest story）的形式出現，只有貞潔且聰明的女主角才能走出迷宮，發現真情真愛與真實自我，見證父權家庭之固若磐石。為了打破女性追尋異性戀婚姻的神話，《女祭司》在反讀、反寫歌德的同時創造了自承不夠聰明也不完美的瓊，讓她深陷找不到出口的迷宮。當然，這樣的安排有利於揭露歌德小說在空間規劃上原來即有的模稜特質。綜觀歷史上著名的歌德文本，不論是「藍鬍子」傳奇、勃朗特（Charlotte Brontë）的《簡愛》（*Jane Eyre*）、還是吉爾曼（Charlotte Perkins Gilman）的「黃色壁紙」（“The Yellow Wallpaper”），無不都在行文間暴露父權所主導之家庭私藏的陰暗角落，混淆異性戀家庭堡壘與劃分男女空間的性別牢獄，讓保衛女人的家搖身變為鬧鬼的城堡和去中心的迷宮。大衛·龐特（David Punter）闡釋歌德羅曼史中難以收束為一的空間矛盾：

〔談歌德地理學（gothic geography）其實是要〕指出歌德無法被定於一的地理。從 Udolpho 到 Gormenghast 等等歌德城堡均座落沒有地圖的世界，它們的門廳走道樓梯無盡延伸，夜裡存在的房間到白天就消聲匿跡，足見歌德對地圖繪製工程的挑戰〔 〕。（“Introduction: Of Apparitions” 4）

歌德想像超乎常軌，歌德空間溢出地圖。逆向反讀歌德，不難發現美滿家庭的骨子裡其實是異鄉鬼域。

在《女祭司》裡，瓊小學時上學日日必經的溪谷可以說就是一個迷宮的象徵：「爬滿藤蔓雜草叢生，密佈的每一株柳樹與灌木叢背後都有媽媽嘴裡說的變態人埋伏，可能是無家可歸的酒精中毒老人、欺姦兒童的人，或更糟」（49）。為了順利通過迷宮考驗，瓊加入童軍團，每天帶著母親的警告、跟隨較為年長的三位鄰居女孩，忐忑不安的上學。有一天，三位女孩要求瓊經歷某個儀式以正式成為她們的一份子。愛特伍在這段情節裡用女童軍活動中的通關儀式來諧擬歌德羅曼史中女主角在到達喜劇終點以前必須穿越迷宮的過程。瓊一直相信只要經歷某一儀式，三位女孩就不會再蔑視與疏離她，而她也能因此遠離上學的恐懼。諷刺的是，說是要瓊通過的儀式其實是一個惡作劇。在一連串的「轉我轉我領我見精靈」咒語之後（57），被蒙上眼睛的瓊沒被引領去看見倒映水裡的「真我」形象，反倒遭五花大綁，一個人被丟在溪谷中「餵壞男人」（58）。更弔詭的是，雖然這個事件發展到最後宛如呼應歌德羅曼史情節般由一個奇蹟式出現的男人來鬆綁瓊，瓊卻始終不能確定這看似解救她的男人究竟真的是好人還是另懷鬼胎？若非瓊的母親佛蘭西絲（Frances）在男人正提議要帶瓊走出溪谷時及時趕到現場，事情會怎麼發展？

就某一層面而言，瓊似乎沒能真正走出溪谷迷宮。不但男人是否為女人的最後救贖被打上問號，溪谷迷宮隱喻式的將瓊困在一個女人虐人（或自虐 因為三位女孩和瓊一樣都站在可能遭受壞男人威脅的位置上）的世界裡。¹¹很明顯的迷宮在此並不指向男-女異性戀關係的單一出口，不但男人對女人潛在的暴力威脅模糊了羅曼史英雄救美的主題，溪谷事件還將重點轉至幽微的女-女同性衝突。仔細推敲，溪谷事件體現在女性人人自危的歌德情境中被犧牲的女女關係：三位女孩以瓊為代罪羔羊的不二人選，讓／看她受虐正可以暫時轉移對自己也活在男人暴力陰影下的注意力。而母親又為何要堅持讓瓊去上一所離家遙遠到需要跨越一個溪谷才能到達的學校？根據瓊的說法，母親自己怕極了溪谷，卻要瓊日日走過溪谷。母親像是希望瓊有能力走過迷宮以到達她自己未能到達的歌德羅曼史終點。但是，在母親對她的警告中瓊聽到更多的不是母親期待她成功而是母親預見她失敗的訊息：「她會在早餐時提出警告，她的聲音暗示不管我跑得多快都沒有用。我毫無勝算〔 〕」（49）。母親一邊轉移自己的失敗到瓊身上，一邊又

¹¹ 佛洛伊德主張「虐人」（sadism）與「自虐」（masochism）原為一體兩面。參見 Freud, “A Child Is Being Beaten.”

執意指出瓊註定敗北，前者是把自我受虐的影像移轉至瓊，後者則難脫自虐傾向。母女兩人失敗的宿命像兩面鏡子般反映著彼此，兩人都走不出鬼影幢幢的歌德迷宮。

在《奉愛之名》這本書裡，蜜雪兒·馬歇指稱環繞著歌德羅曼史消費市場的女人社群說穿了就是一個女人共謀自虐的社群：

女人的自虐訓練，向內吸納所有積極向外的慾力，使自我否定變得自然且像發自內在而非外力促成。一旦歌德女角內化了這些訓練，她會視艱難險阻為個人遭遇，不能有系統的質疑苦難的來源。她會小心監督自己，以放棄努力為美德，還會教導別的女人也如是做。（3）

在歌德羅曼史的世界裡，女人要不是依賴男人救贖，就是淪為男人暴力的受害者，否定了自我追求的力量，甚至還將自我否定的意象不斷加諸在其他女人身上，構築女人互虐的社群。無力面對性別暴力的來源，更無法跳出歌德制式情節另闢思考新徑，歌德女人對自我最後的一道防線就只能將自我否定式的自虐轉化為同樣也是被動，但可暫保自身安全假象的「觀看別人受虐」。馬歇仿照佛洛伊德在論自虐／虐人理論時所提出的「挨打幻想」（beating fantasy）三進程，主張歌德羅曼史構形於「(1) 父親正在傷害一個女人 (2) 父親(或丈夫)正在傷害我 (3) 一個女人正被傷害」的三層想像之間(65)。其中第一層幻想藉父親傷害別人以暗示父親愛我，最不假修飾的暴露女-女爭取男人關愛的競爭關係；而第三層幻想不只轉嫁自己的受害者身份於她人，使自己成為事不關己的旁觀者，更模糊了暴力來源，當然也就成了歌德羅曼史粉飾太平表象的利器。至於自虐的第二層想像則被包覆於一、三層之間，最受壓抑、最隱而不見，但也最常以潛意識鬼魅之姿縈繞不去。

值得注意的是，在佛洛伊德「挨打幻想」的三進程裡，父親總位居想像的中心：「不分男女案例，『挨打幻想』以對父親亂倫之愛為源頭」（“A Child Is Being Beaten” 198）。即使男孩的「挨打幻想」常以母親為施暴者，佛洛伊德仍主張以母親取代父親乃是男孩避開不提自己同性愛戀的策略。那麼女孩在「挨打幻想」中屢屢以父親為施暴者為何不可能也暗示女孩對自己同性愛戀的壓抑？佛洛伊德注意到母親和女孩間雖有複雜的愛恨情結，卻略而不談母親為何總在女孩「挨打幻想」中缺席的問題。更耐人尋味的是，在女孩「挨打幻想」中不只母親總是缺席，很多時候連女孩自己都缺席了。佛洛伊德指稱在女孩「挨打幻想」中被打的經常是男孩，藉此女孩退出「挨打幻想」的情慾舞台，化主動為被動，甘心扮演否認自己慾望的歇斯底里觀眾。

分析女孩「挨打幻想」或有助於我們（反）消費歌德羅曼史中的慾望迷宮。除了馬歇已經指出的歌德羅曼史一如「挨打幻想」持續進行由「父親／丈夫愛我」、「父親／丈夫傷害我」、到「父親／丈夫傷害她」的慾望想像遞嬗，令人忍不住想問的是在這些反覆刻劃男女異性關係的劇碼之下是不是有一個深層的女人缺席的問題？馬歇認為在每一個歌德女角的內心深處都是一個「創傷式的自我否定」（18）。值得討論的是，女人否定的是自己成為男人慾望之物的資格還是更深層的母女同性聯繫？

根據蘇珊·貝克的看法，《女祭司》在重寫歌德迷宮上最大的貢獻之一可能就在其成功轉移一般對歌德羅曼史中男女情愛的注意力於歌德女人身上。不只是小說對瓊自我分裂、自我形變淋漓盡致的描寫使瓊的愛情生活相形見绌，其用力鋪陳的母女關係也有凌駕異性戀婚姻之勢。在《女祭司》裡佛蘭西絲對瓊影響深遠。她為瓊命名，使瓊擺脫不了電影紅星瓊·克勞馥的陰影；她送瓊上舞蹈課、參加童軍團、為她選購服飾、還要她減肥。用瓊自己的話來說，她和佛蘭西絲的關係從她還小時便是「職業化」的：「她〔母親〕是經理人、創造者、管理人；我則是產品」（63）。面對母親威權的管教，十六歲以前的瓊以反抗母親為職志，以離家自立為生活目標。諷刺的是，希望成為和母親全然不同女人的瓊在離家後才發現她其實正走上母親的舊路：和瓊一樣，佛蘭西絲也曾在十六歲時逃家；多年來瓊整理房間的習慣正是承繼自佛蘭西絲對室內擺設之整潔秩序近乎捉狂的要求；就連佛蘭西絲視男人若非救星即為惡徒的歌德羅曼史式二元思維也深

深影響成年以後瓊對男人的看法；而最重要的，瓊和佛蘭西絲一樣都無法成為成功走出歌德迷宮的女人。

不過，正如我在前面討論溪谷迷宮時已經提過的，佛蘭西絲對瓊最深遠的影響不見得是在於她如何將歌德羅曼史中的理想女人形象加諸於瓊，而在於她給了瓊「你絕對無法成功」的宿命訊息。¹²坦白說，佛蘭西絲傳承給瓊的是一種和「挨打幻想」有緊密關連的女人「憂鬱症」(melancholia)。佛洛伊德認為當一個人對失去之人、事、物的慾力無法經過「弔喪」(mourning)的過程轉移至新的人、事、物，反而轉向自身時，揮之不去的失落悲傷就會因此轉嫁為標誌自我痛恨與自我否定的「憂鬱症」。佛洛伊德還補充，失落感若無法透過「弔喪」來轉移，這失落感必然是潛意識的：「憂鬱症」患者不清楚自己失落了什麼，因此只能認同失落，將自我等同失落 (from object-loss to “ego-loss”)。¹³克莉絲緹娃 (Julia Kristeva) 引申佛洛伊德的理論，進一步指出「憂鬱症」源自人類 (潛意識) 與母體分離的始初創傷。失去和母親的始初聯繫，進入象徵建制的過程就構成潛意識失落。¹⁴用「憂鬱症」的理論來理解佛蘭西絲的性格，會發現她就像佛洛伊德筆下的「憂鬱症」患者否定「弔喪」功效，或是像克莉絲緹娃所描述的「憂鬱症」患者不相信象徵建制裡的文字遞演對其始初失落的療效。佛蘭西絲一邊像是傾盡全力要塑造自己和瓊為歌德羅曼史中的聰明女人，一邊倒像是在藉由自己 (和瓊) 的不斷失敗來證明「弔喪」無效、歌德羅曼史教條對她也無效。佛蘭西絲的「憂鬱症」可以說明她為何在瓊期待已久的舞蹈演出前落井下石，建議老師拿掉瓊的蝴蝶角色要她改跳樟腦丸，更可以說明她為何在瓊真的開始減肥之後幾近歇斯底里的惱怒不已，甚至拿刀刺傷瓊的手臂。

顯然，至少在潛意識裡佛蘭西絲不願瓊追隨歌德羅曼史教條，或者她根本不相信歌德羅曼史教條能補足她真正失落的東西。問題是，在自虐 / 虐人的行為表象下她要的到底是什麼？當瓊面對橫渡大西洋來英國尋訪她的母親靈體 (astral body)、注視著母親無聲恐懼的哭泣臉龐時，她想問的也正是「母親到底想向我要什麼？」。有趣的是，母親失落的未嘗不正是瓊所失落的。同樣置身歌德羅曼史主導想像的社會情境中，正如母親將自己的失落轉嫁到瓊身上，多年以來瓊也不斷將自己不能順利走出歌德迷宮的悲劇形象映照在母親身上：

她從來沒真正放開我是因為我從沒真正放開她。在我坐在鏡前時站在我身後的是她，等在每一個轉角處喃喃出聲的也總是她。她是〔我詩文創作中〕那乘坐死亡舢舨的女人，那青絲散亂雙眼浮腫的悲劇女人，那囚禁高塔的女人。〔 〕

她也需要自由；她當我的倒影已經當得太久。（330）

瓊以佛蘭西絲為倒影，投射自己悖離歌德情節的身影，這使她和佛蘭西絲一樣都曾經活在歌德羅曼史女人的「挨打幻想」裡。

瓊在成長過程中常有一個夢境，坐在三面梳妝鏡 (triple mirror) 前的母親變身為三頭怪獸 (monster)。當瓊還小的時候，夢裡的她並不因母親變成怪獸而害怕，因為「她早就知道」母親的祕密 (63)。真正讓她害怕的是在門外伺機，隨時要開門進來的男人。瓊認同母親並和她站在同一陣線，一起承受「挨打」的威脅：「若讓他看見，若讓他知道母親的祕密，不只母親，連我都要遭殃」(63)。可是，當瓊逐漸長大，夢境裡的她卻背叛母親，甚至希望外頭的男人趕快進來揭穿母親的祕密，彷彿只要母親受罰她就可以全身而退，只要證明母親是怪獸她就可以掩蓋自己其實也是怪獸的事實。追根究底，

¹² 瓊承認，母親對她計畫雖多但目標龐大且不明確，以致於「不管我做成了甚麼都不對」(63)。

¹³ 參見 Freud, “Mourning and Melancholia” 257。

¹⁴ 參見 Kristeva 43-55。詳細的說，克莉絲緹娃認為象徵建制裡的語言同時遮掩且喚起被語言活埋的母親。憂鬱症標示個人和母親難以挽回的始初分離，但也促使個人看清象徵建制之不足，進而重尋與母親聯繫的空間。放在討論羅曼史消費的情境中，可以說憂鬱症既是女人備受歌德情節壓抑所產生的徵狀，更是女人質疑歌德情節療傷效力的起點。這一點我在接下來的討論中還會繼續說明。

在針對母親的怪獸想像之下藏的是瓊對自己的怪獸想像：

他們不曾懷疑我；我就像一塊海綿，吞下一切悶不吭聲，雖然我一直有股衝動想吐露一切，包括所有的怨恨和嫉妒，讓自己以自己早已心知肚明的說謊怪獸原形現身。（91）

可以想見的是，在「挨打幻想」的統御之下，瓊和佛蘭西絲無法建立良好的母女關係，也無法找到在異性戀婚姻以外自我的價值。在歌德制式情節的潛意識裡母女關係被遺忘、被取代，使瓊和母親只得委身自我責備、自我否定的「憂鬱症」。

在《女祭司》裡，瓊和佛蘭西絲的自我否定最常體現於她們對自己（或彼此）身體與過去的否定。佛蘭西絲不斷以化妝品遮蓋自己的相貌，以口紅畫出較大的唇形遮掩自己原來的嘴形，在瓊面前並且矢口不談自己的家庭背景和婚前生活。同樣的，瓊在幼年參加舞蹈表演時就曾渴望自己身體能經歷「魔法般的蛻變」（43）；十六歲減肥除去先前的自己，之後的瓊更亟於為自己捏造和前身裁匹配的過去。另外，瓊以假自殺逃離加拿大，到了義大利立刻剪去標示自我身份的紅色長髮，彷彿埋掉一具「被自己謀殺的屍體」般埋掉自己過去的衣物（16）。這些行徑無不驗證瓊將自己除之而後快的願望。

而在希冀除去自己變為別人的過程中，瓊和母親更轉移對自己的不滿為對彼此的不滿。成年的瓊在重新思索她和佛蘭西絲的關係時指出若佛蘭西絲不是活在「憂鬱症」的失落中，若她「知道自己想要什麼又能勇往直前做她想要，她便不會視我為眼中釘，她失敗和絕望的象徵」（64）。同樣的，若非瓊由母親那兒繼承了「憂鬱症」的失落感，若非瓊總是認為自己的生命是個不受母親歡迎的「意外」（74），她也就不會自陷於和母親無止盡的周旋，藉由和母親鬥志、悖離母親給她的減肥安排來證明自己的存在——「我是不是該〔透過不斷的吃〕變得很壯，壯得像石頭一樣好讓她〔母親〕無法除去我？」（74）。仔細推敲，瓊真正的創傷源頭正是與母親分離，她最深的恐懼來源是母親可能遺棄她。由瓊的自述中我們得知瓊也曾極力想取悅母親但功敗垂成。瓊懷疑母親在她六歲之後就不再為她拍照是因為母親已「放棄了她的身體」（39）；她還質疑母親為何鮮少願意觸碰她的身體：出外時「母親不握我的手因為她還有手套要顧慮」，而「她那堅硬一絲不苟的鬚髮」當然容不下「我的巢穴」（85）。在一個重複的兒時夢魘裡，瓊站在坍塌的橋上哭喊，但近在咫尺的母親顧自和別人聊天，對她的求救「充耳不聞」（61）。離家之後瓊認為「最糟」的夢境，就是梳妝鏡前現出三頭怪獸原形的母親「不見蹤影」，獨剩瓊一人關在房內，承受門外竊竊私語的威脅（213）。的確，瓊是這麼憂心母親離她而去，以致於母親的死讓她有好一段時間無法寫作，因為瓊擔心這一次母親真的拋棄了她（181）。

當然佛蘭西絲並不曾真正拋棄瓊。雖然母女倆都曾嘗試服膺歌德羅曼史教條，在異性戀婚姻中尋找慾望出路，但是演出歌德情節對她們而言像是進行一個沒有終點的弔喪過程。被壓抑的過去不時重回現實，被拋棄的自我以鬼魅之姿如影隨形，被犧牲的母女關係更以「詭異」姿態不時重新被喚起：佛蘭西絲真實的唇形像「影子」般由畫上的新唇裡透將出來（64）；減肥成功後的瓊在面對鏡子時也還能看見減肥前身體的輪廓「像霧、像幽靈月亮般環繞著自己」（213）。除此之外，瓊可以埋掉她在加拿大穿過的衣服，卻揮不去彷彿「聽見衣服自己掙扎出土並長出肉身」，以她過去的胖女人形象「降落到她身上」來吞噬她的夢魘（321）¹⁵；而佛蘭西絲的靈體在瓊離家後更鏗而不舍的重訪瓊。這不但證明了佛蘭西絲未曾能夠拋下瓊，更迫使瓊一次又一次必須用心思索母親要的到底是什麼。瓊承認：「我想遺忘過去但過去拒絕遺忘我；它等我入睡便來糾纏我」（213）。在小說接近終了前，瓊終於認清了「逃離無用」的道理：

逃離的嘗試毫無意義，我已將它們〔過去的人事物〕隨身攜帶，我還聽得見它們的聲音，呢呢喃喃像遠方一群憤怒暴徒。重擬未來計畫為時已晚。過去揮之

¹⁵ 這裡值得一提的是，在小說的最後這批衣服不但真的被挖出來，還被重新送回瓊尷尬的手上，戲劇化的破解瓊想埋掉過去自我的企圖。

不去。(310)

故事發展至此，尋求男性救贖以走出歌德迷宮已非瓊生命的唯一出路。瓊在歌德迷宮中反向搜尋，正視歌德迷宮連結過去的「過賸空間」(a space in excess)以及自己和母親之間如迷宮般複雜的愛恨情結。

簡言之，雖然《女祭司》以歌德羅曼史為摹本，又雖然「一部歌德羅曼史」(A Gothic Romance)正是《女祭司》還在手稿階段時的副標題(Becker 151)，大多數的評論都主張愛特伍其實已將《女祭司》寫成了「反歌德」(anti-gothic)(Beran 22, Bouson 63, Rigney 79, Liungberg 127, McMillan 56)。由父權主導、男性至上的歌德羅曼史教條出發，愛特伍將《女祭司》寫成了一部「找尋真正母親」的小說(qtd. in Hengen 66)。但是與其說愛特伍執意挑戰歌德、批判歌德、走出歌德，還不如說她是以廣義的、自我矛盾且自我顛覆的歌德特質去諧擬一個狹義的、自我侷限的歌德羅曼史傳統情節。正如貝克所言，「《女祭司》重寫女性歌德傳統，重複女性歌德經驗，不只為戲謔歌德，更為探索其在當代女性文學文化中的可能性」(154)。愛特伍將歌德小說由囚禁女人的古堡寫成女人漫遊的迷宮，可說挖掘了歌德作為一女性文類本身即具有的顛覆性，更呼應克萊兒·肯恩(Claire Kahane)以「母性空間」(maternal space)為歌德小說經驗中心的主張：

依我看來伊底帕斯情結比較像是傳統表象而非有影響力的內蘊想像，比較像是個輪廓支架包藏一個較之更為聳動的衝突模式。我看見足跨陰陽的母親幽靈現身，一次又一次被鎖入歌德引我進入之禁忌中心，那是一個陳舊但無所不包的鬼魂，象徵女主角必須面對的女性角色難題。(336)

《女祭司》遂尋歌德小說的禁忌中心，在歌德原本即模稜的場域裡挖掘母親幽靈，藉由處理瓊由背離母親到認同母親「三頭」角色的過程，演出一場女人積極介入歌德迷宮中的(反)消費，構築「女人虛飾」的空間與「神諭發聲」的可能。

女人虛飾與神諭發聲

可以說，瓊在《女祭司》裡突破歌德羅曼史鏡像的關鍵在於她逐漸認清且接受自我的多面性。瓊由力主將偏離情節教條的自我不斷以新創自我取代，追求自我在時間順序上的更迭(subject-in-process)，逐漸了解多元自我共時並存的意義，發掘向迷宮般四處延伸之過賸主體(subject-in-excess)所具有的顛覆力。正如前面在討論歌德迷宮時已經說明過的，若非舊的自我陰魂不散，新的自我危機重重，使瓊總是活在多重自我新舊交替的分裂邊界中，她也就無法趨近歌德羅曼史表象之下模稜糾結的迷宮場域。用羅仙娜·范德(Roxanne J. Fand)的話來說，瓊之所以會有那麼多對自己的不滿、經歷那麼多生活的折騰，是因為她追隨「看似簡單的統一自我模式」(197)。瓊大部分時間只能複製歌德制式情節，「她的創造力未加善用」，也因她和自我「對話不足」(not dialogic enough)(196)。呼應范德的主張，琴·渥爾辛頓則更直截了當的指出瓊「想逃離複聲自我與壓抑慾望的錯誤」(299)。

追根究底，想逃離多元自我的動機原本就是錯的，是自我否定與自我棄絕的自虐行為。「我熱愛生命」，瓊承認，為何要「假裝死才能活」(315)？她認清自己共時多元的特質不同於亞瑟與時遞嬗的自我：「我很快發現亞瑟和我一樣多面。不同的是我的多面同時並存而亞瑟的隨時間更換」(211)。很明顯的，瓊之所以陷入與綽號「皇家豪豬」(Royal Porcupine)之實體藝術家(concrete artist)的婚外情，是因為自己已無法再壓抑隨時蠢蠢欲動、想破繭而出的多重自我：「〔和皇家豪豬的關係〕正式開啟我的雙重生命。但我的生命難道不早就鬧雙胞？總有個雙胞胎陰影，我胖時她瘦，我瘦時她胖〔 〕」(245)。而若更深入追蹤，瓊的生命豈只是鬧雙包？她是臃腫不堪的未成年少女、左派政治運動家亞瑟的妻子、隱居的暢銷歌德羅曼史作家、以《女祭司》詩文集享譽文壇的女性主義作家；在自己的想像世界裡她更同時是馬戲團裡的胖女人、歌德羅曼史中的女角、甚至是梳妝鏡前的三頭怪獸。瓊透過「虛飾」構築多重生活空間：

「我不只有雙重人格，我擁有多重、三重人格。我現在可以看見迎向我而來的生命不只一個，而是很多」（245）。

在《女祭司》裡，鏡子意像的運用最為傳神地解構個人主體一元。在心理分析傳統的概念裡，鏡中影像使個人形象定於一，透過與鏡像認同，個人方能樹立完整自我輪廓，鏡像於是成為傳遞主流審美價值、約制個人型塑潛力的媒介。¹⁶小說中佛蘭西絲不斷在鏡前梳妝，卻愈形焦慮惱怒，正因其無法成功複製鏡中呼應主流價值審美觀的理想形象

「彷彿鏡子背面或鏡子裡頭有一個她抓不住或複製不了、稍縱即逝的影像」

（62-63）。但《女祭司》不只描寫將看似完美之他者形象加諸於個人的鏡子，書中出現更多的是化個人影像為三、為多、再為無止盡的三面鏡。長大後的瓊擁有和佛蘭西絲一樣的三面梳妝鏡，她在鏡前點起蠟燭嘗試「無意識寫作」（automatic writing），原本只是希望藉由鏡子引導順利完成手邊的歌德羅曼史創作，沒想到三面鏡沒教給瓊教條情節，反而引領瓊進入一個由一到三到多到無止盡的迷宮世界。瓊藉由「無意識寫作」寫出了她自稱為是「走樣歌德」（a Gothic gone wrong）的《女祭司》詩文集（232），塑造了一個脫胎於三頭怪獸母親的三面女神形象：

她端坐白鐵王位
是一體也是三位
是黑暗女神 純金女神
留白女神 血的
神諭，是她的就得被
永遠 遵從 （225）

瓊筆下的三面女神分明是希羅神話中地獄女神希卡地（Hecate）、月亮女神希寧（Selene）、和狩獵女神雅特密絲（Artemis），或名黛安娜（Diana）合而為一的三面一體女神（the goddess with three forms）化身。¹⁷瓊由想像母親（和自己）為三頭怪獸到賦予其三面一體的女神形象，她透過鏡子扭轉自我貶抑的負面印象。多重自我不再是危及個人生存因而必須被極力掩蓋的祕密，反而是一種優勢，使自己能成為跨界支配地獄、天空、與地面的三面女神。

愛特伍訴諸神話以改寫歌德女人憂鬱症宿命的企圖十分明顯。原本是不夠聰明、不夠貞潔、不夠自制以致於不能成為被拯救的歌德女主角，換個方向思考，這些「不夠」反而成為挑戰歌德羅曼史制式情節力量的來源。舉例而言，減肥前的瓊被摒棄於歌德羅曼史情節之外，但她也因此免除「作為女人的恐懼」（138）。瓊承認肥胖可以是「一種掩飾」、「一層隔離保護」、或是「一個繭」，雖然使她不被注視但也使她不受侵犯（139）。另外，龐大的身軀使瓊擁有超乎一般想像中女人的力量：她「只消輕呼一口氣便足以將潛在騷擾者吹得撞碎在牆上」（138）；而一般男人站在她身邊，「就像懸掛在她手臂上的皮包」（96）。當然，肥胖更重要的意義在於瓊既然曾經不被當作女人看待，減肥成功後的她依然保有看穿性別神話的神祕力量：¹⁸「〔亞瑟〕要我愚昧且脆弱，我的確如此，但只在表面上。深藏底下的是另一個神話：我允許自己愚昧脆弱因為我擁有充滿力量的核心，一個供我隨時汲取後援和溫暖的貯藏所」（88）。愚昧和脆弱只是虛飾表象，隱藏瓊超出制式女人的私密自我，以及她不為人知的神祕力量。

憂鬱症裡的自視不足可以被轉化為具顛覆力的過賸力量，這在瓊幼年時的樟腦丸舞蹈表演裡再次得到印證。表面上扮演樟腦丸是一個懲罰，暴露瓊不足以扮演蝴蝶的殘酷

¹⁶ 參閱 Feldstein 對 Lacan 鏡像理論的詮釋。Feldstein 認為鏡像操作已成為主流文化制約個人慾望與自我想像的主要媒介。

¹⁷ 關於希羅神話中的「三面女神」想像，見 Hamilton 31-32。《女祭司》對「三面女神」神話的應用，亦可參見 Sciff-Zamaro。

¹⁸ 瓊的情況令人想起維吉妮雅·吳爾芙（Virginia Woolf）筆下的傳奇角色歐蘭朵（Orlando）。曾經是男人的歐蘭朵在變為女人之後遠較一般人更能看穿約定成俗的性別迷思。

現實；但正因扮不像蝴蝶，瓊得以跳出約定成俗的「女人 = 蝴蝶」框架，扮演獨一無二的樟腦丸：「沒有指定舞步，因為沒人教我，所以我一邊跳一邊編舞。〔 〕我將自己投入這角色，這是場交織憤怒與毀滅的舞〔 〕」（46）。出乎瓊的意料，她的舞得到滿堂喝采，說明瓊所謂的自視「不足」只是在面對某一特定標準的不足，不是真的自我匱缺。

而其實不只是瓊，佛蘭西絲對瓊的影響力又何嘗不可追溯自她對自我的不滿？和瓊的露依莎姑姑（Aunt Lou）比起來，佛蘭西絲在現實生活中受挫更深。露依莎姑姑帶領瓊看電影、接觸流行思維，擅用羅曼史的逃避主義使現實變得可以接受，無怪乎長大後的瓊是以露依莎為筆名寫作暢銷歌德羅曼史。相反的，佛蘭西絲對現實充滿憤懣，但她強烈的自我企圖心正好轉化為質疑現實體制的強大力量。可以理解的是，崇尚逃避主義的露依莎姑姑在死後即銷聲匿跡，屈服於象徵建置中的生死界限；而不甘心死亡和沈默的佛蘭西絲則屢屢挑戰生死疆界，一次又一次回到瓊的身邊，化身侵擾現實表象的「詭異」靈體。而隨著《女祭司》文本的推進，瓊由認同露依莎姑姑逐漸轉而認同佛蘭西絲那彷彿「被囚禁」但蓄勢待發的女神力量（Hengen 73）。不只在出版《女祭司》詩文集時瓊用的是本名，她還開始意識到佛蘭西絲當初可能不是根據「瓊·克勞馥」而是根據「聖女貞德」（Joan of Art）為自己命名：「我想她告訴我前者只為掩飾」，因為「她會不知道像聖女貞德一樣的女人會有什麼下場嗎？」（337）。瓊指出佛蘭西絲可能只是以「瓊·克勞馥」做為「幌子」偷渡她期待瓊成為如聖女貞德般具有顛覆力量之女人的願望。職是，命名成就女人虛飾，更構築母女傳承認同秘語的空間。

而愛特伍藉由將瓊比擬為「聖女貞德」，點出了小說中的「女祭司」主題。瓊認為她和「聖女貞德」最像的一點是她們都聽得見超出現實的聲音：「當你開始聽見聲音時你就有麻煩了，尤其是當你相信那聲音」（337）。可是聽見聲音也是質疑既存現實的起點。愛特伍呼應西克蘇（Hélène Cixous）、克萊蒙（Catherine Clément）等女性主義學者所提出的巫女（sibyl）發聲論述，在《女祭司》裡似乎也在思考歌德羅曼史中的女人化身為知名如神話中阿波羅（Apollo）臺爾菲（Delphi）神殿中女祭司的可能性和顛覆力。¹⁹問題是，臺爾菲神殿中的女祭司充其量也只能借出自己身體傳遞阿波羅的神諭，而非說出自己的聲音。這令人想起瓊在小說中出版詩文集《女祭司》時所碰到的難題。不只以《女祭司》為作品標題是男編輯的意見，整部詩文集由編輯、出版、到行銷也全由男出版商包辦；瓊不過出借名號與身體成就男性獨霸的出版市場。究竟如何奪回臺爾菲神殿的女性主導權？²⁰如何解決女人只能作為傳聲筒而無法自立神諭格局的問題？是不是當愛特伍同樣以《女祭司》為其小說命名，她的書寫已經成功諧擬了作為書中書的瓊的作品《女祭司》，為女性發聲扳回一城？

或許，要女人在陷阱重重的歌德迷宮中找到自己發聲的機會真是件很難的事。瓊小時候有個夢想就是成為「歌劇演唱家」，希望自己「能夠站在眾人面前盡其所能大聲叫出怨恨、愛戀、怒氣、和失望，嘶喊到肺所能承受的極限，而流瀉出來的是音樂」（74）。不過，要讓尖叫嘶吼的憤懣抗議在流瀉出來時變為動人的音樂談何容易？同樣的，要重寫充滿女人憂鬱自虐的歌德情節為積極正面的女性聲音又怎能不困難重重？用瓊的話來說，女性積極介入歌德羅曼史消費可能就像是要在看似無路的困境裡闢出一條路；她比較亞瑟和自己的歌德處境：「亞瑟有路可走，可能不只一條，他可以一次選一條。我呢則山窮水盡。放眼草叢、河溝、水塘、迷陣、沼澤，就是沒有路」（169）。

¹⁹ 關於 Cixous 和 Clément 等人之「巫女論述」，以及《女祭司》對「巫女論述」的呼應，Bök 已做詳盡討論，本文不再贅述。

²⁰ Patton 在愛特伍《女祭司》手稿資料中發現一批影印自 Robert Graves《希臘神話》（*The Greek Myth*）的資料。在 Graves 書中，臺爾菲神殿原為大地母親擁有，後來「阿波羅掠取神諭」，才落入阿波羅之手。Patton 因此推論「愛特伍似乎有意奪回女神的神諭或預言角色」，由「女祭司」被動傳話位置重返「女神諭」主動發聲位置（41）。

究竟在無路之處走出一條路有多難？在改寫歌德羅曼史作品《被愛跟蹤》的結局時，瓊將自己無路可走的困境投射到書中理當被取代的男主角元配菲麗莎身上。呼應現實生活中瓊因走投無路只好假自殺的情節，菲麗莎不只同樣溺死在湖泊裡，屍體也同樣消失無蹤。根據歌德小說的傳統，菲麗莎的死不僅在預期中，更是男主角雷德蒙和其新歡夏洛特得以結合的關鍵。可是此時已切斷和加拿大聯繫、獨自一人在義大利的瓊猛然懷疑起逃避主義的價值。原以為逃避可以帶來安全，現在才發現百無聊賴會激起更多焦慮：「生命的另一邊絕非天堂，而是無家可歸的漂泊之地」（309）。瓊了解了為何死去之人要頻頻回顧現實。摻雜著自己想重新介入現實的慾望，她靈機一動將菲麗莎寫成拒絕死亡宿命的妻子，讓她宛如自己的分身般以極度肥胖的身體，糾結的紅色頭髮再現現實，重新挑戰歌德迷宮。緊接著菲麗莎在迷宮中遇見四個遭囚禁、均自稱為「雷德蒙夫人」的女人。「要離開迷宮的話只能通過一扇門」，四個女人異口同聲（342），可是駐守在門外的正是雷德曼，他擋住女人們的出路，有權決定是要殺了她們還是娶其為妻。

走筆至此，瓊發現她的小說創作和現實生活已難分彼此。現實先像是呼應歌德小說情節，但很快的其複雜及諸多可能性侵入歌德、篡改歌德女人走投無路的結局。當寫到菲麗莎決定打開歌德迷宮大門勇敢與雷德蒙對質的同時，現實中的瓊也下定決心不再逃避，打開大門面對門外的現實：「我開始覺得不安。我驚覺自己已經花太多時間躲在門後，聆聽另一邊世界的聲音」（341）。瓊亦步亦趨追隨著菲麗莎打開迷宮出口的脚步，她起身拉開公寓大門。原以為站在門外敲門的人勢必是已經發現她的罪行、千里跟蹤來懲罰她的丈夫亞瑟，但愛特伍很快證明瓊是過度相信歌德情節了。不只站在門外的只是個陌生的採訪記者，瓊也從沒想過自己有那麼大的力氣，可以那麼輕易的就將一個大男人打昏（344）。愛特伍一邊安排瓊不斷重複訴說女人無路可走的困境，一邊卻反諷式地凸顯女人在現實中闢出一條路也不見得真有那麼難。²¹說穿了女人的走投無路會不會只是歌德羅曼史複製的諸多迷思之一？女人不敢開門大步向前會不會只因歌德羅曼史傳統蒙蔽了她們的眼睛？

以《女祭司》為例思考歌德羅曼史消費的問題，我們看見歌德羅曼史想像一邊助長女人的自虐與憂鬱徵狀，一邊卻喚起女人的不滿與不安；一邊覆誦男尊女卑的異性戀婚姻結局，一邊卻刻畫男性中心主流思維中「異形」（the foreign body）的搬演；一邊尋思逃避之道以化解創傷，同時卻也籠罩於創傷陰影之中。這樣自相矛盾的文類容許多樣閱讀模式，可以是被動的共謀消費，可能是主動的質疑與反消費，更可能是在重覆嘗試共謀的過程中偏離軌道，像瓊（或佛蘭西絲以及菲麗莎）一樣演出共謀不成反顛覆的結局。瓊在母親靈體最後一次拜訪她時渴望和母親擁抱，直言不諱她對母親的愛：「她能看見我愛她嗎？我愛她但有面玻璃擋在我們之間，我得想個辦法穿過它」（329-330）。擋在瓊和佛蘭西絲中間的玻璃豈非就是傳遞女人自虐／互虐迷思的歌德羅曼史教條？由遵循主導歌德羅曼史制式情節的「父之版本」（père-version）到發掘瀟灑歌德內裡之所謂女人的「不法慾望」（perversion），瓊或許已找出穿越玻璃的方法，或許穿越玻璃本來就不是那麼難，就看她想不想穿越。《女祭司》的結局令人想起吉爾曼（Gilman）在寓言詩作「障礙」（“An Obstacle”）中所描述的情境：先入為主的男性「偏見」擋住了女人去路，女人在百般嘗試移開「偏見」無效之後索性對「偏見」視若無睹地邁開大步前進。奇蹟是，她真的就走過去了：

²¹在稍前的一段情節裡，愛特伍對歌德情節開了一個類似的玩笑：當瓊再也忍受不了只能在門後跳舞的宿命，她舞出門外，卻馬上被地上的碎玻璃割傷了腳。表面上，瓊的遭遇彷彿重複了自己小時候喜愛的《紅舞鞋》（*The Red Shoes*）電影中女主角所面臨的「你敢跳舞我便砍去你的腳」的困境（335），但瓊終究只是割傷了腳，數個小時後她就恢復行走自如。歌德情節在現實生活中顯得誇大無稽。瓊無論如何不是童話故事中要不就要掙得王子真愛，要不就必須在生命或雙足中做出選擇的小美人魚，她玩笑似地改稱自己為「大美人魚」（336）。

我戴上帽子，拿起手杖，
 背負的東西整理好，
 我靠近那懾人的夢魔
 心不在焉地
 直接穿過他，
 就當他不存在。（322）

穿越男性的「偏見」能夠如此，穿越歌德羅曼史的迷思或亦如是。

引用書目

- Atwood, Margaret. *Lady Oracle*. New York: Anchor, 1976.
- Becker, Susanne. *Gothic Forms of Feminine Fictions*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1999.
- Beran, Carol L. "George, Leda, and a Poured Concrete Balcony." *Canadian Literature* 112 (1987): 18-28.
- Bök, Christian. "Sibyls: Echoes of French Feminism in *The Diviners* and *Lady Oracle*." *Canadian Literature* 135 (1992): 80-93.
- Botting, Fred. "The Gothic Production of the Unconscious." *Spectral Readings: Towards a Gothic Geography*. Ed. Glennis Byron and David Punter. London: MacMillan, 1999. 11-36.
- Bouson, J. Brooks. *Brutal Choreographies: Oppositional Strategies and Narrative Design in the Novels of Margaret Atwood*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.
- David-Ménard, Monique. *Hysteria from Freud to Lacan*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Ellis, Kate Ferguson. *The Contested Castle: Gothic Novels and the Subversion of Domestic Ideology*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1989.
- Fand, J. Roxanee. *The Dialogic Self: Reconstructing Subjectivity in Woolf, Lessing and Atwood*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Press, 1999.
- Feldstein, Richard. "The Mirror of Manufactured Cultural Relations." *Reading Seminars I and II: Lacan's Return to Freud*. Ed. Richard Feldstein, Bruce Fink, and Maire Jaanus. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996. 130-169.
- Fowler, Bridget. *The Alienated Reader: Women and Romantic Literature in the Twentieth-Century*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
- Freud, Sigmund. "'A Child Is Being Beaten': A Contribution to the Study of the Origin of Sexual Perversions." 1919. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud (SE)*. Trans. and Ed. James Strachey. Vol. 17. London: The Hogarth Press, 1955. 175-204. 24 vols.
- . "Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria." 1905. *SE*. Vol. 7. 1-122.
- . "Mourning and Melancholia." 1917. *SE*. Vol. 14. 239-258.
- . "Remembering, Repeating and Working-Through." 1914. *SE*. Vol. 12. 145-156.
- . "The 'Uncanny.'" 1919. *SE*. Vol. 17. 217-252.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. "An Obstacle." 1890. *Charlotte Perkins Gilman: Herland, "The Yellow Wall-Paper," and Selected Writings*. New York: Penguin, 1999. 321-322.
- Hamilton, Edith. *Mythology: Timeless Tales of Gods and Heroes*. 1940. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
- Hammond, Karla. "Defying Distinctions." *Margaret Atwood: Conversations*. Ed. Earl G. Ingersoll. 1990. London: Virago Press, 1992. 99-108.

- Hengen, Shannon. *Margaret Atwood's Power: Mirrors, Reflections and Images in Select Fiction and Poetry*. Toronto: Second Story Press, 1993.
- Hoepfner, Kenneth. "Frye's Theory of Romance, Popular Romance and Atwood's *Lady Oracle*." *Aclals Bulletin* 8.1 (1989): 74-87.
- Howells, Coral Ann. "Atwoodian Gothic: From *Lady Oracle* to *The Robber Bride*." *Modern Novelists: Margaret Atwood*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995. 62-85.
- . *Love, Mystery, and Misery: Feeling in Gothic Fiction*. London: Athlone, 1995.
- Kahane, Claire. "The Gothic Mirror." *The (M)other Tongue: Essays in Feminist Psychoanalytic Interpretation*. Ed. Shirley Nelson Garner, Claire Kahane, and Madelon Sprengnether. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985. 334-351.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Black Sun: Depression and Melancholia*. 1987. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1989.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Subversion of the Subject and the Dialectic of Desire in the Freudian Unconscious." *Écrits: A Selection*. 1966. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1977. 292-325.
- Liungberg, Christina. *To Join, to Fit, and to Make: The Creative Craft of Margaret Atwood's Fiction*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.
- Mandel, Eli. "Atwood Gothic [*You Are Happy, Surfacing, Survival, The Animals in that Country, The Circle Game, and Power Politics*]." *Critical Essays on Margaret Atwood*. Ed. Judith McCombs. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1988. 114-123.
- Massé, Michelle A. *In the Name of Love: Women, Masochism, and the Gothic*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1992.
- McMillan, Ann. "The Transforming Eye: *Lady Oracle* and Gothic Tradition." *Margaret Atwood: Vision and Forms*. Ed. Kathryn VanSpanckeren and Jan Garden Castro. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1988. 48-64.
- Palmer, Jerry. *Potboilers: Methods, Concepts and Case Studies in Popular Fiction*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- Patton, Marilyn. "*Lady Oracle*: The Politics of the Body." *Ariel: A Review of International Literature* 22.4 (1991): 29-48.
- Punter, David. "Ceremonial Gothic." *Spectral Readings: Towards a Gothic Geography*. Ed. Glennis Byron and David Punter. London: MacMillan, 1999. 37-53.
- . *Gothic Pathologies: The Text, the Body and the Law*. London: MacMillan, 1998.
- . "Introduction: of Apparitions." *Spectral Readings: Towards a Gothic Geography*. Ed. Glennis Byron and David Punter. London: MacMillan, 1999. 1-8.
- Radway, Janice A. *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.
- Rigney, Barbara Hill. *Margaret Atwood*. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books, 1987.
- Rosowski, Susan J. "Margaret Atwood's *Lady Oracle*: Fantasy and the Modern Gothic Novel." *Critical Essays on Margaret Atwood*. Ed. Judith McCombs. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1988. 197-208.
- Sciff-Zamaro, Roberta. "The Re/Membering of the Female Power in *Lady Oracle*." *Canadian Literature* 112 (1987): 32-38.
- Worthington, Kim L. *Self as Narrative: Subjectivity and Community in Contemporary Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Žižek, Slavoj. "'Che Vuoi?'" *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. New York: Verso, 1989. 87-129.

II.

「無名女人」後裔： 亞美文學中的陰性系譜²²

李秀娟

國立台灣師範大學英語系

摘要

本文著眼亞美性別政治，思考性別議題或女人介入亞美論述對亞美想像的貢獻和啟示。論文由湯亭亭《女鬥士》（*The Woman Warrior*）中的「無名女人」意象談起，一邊指出早期亞美女人遭逐出家門與消音匿名的困境，但以更多篇幅思索「無名女人」後裔反書「無名」為跨族跨國命名空間，翻轉「棄卻」（abjection）為社群向外向它者延伸的可能，進而為編織亞美文學不爭取純種而爭取時空蔓延的陰性系譜鋪路。論文首先討論數部經典亞美女性作品，思考亞美女性書寫如何轉化「無名」處境為社群綿延的開端。緊接著，我舉出數部作品中亞美個人棄卻亞美母親的傾向與滅種焦慮的例子，說明相對於某些亞美男性角色自我設限的「純種要求」與對「父之名」的堅持，不少亞美敘述反而能以「無名」為傳承介面鋪衍出父權焦慮以外族裔繁衍的契機。論文最後藉由對「宮籟」概念的討論，延伸出「宮籟緣起」（choric cause）的論點，藉由理論指出許多亞美女性角色在亞美歷史與文化發展中扮演如「宮籟」般「無名」但容許雜音、萬流涵匯的介面--她們的「不純」或者成為促成亞美社群蔓延與生存的關鍵。

關鍵詞：亞美文學、性別政治、陰性、宮籟（緣起）、棄卻、無名女人、族裔書寫

讓我們別忘了[.....]我們早有歷史；有些女人儘管面對重重文化障礙，仍然已在歷史中留下痕跡，只是我們常常把這些痕跡忘了。

--露西·伊熙佳荷（Luce Irigaray），《性別系譜》
（*Sexes and Genealogies*）19

你真正的祖父是亞來·湯瑪斯；至於亞來的父親是誰，只有天曉得了。富人、窮人、乞丐、聖徒、多國混血、記載於十數張已消失的地圖、或來自於數百個早被夷平的村落--你自己挑吧。你的父系傳承包容無盡想像。你儘可以隨意編造。

--瑪格麗特·愛特伍（Margaret Atwood），《盲眼刺客》
（*The Blind Assassin*）513

²² 本文的修改，得力於在東吳大學舉辦之第二十七屆全國比較文學研討會中劉紀雯教授割切的評論甚多，特此致謝。

亞裔美籍女性在亞美文學與文化發展中的位置一直備受爭議。早在趙健秀 (Frank Chin)、陳耀光 (Jeffery Paul Chan) 等人為首所掀起的亞美「真偽之辨」中，著名的亞美作家如湯亭亭 (Maxine Hong Kingston)、譚恩美 (Amy Tan)、黃玉雪 (Jade Snow Wong) 等人均遭到點名批評，表面上的理由是她們所寫的無法「真實」(authentically) 反映所謂「亞美感性」(Asian American sensibility)，但追根究底這裡所謂的「真實亞美感性」無非就是以亞美男性權力為中心，以父子傳承為基礎，追求亞美純種的英雄民族主義。²³ 換句話說，亞美作家們似乎不該以女性關懷與性別政治，介入亞美英雄主義建構；或說，亞美女性主義將注意力由亞美民族政治轉移至性別議題，其發展似乎有分裂、雜化亞美民族一統的危險。張敬珩 (Kink-Kok Cheung) 在一九九〇年發表的一篇文章，標題「女鬥士對抗渡洋中國男人：華美批評非得在女性主義與英雄主義中二選一嗎？」(“The Woman Warrior versus the Chinaman Pacific: Must a Chinese American Critic Choose between Feminism and Heroism?”)，不偏不倚地點出女性主義與性別政治在七〇與八〇年代亞美研究中的尷尬地位。²⁴

亞美研究在一九九〇年代朝向多元與跨國快速發展，然而女性主義和亞美族裔政治之間互為扞格的情況依然存在。李蕾潔 (Rachel C. Lee) 一九九九年出版《亞美文學中的眾美國：民族與跨民族性別小說》(*The Americas of Asian American Literature: Gendered Fictions of Nation and Transnation*)，其念茲在茲的仍舊是亞美政治假奉族裔、種族整體利益之名犧牲性別的問題。除了重複張敬珩以及金惠經 (Elaine Kim) 等女性學者對「整個亞美書寫都意在重振亞美男性雄風」以及亞美學者「被迫在女性主義與族裔中心批判之間選邊」(Rachel Lee 8) 的擔憂，她特別指出當亞美研究陷入紛擾不休的民族、跨民族、與離散等議題的爭辯時，女性議題更有淪為次要、甚或被遺忘的危險。之前為與男性中心亞美民族主義相抗衡，女性主義尚屬師出有名，如今民族主義勢力削弱，亞美女性主義何去何從 (Lee 10)？李蕾潔提醒亞美學界：跨民族與跨國不意味性別問題頓時解決，亞美女性的議題不該銷聲匿跡於環繞於亞美立國、跨國、或去國的喧囂擾攘之中。

本論文以思考女性在亞美文學與歷史中的位置為出發點，嘗試說明女性主義、或女性議題介入亞美書寫對整個亞美社群發展的貢獻和啟示。論文首先回顧在所謂的「族裔

²³ 有關亞美「真偽之辨」，見 Aiiieeeee! 序言及 *The Big Aiiieeeee!* 中“Come All Ye Asian American Writers of the Real and the Fake”。當然，趙健秀等人除了批評湯亭亭、譚恩美、黃玉雪等女性作家，也批評了劉裔昌 (Pardee Lowe) 的《虎父虎子》(*Father and Glorious Descendant*, 1943) 和以《蝴蝶君》(*M. Butterfly*, 1986) 馳名的黃哲倫 (David Henry Hwang)。在這裡趙健秀等人雖然沒有嚴格區分亞美男、女作家，卻建立了以男性威權為中心的亞美英雄主義傳統和亞美性別政治的對峙，任何以性別政治角度批評亞美父權或雜化亞美男性形象的嘗試均被譏為與白人種族主義掛勾，或自亂亞美陣營。

²⁴ 有關亞美政治中男性中心與女性議題的對峙現象，亦可參見 Kim。

為先、性別其次」考量之下，亞美文藝中女性角色的塑造經常必須步步為營唯恐有損亞美男性氣概與民族一統的歷史。不過我並不想在文中重彈女性主義和（亞美）族裔政治口徑不一、目標分歧的舊調，也無法在這極有限的篇幅中透徹分析亞美女作家如何另闢蹊徑為女性發聲，定義所謂不同於男性中心敘述的「亞美女性主義」（Asian American Feminism）或「亞美女性詩學」（Asian American women's poetics）。²⁵此外，要特別強調的是，關注亞美女性的位置並不見得是要重返男女二元對峙的傳統性別論述。相反的，透過對具代表性的小說中男、女角色在亞美社群中不同生活經驗的觀察，我想試著在這篇論文中提出一個屬於「她/它者」的另類觀點來勾勒亞美文藝與歷史發展，分析女性議題或女人介入亞美論述對亞美文化與歷史的繁衍其實利多於弊，進而企圖以「陰性系譜」的建立為整個亞美社群之「雜化」鋪路。當然，這樣的論點違逆了許多人信以為真的性別與族裔對峙理論。²⁶但是誰能說「贏了性別、輸了族裔」或「贏了族裔、輸了性別」是顛撲不破的真理？首先，已經有越來越多亞美學界認清亞美政治必須是結合種族、性別、與階級的政治。亞美的「種族化」（racialized）兼含「性別化」（gendered）與「階級化」。我們因此無法擺脫性別，光討論亞美的族裔問題。²⁷其次，而這也是我在本文中要特別提出來討論的，我注意到亞美文藝能蓬勃發展不在於其維繫「純種」而在於其必須含納「雜質」。試想，若非有「真偽之辨」中那些「偽」作家們的攪和，哪來沸沸揚揚亞美文藝復興中眾多亞美作家與學者你來我往的爭辯與論述？最明顯的例子是，姑不論暢銷作品如湯亭亭的《女鬥士》（*The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts*, 1976）在族裔政治的考量上正不正確，也先不考慮其為自傳非小說或虛構想像之作，我一直認為它至少創造了一個橫跨時空與學科的亞美論述空間，不僅雜化更延展了亞美文藝與文化的影響力。²⁸或者我們可以說，若非性別「二」元的介入，亞美想像那能跨出名號「一」統的侷限，建立駁「雜」共治的社群對話？²⁹

²⁵ 類似的分析著名亞美女性作家/學者如林玉玲（Shirley Lim）和朱蓓章（Patricia P. Chu）等都做過，她們認為亞美女性必須新創「情節」（plots），歧出男性中心的亞美民族敘述模式。朱蓓章討論「女性情節」（“women's plots”），林玉玲則指出亞美女性必須「新創情節」（inventing new plots）以追求其性別利益。參見 Chu, “Women's Plots: Edith Maude Eaton and Bharati Mukerjee,” 收錄於 *Assimilating Asians* 90-138 以及 Lim, “Feminist and Ethnic Literary Theories in Asian American Literature”。林玉玲並在其文章中提到「亞美女性主義」（Asian American Feminism）的概念。

²⁶ 林玉玲就曾引述 Johnella Butler 等人的觀點，指出一般認為女性主義學者和族裔學者關懷不同，目標「不協和」（“asymmetrical”）。見 Lim, “Feminist and Ethnic Literary Theories in Asian American Literature” 807。

²⁷ 結合對種族、性別、階級、甚至世代與年紀等多重角度的論述已蔚為亞美研究新潮流，許多學者對此作出呼籲，參見 Lim, “Asian American Literature, Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality,” David Leiwei Li 以及 David Eng。

²⁸ 對環繞《女鬥士》衍生之寬廣論述社群的討論，參閱拙作“Genre-Crossing: Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* and Its Discursive Community”。

²⁹ 容我再次強調，這裡我並非以重返性別「二」元為論述終點，而是以性別「二」元、陰性介入作為雜化亞美的起點。

這篇論文嘗試勾勒亞美文學與歷史中的陰性系譜。名之為「陰性」，不只因為這份系譜是以女-女連結為想像起點，背離「陽」具中心論述，更因其暴露亞美社群在一元民族的檯面想像之下如地下莖般跨時空繁衍的面相，「陰性」系譜於是與「隱形」(invisible) 歷史休戚相關。仔細推敲，陰性系譜的建立不僅僅意在重振亞美女權或創造女性發聲的機會，更強調對亞美社群整體陰/隱形歷史的再現。從這樣的觀點來看，男性作家亦可參與陰性系譜的書寫，或者讀者也可以由陰性觀點對男性作家作品進行「酷異式」的閱讀。³⁰不過，由於篇幅的限制，本文將先以挖掘亞美文學與文化運動經典女作家作品中的陰性系譜為論述主軸。在接下來的討論中，我由《女鬥士》中著名的「無名女人」(No-Name Woman) 意象為起點，一邊指出數部經典亞美文學中亞美女人遭逐出家門與消音匿名的困境，但將以更多篇幅分析亞美女人作為「無名女人」後裔，反書「無名」為跨族跨國自我命名空間，翻轉「棄卻」(abjection) 為社群向外向它者延伸動力的意義，編織亞美文學不爭取純種而爭取社群時空蔓延的陰性系譜。而在文本討論之外，我還將藉由克莉絲蒂娃 (Julia Kristeva) 的「宮籟」(chora) 理論，點出亞美「無名女人」介面與「宮籟」介面的類似性。透過「宮籟緣起」(choric cause) 論點的提出，我進一步由理論層次思考亞美陰性系譜中「無名」之始與「萬流匯集」之雜。³¹

因為「無名」，方得開始

湯亭亭不是第一位亞美女作家，但很少人能否認《女鬥士》在亞美文學與歷史發展中的里程碑效應。它以女性角色為中心書寫亞美跨國移民三代女性的故事--包括丈夫與兄長赴美而自己留在中國的無名姑姑，成人之後才赴美的第一代移民母親英蘭 (Brave Orchid)，以及在美國出生長大的移民第二代麥克馨 (Maxine) --岔出了亞美國族論述一般對男性跨海移民，淘金與架設鐵路等英雄事蹟的關注，為亞美移民歷史找到一個陰性緣起。作品的副標題--「幽靈環繞的女孩歲月回憶錄」--以「幽靈」暗喻湮埋於亞美

³⁰ 較著名的例子包括 Eng 對《蝴蝶君》與《唐老亞》(Donald Duk) 等作品的閱讀以及 Crystal Parikh 反寫當代亞美男人的「rice boy」形象為亞美「酷異化」反動空間；而拙作“Colored Desire, Gendered Body, and David Mura’s Re-Writing of Asian American Manhood”亦嘗試由 David Mura 作品中看出其「陰性」化亞美男性身份的嘗試。

³¹ 本文原本計畫在概述亞美經典文學中「無名女人」的陰性敘述脈絡與提出「宮籟緣起」的理論之後，再藉由分析兩位出生於二次戰後的日美三世 (Sansei) 作家辛西亞·門畑 (Cynthia Kadohata) 及湊谷百合子 (Lydia Yuri Minatoya) 的作品，討論在二十世紀八、九〇年代以後亞美作家對「無名女子」傳統的繼承與陰性系譜的綿延發展。但由於論文篇幅及撰寫時間的限制，這一部份的內容將待日後於另文再敘。除此之外，譚恩美 2001 年作品《接骨師的女兒》(The Bonesetter’s Daughter) 在某一層次上也延續了「無名女人」的書寫傳統，全書情節發展環繞著書中兩位女性敘述者對「寶伯母」/「媒母」(Precious Auntie) 姓名的遺忘與重新記憶，足見「無名女人」在亞美作家書寫傳統中的重要性。

主流歷史之下、隱而不宣的的移民人事，饒富意義的點出亞美歷史的陰/隱性面相。

《女鬥士》的故事是由「無名女人」開始的。表面上，英蘭以「無名姑姑」的經歷作為警告故事，重述踰矩女子將遭受的懲罰，藉此約制逐漸長大、超出移民父母約束之麥克馨的言行。問題是，故事一旦說出，帶來的是超乎英蘭所能預期的意義傳遞骨牌效應。首先，麥克馨對這位無名姑姑個人產生莫大興趣，開始想像姑姑當時各種可能的處境——為何懷孕，有何慾望，怎麼樣在遭家族驅逐之後獨自生下小孩。英蘭儀式式的反覆告訴麥克馨無名姑姑的故事，非但沒能為男性中心的亞美文化傳承除邪驅魔，反而為無名女人的歷史留下不死的文字痕跡。³²其次，麥克馨不但沒加入共謀遺忘姑姑的噤聲社群，她還在「無名姑姑」的「無名」中找到了自我多元形象創造的載體。「無名」使得姑姑是如何之人有了多重可能性：麥克馨將自己的願望實現投射到姑姑身上，想像她曾經是與眾不同、疼愛女兒之祖父眼中的掌上明珠；又或者姑姑像麥克馨一樣執意追求個性與自主，在毫無個人空間的古老中國社會裡，村民處罰姑姑正因「她暗藏群體生活之外的私密生活」（13）。麥克馨還嘗試將無名姑姑想成亞美女人「先驅」（“forerunner”），卻礙於時代與家庭背景不能跨洋渡海，因之以踰越禮儀規範代替空間疆界的跨越（8）。最重要的，麥克馨將姑姑的故事想成不是單獨個案，而是她眾多女性先祖共有的經驗：「我的姑姑不會是當時唯一一個為慾望放棄一切的女人」（6）。如此這般，遭棄卻的女人不能成功生下偷情子嗣卻衍生超越時空四處蔓延的移民家族傳說。原本剝除踰越父權規範者的姓名是要促成遺忘與滅跡，但正因「無名」，故事成了群體的故事。「無名」本身可能是負面的、噤聲的，但書寫「無名」的努力卻足以翻轉滅跡與沈默為機會，化「無名」為亞美社群重構陰性系譜的開放空間。

我以湯亭亭「無名女人」的故事作為亞美陰性系譜的開端，既因它最是意象鮮明的點出亞美「無名」女人的主題，也因《女鬥士》的出版與風行對亞美陰性政治具定音式的影響力。更重要的是，《女鬥士》由書寫「無名」到開創亞美社群脈絡的過程呼應「亞美」名號從無到有到雜的歷史。當然，書寫亞美女人之「無名」有其更悠遠的歷史。日裔美籍作家山本久枝（Hisaye Yamamoto）在1950年發表的短篇創作 莎莎格瓦拉小姐傳說（*The Legend of Miss Sasagawara*）即可被視為同類作品中相當著名的一篇。³³表面看來是一篇書寫日美女子間文軼事、炒作神秘女人八卦的小品；這篇小說其實是以極

³² 表面上英蘭說了故事後要求麥克馨對故事封口，其實英蘭是藉助「無名姑姑」故事來樹立自己在女兒面前的權威；換句話說，英蘭自己也加入了敘述「無名」、翻轉「無名」為存在力量的亞美陰性系譜；她必須挪用「無名姑姑」的「無名」來確立自己的「話份」，穩固自己作為第一代移民母親在美國岌岌可危的母權位置。

³³ 雖然山本是二次世界戰後極少數享譽美國文壇的日裔作家之一，自四〇年代末即陸續有作品發表，文學研究者對其作品廣泛的閱讀及討論，乃是七〇年代後半期亞美文藝復興以後的事。

低調隱晦的手法揭露二次大戰期間日美族群所遭受的不平等、非理性待遇。³⁴在關於莎莎格瓦拉小姐多手傳遞的故事中，莎莎格瓦拉小姐較真實年齡年輕、面目姣好、未婚、追求獨立自主、並曾是巡迴各地演出的芭蕾舞者，她在忍辱吞聲、視湮滅自我為理所當然的日美集中營社群中所凸顯的「不同」使她動見觀瞻，被渲染為精神異常，甚至不只一次被送至療養院隔離治療。有趣的是，山本不斷在她作品中佈下蛛絲馬跡，藉由敘述者不確定的口吻讓讀者懷疑小說中瘋了的究竟是莎莎格瓦拉小姐，對集中營生活的荒謬不公逆來順受、竟日在她背後指指點點的日美社群成員，還是像得了被害妄想症般不分青紅皂白將所有日美社群成員由太平洋岸強制驅離至內陸集中營的戰時美國政府？環繞著有姓無名的莎莎格瓦拉小姐所衍生出來的於是不只是茶餘飯後無關緊要的八卦耳語，而是日美社群對戰時拘禁經驗深刻的反省。甚至，在某一層次上山本未嘗不是以遭受莫須有罪名指控的莎莎格瓦拉小姐的遭遇暗中影射整體日美社群在戰爭期間承受的莫須有罪名。³⁵在此我要特別強調的是，以一名秀異女子的故事暗寓日美社群經驗，山本巧妙地聯繫女性議題與族裔關懷，將書寫「無名」女子所能激發的敘述潛力延展成為替族裔社群平反的動力來源。小說一直到最後才安排敘述者在一個偶然的情境中瞥見署名「瑪俐·莎莎格瓦拉」(Mari Sasagawara)的詩作，讓莎莎格瓦拉小姐由無名到有名，由被動的八掛人物搖身變為主動發聲的詩人，更促成檯面下無名女子陰性系譜與檯面上父權至上公共論述的交鋒。³⁶

喬伊·小川(Joy Kogawa)的作品《歐巴桑》(*Obasan*, 1981)可被歸作日美/日加作品中另一部書寫「無名女人」的經典。首先，小說中的主角兼敘述者中根直美(Naomi Nakane)因為其姓名發音的緣故常被叫為「Nomi」，「直美」--Naomi--於是成了「無我」--No Me，表面上有名有姓，其實直美在二次戰後加拿大政治社會中無我無名。三十六歲的直美蟄居加國一隅做著千篇一律的教書工作，在學校中困擾於學生念不出她的日裔姓名，在人際交往過程中受挫於他人對自己的第三代日加移民身份百思不解。而日加社群的破碎離散，就反映在直美「目前的朋友中沒有一個擁有日裔背景」的現狀裡。就這一點而言，《歐巴桑》和 莎莎格瓦拉小姐傳說 一樣，不只討論個別女人處境，

³⁴ Cheung 認為山本刻意「隱諱」其作品中的「政治暗示」(“camouflage the political illusions,” “Rhetorical Silence” 71)。

³⁵ 莎莎格瓦拉小姐和整體日美社群遭遇的類似點包括(1)莎莎格瓦拉小姐三十九歲依然年輕貌美，而日美社群在戰前美國社會則因經濟實力與社群凝聚力，兩者均為「妒忌的對象」(the objects of envy)；(2)莎莎格瓦拉小姐未婚且擁有旅行各地的舞蹈家身份，而日美社群主要因為其族裔身份，兩者在芸芸多數中均暴露其「不同」(strangeness)；(3)兩者均因莫須有的罪/病名被遣送他地，美其名為了公共安全接受集中管理/治療。

³⁶ 「瑪俐·莎莎格瓦拉」在其詩作中暴露對自己父親的不滿。她認為父親固然可以沈迷禪修，遁出世事，卻無權要求作為舞蹈家的女兒也依循父道。「瑪俐·莎莎格瓦拉」想要逸出父權中心道路，另闢「陰性」路徑的企圖相當明顯。

更以女人無名暗寓日美/日加社群的無名困境。

不過，直美不是《歐巴桑》故事中唯一的「無名」女人，小說中真正「不見了」、隱名埋姓度過終生的女人是直美的母親。《歐巴桑》戲劇化地安排直美母親在太平洋戰爭爆發之前赴日探親，因戰爭爆發無法返家而「不見了」、「消失了」；她的故事也成為直美家族溝通的禁忌。平心而論，母親只是由加拿大到達日本，並沒有真正拋下直美或出走日加社群。我曾經在 分合之間：《歐巴桑》與日加移民屬性的「缺席」與重建 這篇論文中分析直美母親之所以最後演變為像是「不見」或「消失」的三個主要原因：

第一、[.....]日加戰事阻斷移民空間，使分處兩國的日加移民通訊無門；第二、即使是在戰爭結束兩國通訊再度成為可能，母親不但拒絕返加，更不願向加國親族吐露一絲一毫她在日本的遭遇。或是因為無法面對自己殘破的容貌和身體，或是為了自己在戰爭中莫名地被歸類為挑起戰端的日本人並遭到原子彈轟炸而感到可恥，母親選擇以布面具遮掩容顏，沉默地在日本度過殘生。[.....] 第三、[..... 直美的]長輩，包括伯父山姆、伯母綾子、艾蜜莉阿姨均不願意向直美吐露實情。艾蜜莉在一九四九年，山姆和綾子在一九五四就得知母親的遭遇，卻一直等到一九七二年才說出故事。(69)

仔細推敲，這三個理由中除了第一個牽涉到戰爭的現實面，其餘兩個理由都攸關日加社群成員能不能正視歷史的問題。表面上，不說、置直美母親於「無名」處境當然可能因為日加社群（包括母親本人及其他家族成員）無法面對戰爭創傷，甚至美其名說是因為要保護未成年的直美。³⁷但是追根究底母親的故事之所以成為禁忌，一個絕不能忽視的原因是母親跨越國界，觸犯因戰爭而被強化的日加二元對峙邏輯。母親象徵了直美家族的日本聯繫，她在戰爭期間的遭遇毫不留情地揭露日加社群在戰事發生時尷尬的跨國聯繫，她的存在似乎威脅直美家族自戰爭爆發以來極力爭取的加拿大國族認同。直美母親在小說中留下一個「無名」的空間，由直美的伯母綾子，即故事中的「歐巴桑」暫代其母職。小說以「歐巴桑」為標題，遮掩書中記憶直美母親故事的主題，正凸顯《歐巴桑》表面迴避、其實暗中書寫「無名」女人的特質。而當直美聯繫起她的「溫哥華母親」和「長崎母親」的那一剎那，日加社群跨越國族劃界的陰性系譜於焉誕生。

棄卻母親與滅種焦慮

³⁷ 值得說明的是，小說中直美的長輩雖然不斷以「為小孩之故」（“*kodomo no tame*”）作為不向直美說出母親遭遇的理由，但一直到直美年過三十，早就不再是個小孩，長輩們依然不顧直美追問，不願或無法啟口說出母親遭遇；這不能不令人懷疑「為小孩之故」是否只是他們不能面對社群歷史創傷的託詞罷了。詳見拙作 分合之間 中的分析。

關於《歐巴桑》如何透過對「無名母親」故事的重述開啟日加社群的跨國脈絡，我在「分合之間」裡已有詳細討論。在這裡我除了要凸顯「書寫無名女人」在開啟亞美文學與歷史想像上的重要性，更想說明亞美女人妾身未明、卻又如鬼魅般揮之不去的「無名」、不定位置往往成為亞美由自我設限的族裔國界與父系族譜向外向它者/它處繁衍的動力。我想特別指出，《歐巴桑》在書寫「無名女人」的傳統中，不單單以「女人」的消失或「無名」作為日加移民社群自我認同危機的抽象隱喻，更聯繫起「無名女人」的主題與日加/日美社群在現實歷史中繁衍或絕種的問題。換言之，《歐巴桑》不僅挪用直美母親為日加跨國移民社群的隱喻，直美的母親更是肉身女人，其「母體」(maternal body)的存在與否乃日加社群能否繼續蔓延成長的關鍵。日加族裔的存亡是《歐巴桑》故事中不斷被暗示的主題。從小說一開始，直美不只因為對自己抽象族裔身份認同的不確定而感到焦慮，更因社群成員離散、家族血脈瀕臨殞滅憂心忡忡。面對她的學生詢問她是否已成家的問題，直美不由想起在自己不算龐大的家族中除了她之外，五十六歲仍單身的艾蜜莉阿姨，還有結婚多年、已逾八十高齡但無子嗣的伯母綾子。直美暗暗憂慮自己家族基因中是否隱藏一種「乾癟老太婆症候群」(crone-prone syndrome)，進而聯繫起家族的不育與整個日加社群的凋零命運：「有些家族在歷史更迭中不斷成長茁壯，強韌、搶眼、且洋溢繁殖力量。另一些則由地面悄然消失」(21)。

在二次大戰期間與其後日美/日加社群遭驅離、放逐的歷史情境中，滅種的焦慮不足為奇。根據艾蜜莉阿姨在戰爭爆發之後所記下的日記，囚禁日加社群成員的集中營區隔男女，警衛駐守各營區門口，不讓任何「日本女人」進入男人營區，而報紙上公然寫著這是「為了要讓日加社群斷根絕種」(98)。³⁸而在直美個人的流離經驗中，她的家族先是被驅離座落於溫哥華的家園，遷居位於內陸的司拉肯(Slocan)幽靈城(ghost town)，戰爭結束後再度由司拉肯被流放到阿爾伯他省(Alberta)荒涼、漫無邊際、且了無屏障大草原上的格蘭登(Granton)。日加社群這樣一次又一次遭放逐，如何能在加拿大落地繁衍？一九六二年直美偶然驅車路過司拉肯附近，遍尋不得四〇年代日加社群在那裡苦心經營的地標。直美的敘述或者最是鮮明地闡述日加社群對他們在加國地理與歷史中悶不吭聲遁入無形的焦慮：

我驅車經過幽靈城的遺跡，那裡曾一度住著礦石工人、又有一度住著日加成員。
現在第一波的幽靈仍在那裡，那些礦石工，那些依靠木頭生活的人，他們的白

³⁸ 特別值得一提的是，艾蜜莉阿姨的日記並非虛構，而是節錄自一名真實二世(Nisei)社會運動者 Muriel Kitagawa 遺留下來的一批文件。

骨深埋松針滿佈的地底，肉體化作土地，融入空氣。他們的居所--旅館、廢棄礦田、木屋--猶然矗立以標誌他們的曾經存在。但是第二波的居民呢？我們在那裡留下了什麼？（117）

《歐巴桑》中充滿石頭的意象，文字如石說不出，麵包如石嚥不下，伯母綾子鎮日喃喃自語「人都會死」與「凡事均將歸於遺忘」（11, 25, 26, 30, 44, 45, 231），這些無不都在暗示日加社群不說不吃，「像露水般悶聲不響在邁向未來的路上消失」的可能（112）。

在另一部更早出版的日美文學經典《說不-不的男孩》（*No-No Boy*, 1957）中，類似的滅種焦慮亦被喚起。較《歐巴桑》裡的情節更駭人聽聞的是，《說不-不的男孩》中的日美成員不只是在不得不的情況下被迫面對滅種可能，更進一步參與策劃與想像自己社群的銷聲匿跡。小說中因為參加歐戰而失去一條腿的俊志（Kenji）這樣勸告不知如何方能逃脫「不-不男孩」的身份、如何方能證明自己是美國人而且認同、效忠美國的主角山田一郎（Ichiro Yamada）：

到一個千里之內找不到另一個日本狗（Jap）的地方。討一個白女人、黑女人、義大利、甚至中國女人--反正不要是日本女人就好--作老婆。幾代之後，你就能將那東西給了斷。（164）

「那東西」指的當然是日本基因。這裡我想先指出的是俊志提出的勸告明顯地不只是針對一郎。俊志在戰爭期間向美國輸誠，甚至為此失去一條腿成為「半個（男）人」（“half a man,” 89），仍然難逃身份困境，才會認為唯有透過跨族混血方能徹底革除自己的日本基因。其次，在俊志的勸告中最令人匪夷所思的不在於他鼓勵跨種族聯姻，而在於他將自己的族裔基因除之而後快的願望。跨種族聯姻本身沒有問題，但很明顯的俊志在這裡主張的是以跨族聯姻為手段行族裔自殺或謀殺之實。

當然我們還得注意到俊志話語中所透露之「棄卻」（*abject*）日美女人的企圖。表面上，俊志是要藉由「棄卻」日美女人以成全日美男人「漂白」日本基因，以期有朝一日變成百分百「美國人」；其實，「棄卻」日美女人即「棄卻」日美社群中極重要的一部份，是自虐式的自殘與自殺。值得注意的是，俊志的言論看似極端，但「棄卻」亞洲母親或亞美女人卻是許多亞美作家作品中常見的主題。在《同化亞洲人：亞美作家身份性別策略》（*Assimilating Asians: Gendered Strategies of Authorship in Asian America*, 2000）一書中，朱蓓章（Patricia P. Chu）即指出亞美作家在處理亞美個人在美國落地生根議題時經常出現「棄卻」亞洲女人的現象。朱舉布羅桑（Carlos Bulosan）、村（David Mura）和岡田（John Okada）等作家為例，先說明這幾位男性作家如何因其弱勢族裔身份挪用了原屬西方女性的成長小說文類，再指出這些亞美男性成長小說中的男性角色通

常以白種女人作為引領他們進入美國的繆司；相對於白種女人，亞洲或亞美女人象徵他們與亞洲母國的聯繫。「棄卻」亞美女人便等於棄絕亞洲聯繫，是他們融入美國的不二法門。問題是，「棄卻」亞美女人不但不能確保亞美男人在美國落地生根，反而反映亞美男性自我責備與自我棄卻的憂鬱症傾向，這由《說不-不的男孩》中俊志及一郎自覺不足的心理困境即可得知一二。³⁹另外，正如《歐巴桑》所暗示的，沒有（跨國）母親，就只有滅種的命運。一味追求「純種」的美/加身份只會戕害亞美族裔自然繁衍的脈絡，增強族裔滅種的危機。

有趣的是，在傳統亞美文學論述中，族裔繁衍一向是男性較為關懷的議題。比方說，朱路易（Louis Chu）在《喫一碗茶》（*Eat a Bowl of Tea*, 1961）中戲劇化的搬演早期華美「單身漢社群」（bachelor society）男性傳宗接代的責任與困境；在《說不-不的男孩》中，一郎以在美國購屋、成家、成為父親、繁衍子孫為生命中最重要夢想；而根據朱蓓章的讀法，當大衛·村在《當身體撞見記憶》（*Where the Body Meets Memory: An Odyssey of Race, Sexuality and Identity*, 1996）中寫到了自己和白種女人蘇西（Susie）結婚且生下三個小孩，確認自己的父親位置時，其回憶錄也正好到達似乎是傳統成長小說裡令人滿意的終點。⁴⁰不過，我在本文一個重要的論點是，雖然亞美男性普遍在意族裔繁衍，但其傾向追求純種、追求父子一脈相傳（patrilineality）的態度卻往往侷限--而非開拓--亞美自然繁衍的血脈。這說明了為何不少亞美男性作家的作品總是瀰漫對族裔繁衍問題的焦慮。前面提到，當一個亞美男人「棄卻」亞美女人以追求「純種」美國身份時，他其實已「棄卻」了部分的自己。而黃秀玲（Sau-ling Cynthia Wong）在一九九〇年代華/亞美男性：雷祖威《愛之痛》中的錯置、化身、父系、和絕種（*Chinese/Asian American Men in the 1990s: Displacement, Impersonation, Paternity, and Extinction in David Wong Louie's Pangs of Love*）這篇論文裡更進一步指出，即使到了美國移民政策開放以及華/亞美男性經濟地位與文化語文能力大幅提升的九〇年代，依然有為數不少的華/亞美男性必須面對傳宗接代問題帶來的無止盡焦慮。黃以雷祖威作品中的男性角色舉例，說明表面上九〇年代的許多華美男人儘可以享有與白種女人交友、結婚的機會，但卻往往無法確立其「父之名」所象徵的權威，在某些情況下反而成為其白人女友/妻子的附屬品。面對這樣的現象，我們除了必須再一次控訴美國社會中根深蒂固的種族主義之外，

³⁹ 關於亞美男性的憂鬱症傾向，我在“Colored Desire, Gendered Body”中有過討論，本文不再贅述。相關討論亦可參見 Cheng。

⁴⁰ 我同意朱蓓章對亞美作品中常見男性角色憂心絕後現象的看法，但是要特別說明「滅種焦慮」並非是亞美男性獨自面對的問題。前面提到，《歐巴桑》也瀰漫強烈的滅種危機意識。另外，當然也不是所有亞美男性角色都以傳遞「純種」父之名為職志。事實上，個人並不同意朱蓓章所提出的、大衛·村以結婚生子作為其成長追尋令人滿意之終點的論點。詳見拙作“Colored Desire, Gendered Body”最後一部份的討論。

還忍不住要問，華/亞美男性為何如此在意自己「父親的地位」(fatherhood)? 黃秀玲在其論文中問得好：當華美社群早就脫離「單身漢社群」；換句話說，「當生物學上的集體絕種對華美個人已不具威脅性，如此『歇斯底里』地執泥於絕種問題所為何來？」(187)。說穿了許多華美男性的「絕種恐懼」其實是一種對「身份認同絕種」(identity extinction)的恐懼(Wong 187)。很清楚的，許多華美人在意的不只是「有後」，更在意自己能否延續父權中心社會中父子身份認同一脈相連的傳統。華/亞美社群的絕種焦慮，追根究底源自於其對「純種」父之名的執迷，對社群發展不能踰越男性中心操控的堅持。

宮籟緣起與陰性系譜

簡單的說，許多亞美男性角色不管是執意透過混血剔除自身亞洲血緣或是堅持亞美父子一脈相傳的男性威權，往往都因追求「純種」而限制了社群向多方發展的可能。而相對於這些亞美個人自我設限的「純種要求」與對「父之名」堅持的例子，不少亞美敘述反而能以「無名」為傳承介面鋪衍出社群絕種焦慮以外族裔繁衍的陰性系譜，推動亞美族裔由「血脈相傳」(filiation)的社群轉型為「聯姻結盟」(affiliation)的社群。⁴¹黃秀玲說得很清楚，亞美人之所以擺脫不了焦慮，是因為他們在進行「聯姻結盟」的同時拋不下對「血脈相傳」的暗底渴望。然而「血脈相傳」、族譜一元的「鎖家」或「鎖國」政策在亞美跨國移民、頻頻與外族接觸的歷史與文化情境中是行不通的。⁴²作為一個移民社群，亞美族裔本身不斷位移與質變，「聯姻結盟」於是成了社群不閉關自守、自斷生路的生存與發展關鍵。用《歐巴桑》的例子來看，直美的「無名母親」之所以能成為似乎是維繫日加社群存續與否的關鍵人物，正在於她在小說中佔據了促成日加社群「聯姻結盟」的推手位置。首先，在一張難得的家族合照中，父親中根和母親加藤(Kato)兩家族齊聚一堂，象徵戰前尚未分裂的、建構於「不同」家族成員「聯姻結盟」基礎之上的日加社群，而照片中的直美父母正像「兩根針細心地將家族緊織成毯」(20)。由小說的敘述我們還知道直美父母的結合是兩個家族中首樁自由戀愛婚姻，未經父權體系與媒妁之言操弄，是族裔社群自然成長的結果。其次，在母親、艾蜜莉阿姨，以及伯母

⁴¹ 「血脈相傳」與「聯姻結盟」的概念原出 Said，亦參見 Wong 文中的解釋。

⁴² 頻頻出現在亞美文藝中亞美女性外遇的問題即可證明亞美系譜一元之不可行。最著名的例子包括《啜一碗茶》中女主角雷美愛(Lee Mai Oi)的婚外情；山本久枝的短篇小說如「十七音節」(“Seventeen Syllables,” 1949)與「米子的地震」(“Yoneko’s Earthquake,” 1951)亦描述日美一世(Issei)母親外遇情節。另外，在我原本計畫納入本文討論的辛西亞·門畑《浮世》(The Floating World, 1989)及湊谷百合子《話予雪地高僧》(Talking to High Monks in the Snow, 1992)等作品中，也有亞美女性外遇的情節。

綾子這一代，母親是唯一育有子女的女人。另外，母親生於加拿大、長於日本，其後更時常往來兩國之間的背景使她名副其實成為聯繫日加跨國家族成員、延展社群時空版圖的靈魂人物。無怪乎在小說最後直美必須透過對母親故事的重述方能整合自己家族中不同國籍、不同語言、不同政治認同的成員，還原社群「聯姻結盟」的跨界拓展潛能。

《歐巴桑》不予母親具名，使她的存在或關於她的記憶成為不預設立場、或故步自封的社群繁衍載體。《女鬥士》中的「無名姑姑」亦有類似功效。她透過婚外情而懷孕的身體，雖然沒能成功地將「雜」的血緣帶入家族系譜，留下的故事卻成為開放想像的介面。麥克馨稍後在故事中創造了一個新的花木蘭角色，背上刺字、腹中懷孕的形象不只結合了中國傳統故事中岳飛與花木蘭的形象，更可說是脫胎於能說善寫的麥克馨與其懷孕之無名姑姑形象的並置與融合，是麥克馨改寫自我形象，挑戰父權中心，開啟陰性族裔脈絡的第一步。

在這裡，亞美女人「無名」、「無具形」、中介想像、雜匯人/我血脈構築「聯姻結盟」、與作為繁衍族裔載體的特質無不像極了克莉絲蒂娃 (Julia Kristeva) 所提出的「宮籟」(chora) 介面。克莉絲蒂娃的「宮籟」概念取自柏拉圖。根據柏拉圖的理論，「宮籟」原本無定型且身份模稜，「非實體存在而是無底深淵」，或者就是一抹「折曲」(“crease”)，介於「一」與「多」形而上之本體存在與形而下雜流蔓延之間 (Grosz 116)。「宮籟」於是乎是具有傳承與增生的功能。雖然扮演的是易遭遺忘的中介角色，「宮籟」卻不見得全然被動，或者注定在形而下物質世界中銷聲匿跡。克莉絲蒂娃就指出，「宮籟」乃由人類身體中尚未定型之「慾力」(drives) 與「能量」(energy) 匯流而成，並且有「跡」可循：「慾力」與「能量」不斷「位移」以及其在位移過程中「瞬間駐留痕跡」所構築成之「本質上流動」且「極度短暫的發音」即為「宮籟」(25)。看似妾身未明的「宮籟」在物質世界仍保有其殘音軌跡，成為象徵建制中揮之不去的陰/隱性殘留。

可以理解的是，「宮籟」催吐萬物，本身卻未曾被規範形而下世界中的象徵建制所完全吸納或遺忘。作為捉摸不定的「它者」殘留，「宮籟」不斷滲入與騷擾既定的象徵建制，成了解構秩序，開發雜流蔓延的動能源頭。戴西達 (Jacques Derrida) 就曾嘗試聯繫「宮籟」概念與其解構理論中諸多重要概念，如「餘燼」(cinders)、「幽靈」(ghost)、「殘存」(remainder/residue)、「補遺」(supplement)、「印記」(trace) 等，指出「宮籟」反斥象徵建制、解構意義框架的力量。⁴³我在這裡則更要強調「宮籟」透過其反斥與「解構」動能以締造多重意義「緣起」(cause) 的潛力。⁴⁴事實上，克莉絲蒂娃將宛如

⁴³ 參見 Grosz 對戴西達理論中「宮籟」概念的分析。

⁴⁴ 此處「cause」的概念擷自拉崗 (Jacques Lacan)。在拉崗的理論中，「cause」不單純指涉因果論中的「原因」，而是標示語言象徵失序斷裂的那一點。拉崗指出，一定是原有的語言意義遞換模式行不通了，人

幽靈般「發音」的「宮籟」想像成類似「子宮」--但並非等同於實體子宮，而是有能力不斷在既成現實與既定秩序中滋生出無數雜音的「韻律空間」（“a rhythmic space”）：「宮籟」乃「韻律空間，但無特定命題與位置，而是鑄造多元意義的過程。」（26）。引用蔡淑玲(Shu-Ling Stephanie Tsai)的說法，這裡的「韻律空間」應該被理解為「『宮籟』藉律動延展『空』、『間』意象」（169）。「宮籟」運用其殘音印記在一般習以為常的意義系統中延展出「空」與「間」，正如無名或缺席了的亞美女人可以在其後裔的記憶或文字書寫中催生亞美社群發展的多重可能。

我在這裡嘗試將「宮籟」的理論帶入對亞美無名女人書寫的研究，主要是希望藉由和理論對話，更深入瞭解「無名女人」在亞美文化與族裔繁衍上可以產生的意義和啟示。簡單的說，「宮籟」想像提供我們在對「父之名」的堅持之外另一種族裔傳承的模式。「宮籟」無名無我，不自限於一脈相傳，因之能含納萬流與催吐多元意義。我認為在亞美文學與歷史中開啟陰性系譜的諸多「無名女人」，扮演的正是有如「宮籟」般的中介角色。她們開啟亞美族裔像地下莖一樣不拘泥於一、於己、四處蔓延生長的潛力。我還想進一步主張，在亞美文化與歷史發展中女性議題的介入、或是「棄卻」無名女性的二度回返均為亞美想像創造了「宮籟緣起」的契機。毫無疑問，女性議題與「無名女人」的二度回返一直是「雜化」亞美想像一元與民族一統的重要根源，但從一個不要求純種而強調存在與繁衍的角度來看，亞美文學與文化乃因「雜音」介入而蓬勃發展。

引用書目

- Atwood, Margaret. *The Blind Assassin*. New York: Anchor, 2000.
- Cheng, Anne Anlin. *The Melancholy of Race: Psychoanalysis, Assimilation, and Hidden Grief*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cheung, King-kok. “Rhetorical Silence: ‘Seventeen Syllables,’ ‘Yoneko’s Earthquake,’ and ‘The Legend of Miss Sasagawara.’” *Articulate Silences: Hisaye Yamamoto, Maxine Hong Kingston, Joy Kogawa*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993. 27-73.
- . “The Woman Warrior versus the Chinaman Pacific: Must a Chinese American Critic Choose between Feminism and Heroism?” *Conflicts in Feminism*. Ed. Marianne

們才會開始追問「cause」。換句話說，當人們在追問「cause」時，他們不再依循既存的邏輯系統追溯原因，而是在找尋新的語言邏輯系統。「cause」策動象徵建制的流動與變異，催生「新」語言、「新」系統。我也因此不將「cause」譯成「原因」，而將其譯為「緣起」。參見 Lacan。

- Hirsch and Evelyn Fox Keller. New York: Routledge, 1990. 234-251.
- Chin, Frank, et al., eds. *Aiiieeee!: An Anthology of Asian American Writers*. New York: Mentor, 1974.
- , eds. *The Big Aiiieeee!: An Anthology of Chinese American and Japanese American Literature*. New York: Meridian, 1991.
- Chu, Louis. *Eat a Bowl of Tea*. 1961. New York: Lyle Stuart, 1993.
- Chu, Patricia P. *Assimilating Asians: Gendered Strategies of Authorship in Asian America*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Eng, David L. *Racial Castration: Managing Masculinity in Asian American*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "Woman, Chora, Dwelling." *Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. New York: Routledge, 1995. 111-124.
- Irigaray, Luce. *Sexes and Genealogies*. 1987. Trans. Gillian C. Gill. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Kadohata, Cynthia. *The Floating World*. New York: Ballantine, 1989.
- Kim, Elaine H. "'Such Opposite Creatures': Men and Women in Asian American Literature." *Michigan Quarterly Review* 29.1 (1990): 68-93.
- Kingston, Maxine Hong. *The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts*. New York: Vintage, 1976.
- Kogawa, Joy. *Obasan: A Novel*. Boston: David R. Godine, 1981.
- Kristeva, Julia. "The Semiotic Chora Ordering the Drives." *Revolution in Poetic Language*. 1974. Trans. Margaret Waller. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984. 25-30.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Freudian Unconscious and Ours." 1964. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. 1973. Trans. Alan Sheridan. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. New York: Norton, 1977. 17-28.
- Lee, Hsiu-chuan (李秀娟). "Colored Desire, Gendered Body, and David Mura's Re-Writing of Asian American Manhood." Paper delivered at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the Association for Asian American Studies, Salt Lake City, April 24-28, 2002.
- . 分合之間：《歐巴桑》與日加移民屬性的「缺席」與重建 ("Dis/integration: Joy Kogawa's *Obasan* and the Immigrant Bodies by Default"). 《中外文學》29.9 (1999):

- 64-89.
- . "Genre-Crossing: Kingston's *The Woman Warrior* and Its Discursive Community." *Paroles Gelées* 14.2 (1996): 87-102.
- Lee, Rachel C. *The Americas of Asian American Literature: Gendered Fictions of Nation and Transnation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Li, David Leiwei. "Race, Gender, Class and Asian American Literary Theory." *Race, Gender, and Class: Asian American Voices* 4.3 (1997): 40-53.
- Lim, Shirley Geok-lin. "Asian American Literature: Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality." *Multicultural Review* 3.2 (1994): 46-53.
- . "Feminist and Ethnic Literary Theories in Asian American Literature." 1993. *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1997. 807-826.
- Minatoya, Lydia Yuriko. *Talking to High Monks in the Snow: An Asian American Odyssey*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Mura, David. *Where the Body Meets Memory: An Odyssey of Race, Sexuality, and Identity*. New York: Anchor Books, 1996.
- Okada, John. *No-No Boy*. 1957. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976.
- Parikh, Crystal. "'The Most Outrageous Masquerade': Queering Asian-American Masculinity." *Modern Fiction Studies* 48 (2002): 858-898.
- Said, Edward W. "Secular Criticism." *Critical Theory since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press, 1986. 604-622.
- Tsai, Shu-Ling Stephannie (蔡淑玲). 聽，那萬流匯聚的「中界」--從克莉絲蒂娃的「宮籟」探主體的異化與論述的侷限 (Kristeva's Chora—The Alienation of Subject and the Limit of Discourse). *《中外文學》* 30.8 (2002): 158-182.
- Wong, Sau-ling Cynthia. "Chinese/Asian American Men in the 1990s: Displacement, Impersonation, Paternity, and Extinction in David Wong Louie's *Pangs of Love*." *Privileging Positions: The Sites of Asian American Studies*. Ed. Gary Y. Okihiro, et al. Pullman: Washington State University Press, 1995. 181-191.
- Tan, Amy. *The Bonesetter's Daughter*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2001.
- Yamamoto, Hisaye. "The Legend of Miss Sasagawara." 1950. *Seventeen Syllables and Other Stories*. Latham, NY: Kitchen Table/Women of Color

Press, 1988. 20-33.

---. "Seventeen Syllables." 1949. *Seventeen Syllables and Other Stories* 8-19.

---. "Yoneko's Earthquake." 1951. *Seventeen Syllables and Other Stories* 46-56.

III.

The Unhomely Home, the Makeshift Family, and the Domestic Intervention in the Works of Cynthia Kadohata and Lydia Minatoya

Hsiu-chuan Lee

National Taiwan Normal University

[. . .] from the perspective of all those who have been displaced from the normative ground of authorized tradition, that both within "our own" culture, and certainly beyond, there are many other ways to think and live family.

--Angelika Bammer, "Mother Tongues and Other Strangers: Writing 'Family' across Cultural Divides"
92

[. . .] domesticity is more mobile and less stabilizing; it travels in contradictory circuits both to expand and contract the boundaries of home and nation [. . .].

--Amy Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity" 583

From Nation to Families

Increasing attentions in recent Asian American studies have been devoted to a re-thinking of Asian America as a unified category of nation.⁴⁵ Conceived in the wake of the Civil Rights Movements and the Third World Peoples Movement in the 1960s and 1970s, "Asian America" has been a political expedient to build a coalition among different

⁴⁵ Please refer to, for example, Li, Lowe, and Dirlik.

peoples of Asian origin. It has never been clear, however, how peoples of diverse national origins, linguistic backgrounds, cultural identifications, and class associations can be lumped together in one single category of political empowerment.⁴⁶ And this heterogeneity of Asian American constitution is exacerbated after the U.S government's 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act. The influx of new immigrants, migrants, refugees, travelers, and businesspersons renders the male-centered and nation-based "Asian American discourse" even more inadequate to address the increasing national, gender, and class diversities of Asian American populations. Clear is that "Asian American" should not be reduced to a cultural icon, a fossilized ethnic label, which excludes the "different" types of Asian Americans. Nor should it assume the image of a stable center, a new "melting pot," awaiting the integration of differences into it. For "Asian American" to remain a living and useful category, it has to be constantly re-signified.⁴⁷ Or, to borrow from Lacan, it has to remain "not-whole" (*pas-toute*), admitting that some part of itself remains underneath or outside the territorial confinement and temporal linearity of a nationalist representation, that something repressed or simply missing is always in the process of (re)emergence.⁴⁸

This paper intends to excavate the constitutive differences of Asian America. Instead of reading "Asian America" in terms of its pedagogical self-confinement as *one* nation, I attempt to understand "Asian America" as constituted by multiple families of shifting spatial and temporal dimensions. Of primary interest here is the complicated relationship between nation-building and family-construction. Traditionally people tend to connect nation and family. Not only do we usually speak "nations" as "homelands," "fatherlands," or "mother countries," the coining of the term "nation-family" figures nation in the seeming organic unity and continuity of a family.⁴⁹ To compare nations to families is to justify the "natural" status of nations. The idea of "nation-family" best links the paternal genealogies and genetic continuity of both a nation and a family.

⁴⁶ As Yanagisako has pointed out in "Transforming Orientalism," "'Asian American' poses the conundrum of how a category of people whose only common experience is that of having been labeled 'Oriental' in an 'Occidental' nation can forge for themselves a politically empowering ethnic identity" (275). She argues that Asian American identity is primarily a product of "academic and 'pedagogical' practices" (275).

⁴⁷ My idea of "re-signing" Asian America is indebted to Ono, who eloquently advocates a "re-signing" (refiguring) rather than "resigning" (retiring or replacing) "Asian America." My analysis in this paper, however, departs from Ono's in at least two aspects: (1) While Ono feels the need to "re-sign" Asian American largely because of the influx of new immigrants after 1965, my study of the heterogeneous constitutions of Asian America extends to the era before 1965; (2) while Ono emphasizes in his essay a "critical rhetorical analysis" (68), my analysis of Asian American families demonstrates certainly more than "rhetorical" concerns.

⁴⁸ Lacan introduces the idea of "*pas-toute*" mostly through his analysis of Woman (*La femme*) and Woman's jouissance. Being "*pas-toute*" (not-whole), Woman is never completely represented or appropriated by the phallic symbolic. She is there in the symbolic order "in full" (*à plein*); but there is "something more" (*en plus*) (74).

⁴⁹ For a detailed analysis of the nation-family analogy, see McClintock 90-91.

What is ironic in this nation-family analogy, however, is that families are not always as unified and continuous as may have been expected. Whereas many people conceive “family” in terms of the bourgeois nuclear model, emphasizing its institutional function to impose spatial boundary and ensure patrilinear reproduction, few “real” families feature idealized domesticity.⁵⁰ For one thing, it has been noted that the bourgeois nuclear family is a pretty recent invention in human history. It did not arise until the nineteenth century as a by-product of industrialization and urbanization. Moreover, even among the urban, middle-class populations, the “ideal domesticity,” defined as a household completely “closed off” from the outside world like a “private kingdom” (Hareven 5), is usually not achievable in everyday reality. Studying the role of families in the context of the nineteenth-century imperial expansion, Amy Kaplan suggests that domesticity mostly serves as “the ambiguous third realm between the nation and the foreign” (584)—“not as a static condition but as the process of domestication” of the wild, the unfamiliar, and the other, which keep intruding into the family (582). Analyzing the twentieth-century women’s writings, Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar further describe families and homes as the “front” in gender and cultural wars (xv). Both studies lay bare an inevitable blurring of the line between the domestic-private and the foreign-public even in the so-called bourgeois domicile. Investigating the development of kinship in the U.S., Sylvia Yanagisako actually reaches the conclusion that “[t]he so-called modern American family is a folk model, a Weberian ideal type, that describes no one’s behavior, not anyone’s normative system—other than, of course, that of a hypothetical category of Americans” (*Transforming the Past* 258).

And the porosity of domesticity becomes even more evident when we take into consideration families that are not defined by the bourgeois nuclear model. Tamara K. Hareven notices that the idea of domestic enclosure and genetic unity does not apply to many types of families in human history. Both preindustrial households and modern working class and immigrant families, for example, are “characterized by sociability rather than privacy” (3). In the preindustrial society,

the household was the site of a multiplicity of activities. It served as the site of production, as a welfare agency and correctional institution, as an educational institution, and as a place for religious worship. Rather than catering strictly to the needs of the family, the household served the entire community [. . .]. (2)

⁵⁰ Here, what I mean by “real” does not simply refer to “reality”; it is more or less a Lacanian “real” that is situated outside language and would return as the specter of reality. As will be demonstrated by my ensuing analysis, I am concerned not only about what most families appear in reality but how their “real” underside keeps emerging to threaten their albeit unified and harmonious appearance.

Similarly, a modern working class and immigrant domicile is not “merely a private refuge; it was a resource that could be used for generating extra income, for paying debts [. . .]” (14). And as “[p]rivacy was less important than the flexible use of household space,” the working class and immigrant families “frequently took in newly arrived immigrants and, at least temporarily, shared housing with them” (14).

Contrary to the prevailing belief that household members must be individuals tied by “blood and marriage,” it is not unusual for both preindustrial and modern working class/immigrant families to take in “unrelated individuals such as servants, apprentices, boarders and lodgers, and ‘unfortunates’ from the community” (2). Families as such are not emptied-out metaphors of stability and homogeneity for nations. Rather, they undergo continuous changes by taking in the genetically unrelated and accumulating the heterogeneous.

Indeed, while “nation” usually appeals to a “family” trope to cover up its discontinuous history and heterogeneous constitutions, “family” could itself be a space introducing others’ interventions and generating everyday hybridities. “The family becomes,” summarizes Anne McClintock, “at one and the same time, both the *organizing figure* for national history and its *antithesis*” (91). Based on this understanding, to study Asian American families is not to consolidate “Asian America” as one nation but to restore Asian American construction to its domestic dimensions, which involve Asian American individuals’ familial connections, productions, deviations, and hybridizations. In what follows, I take Cynthia Kadohata’s *The Floating World* (1989) and Lydia Minatoya’s *Talking to High Monks in the Snow: An Asian American Odyssey* (1992; henceforth *Talking to High Monks*) as two cases to study the familial dimensions of Asian American constitution, seeking in the Japanese American households the radical spaces from which a re-signification of “Asian America” is made possible. Briefly, Asian American families must be known not simply as tools of genetic integration or cultural assimilation but as spaces of national, ethnic, cultural identificatory conflicts and gender, generational, and transnational negotiations. The change and development of Japanese American communities are in one way or another embedded in the establishment, extension, movement, and/or disintegration of individual families.

From Home to “Unhome”

What makes Cynthia Kadohata’s *The Floating World* (1989) an interesting text of analysis in this paper is that it introduces an “other” kind of Japanese American family. Asian

American literature has long been noted for its preoccupation with the establishment of families and homes in the United States. Building up a family symbolizes Asian Americans' successful integration into the American society. It helps the immigrant individuals and their offspring to confirm their identity and secure their genealogy in the land they choose, though for different reasons, to stay. And this desire to set up one's own family could be especially intense in the case of post-internment Japanese Americans. After the traumatic relocation and the disruption of their community during World War II, Japanese Americans crave to re-establish their families, preferably in the model of American bourgeois household. One obvious example can be found in John Okada's *No-No Boy* (1957), in which the protagonist-narrator Ichiro dreams to purchase a house and build a family marked by paternity and progeny:

In time, [. . .] there will [. . .] be a place for me. I will buy a home and love my family and I will walk down the street holding my son's hand and people will stop and talk with us about the weather and the ball games and the elections. (52)

Similarly, in his memoir, *Where the Body Meets Memory: An Odyssey of Race, Sexuality, and Identity* (1996), David Mura vividly describes how, after the internment, his Nisei father moves every seven years, from the city to the "calm suburban world" in order to build a typical American bourgeois household that is free from his Japanese American history (18). Both examples demonstrate the post-war Japanese Americans' strong desire to be assimilated into the mainstream American society. It seems that the possession of a suburban domicile—a "typical" nuclear bourgeois household—that separates the family from the world and the history provides an important way for Japanese Americans to sustain the self-enclosed stability of their identities. Also set in the post-war socio-historical context, Kadohata's *The Floating World*, however, tells a different story.

Indeed, the "unconventionalities" of *The Floating World* have been widely noted ever since its publication.⁵¹ Among them, what concern my discussion in this paper are primarily two points. First, instead of writing to secure a stable home and a self-enclosed family for her Japanese American characters, Kadohata launches them into multiple traveling routes across the 1950s United States. The delineation of a type of Japanese American family that is usually on the way and ceaselessly moves toward the outside and the other restores our imagination of

⁵¹ Yogi, for example, reads *The Floating World* as conveying "a sense of rootlessness and randomness" (147). He attributes Kadohata's "hypnotic, sparse prose style" and "cinematic narrative structure" not as much to Japanese American literary tradition as to the South American magic realist writers (147). Other critics comment on the unconventional contents of the novel. Sarkar asserts that *The Floating World* presents "alternative stories" of Japanese Americans (80). Some other reviewers further point out that the characters in the novel are "not acting Japanese enough" (qtd. in Pearlman 117). Some even accuse this novel of not being "angry enough" and

Japanese American families to their multiple images and functions. Besides, I am interested in what some reviewers claim to be the “unconventional” Nikkei characters created by the novel.⁵² Among them, the most notorious is the protagonist-narrator Olivia’s Issei grandmother, Obāsan, who marries “three times” (2) and is still “consumed with an affair” at the age of seventy-six (13). Besides, Olivia’s mother marries Charlie-O when she is “eight months pregnant” with Olivia (39) and has a series of extramarital affairs. Added to this list of “unconventional characters” is Olivia herself. She, together with her mother and her maternal grandmother, Obāsan, complicates the patrilinear order and genetic unity of traditional families. In one way or another, *The Floating World* displaces the Asian American search for a self-enclosed, patrilinear household with its portrayal of traveling “unhome(s)” and makeshift families.

Here, the word “unhome” is chosen to indicate the multiple layers of Japanese Americans’ experiences with family and home. In its most obvious sense, the prefix “un” of “unhome” negates the idea of “home.” The “unhome” is “not” a “home,” or, more precisely, not a “home” in its traditional sense of providing spatial moorings and stable identity. If an idealized “home” is noted by its privacy and self-enclosure, an “unhome” could be extroverted, pointing to the alien and the unfamiliar. To move from “home” to “unhome,” one is, in a sense, exiled from a stable, fixed, and self-enclosed place called “home” upon which one’s identity is embedded.

In light of this interpretation of “unhome,” the movement and travels of the post-war Japanese Americans in *The Floating World* could be easily attributed to the forced dispersion of Japanese Americans immediate after the Second World War. As Sheila Sarkar makes clear, the years-long travels of Olivia’s family in Oregon, Wyoming, California, and Washington reflects “the forced dispersion of many Japanese Americans” after their relocation during World War II (84) and “the temporary jobs that Olivia describes among the Japanese American community” point to “the economic instability for many Japanese Americans at the time because their own property and financial means of survival had been taken away during internment” (83). Similarly, You-me Park and Gayle Wald read the three reasons Olivia mentions for her family’s constant movement—the bad luck of her father, the fact of their being Japanese Americans, and the problems of her parents’ marriage—as coinciding with the difficulties Japanese immigrants had to deal with in postwar America: the economic crisis brought on by slower economic growth, the racializing nationalist

not “talk[ing] enough about the camps” (qtd. in Pearlman 116, 117).

⁵² See note 7.

discourse that defined Japanese Americans only as Japanese, and the reconfiguring of gender relations within the family. (626)

Except reflecting “the reconfiguring of gender relations,” the Japanese American “unhomes” are generally the result of racism that still permeates the post-war United States. Japanese Americans are exiled from “homes.” Their “unhomely” situation bears witness to their falling victims to socio-political persecutions.

Undoubtedly, Kadohata has taken the post-war Japanese American situation as the historical backdrop of her writing. I also agree that Olivia and her family members are to a certain extent victims of racial discrimination and economic exploitation. They are not able to establish a “normal” household partly because they cannot afford a house.⁵³ What makes Kadohata’s writing truly “unconventional,” however, is that *The Floating World* does not describe this historical dispersion of Japanese Americans as a completely negative situation, which one had better leave behind in order to move into a brighter future. Instead of taking Japanese Americans’ “unhomely” experiences as something Japanese Americans need to outgrow as quickly as possible or considering their “unhomeliness” a mere prelude from which one can project unto the future an unproblematic Japanese American “homecoming,” *The Floating World* seems to dawdle over these “unhomely” moments, treating them sometimes as valuable or even productive. In Olivia’s words,

It was always hard to leave our homes, but once we started traveling, a part of me loves that life. All the packing and moving was especially hard on my parents, but I think even they enjoyed some of the long drives [. . .]. I remember how fine it was to drive through the passage of light from morning to noon to night. (4)

The joy of travel is worth the pain of leaving home. Or, as Olivia’s mother admits, “[i]t’s always nice when we start out somewhere, then it’s less nice when we’re almost there” (41). To be on the way, to move toward somewhere new, could be better than facing the end of one’s journey. Indeed, Olivia never considers the possession of an “idealized” domicile the goal of her travels and movement. Even after Charlie-O finally purchases a garage in Arkansas and becomes a property owner, Olivia still decides to leave behind her Arkansas home—despite its “neatly trimmed lawn in front and a swing set in the large backyard” (120)—for the uncertainties of further movement:

My family has lived many places, and traveled many places. I thought then that Arkansas was the most beautiful place I had ever been in, yet I wanted badly to

⁵³ Olivia narrates her family’s difficulties in purchasing a house: Her parents look around model homes, each one “more beguiling than the one before,” but the fact is that they “couldn’t really afford a house” (148).

leave, and I knew that [. . .] someday I would have that freedom. (110-111)

Life on the road features something to be privileged. The “unhome” in *The Floating World* is not necessarily an inferior home; it could be “better” in that it provides more living opportunities.

Here, by recasting the post-war Japanese American dispersion into an experience with positive prospects, Kadohata teases from “unhome” another layer of significance. “Unhome” does not simply denote a lack of home. It rather indicates an “other” kind of home, which is noted not as much by its self-enclosed boundary as by its extroverted tendency towards the open road. Rather than being a mark of “lack,” the prefix “un” here indicates the act to move “out” of a territorially self-confined home. To be “unhomed” is not “without” home, but to stay in the *without*, to be unbounded by a “home.” It is clear that Olivia cannot tolerate a life of self-imprisoned stasis. Her sense of “home” is attributed a least in part to her physically being away from home. When staying in Arkansas, for instance, she prefers sleeping in the living room or wandering in the woods at night because she “wanted to feel separate from [. . . her] normal life yet protected within it” (71). When she turns fourteen, she begins to have “two lives”—her life at home and her life with her friends (72). Moreover, she likes her apartment in Los Angeles because it gives her the “old feeling of being displaced and safe at the same time, like when [. . . she] used to play in the small woods back of [. . . her] house at night” (126). Like her younger brother’s caterpillars that would still venture into an open space even though they are well-fed in a glass jar, Olivia prefers “unhome” to a traditional “home” because the former challenges the segregation of the public and domestic spaces. It conjoins her sense of familial belongings to the freedom provided by the world outside a “home.”

Implicit in an “unhomely” situation is thus the intervention of the domestic and the private into the public. Indeed, most characters in *The Floating World* are not passively “homeless” despite their “unhomeliness.” Kadohata’s writing at this point bears strong echo to Homi Bhabha’s famous rendition of the “unhomely: “To be unhomed is not to be homeless, nor can the unhomely be easily accommodated in that familiar division of the social life into private and the public spheres” (445). Reading the “unhomely” not simply as paradigmatic of the postcolonial situation but as prevalent in all socio-historical conditions of cultural differences and power negotiations, Bhabha further points out that the “unhomely” features the space of “cultural dissensus and alterity,” the space not yet accommodated by the calcified dominant (usually national) spatialization (449). The “unhomely” as such could be understood as the “meeting place” or as the “contact zone” between the domestic and the public, the

everyday (un)home and the regulating nation-state. It is where the traumatic, psychic, personal, and ethnic experiences emerge to inscribe their symbolic presence. In Bhabha's own words, the domestic "unhomely" usually turns into "sites for history's most intricate invasions" (445).

Blurring the line between the world and the (un)home, *The Floating World* presents many textual examples to manifest the apparition of Japanese American communities from their "unhomely" travels, movement, and transgression. When Olivia's family sets up households among "gas station attendants, restaurants, the jobs [. . . it] depended upon, the motel towns floating in the middle of fields and mountains" (2), it becomes not clear whether one should mourn for their "homelessness" or acclaim their intrusion into multiple public spaces. Although at the most pessimistic moment of her life Olivia compares the migrant Japanese American farmworkers to "animals migrating across a field [. . . ,] moving from the hard life just past to the life, maybe harder, to come" (149), in most places *The Floating World* describes these migrant Japanese Americans as being able to exert agency in the mapping of America. Olivia, for example, does not consider herself "floating": the world is "floating," but her self is "stable, traveling through an unstable world" to test the various possibilities of dwelling and forming communities (3). The novel's description of the Japanese American chicken sexers in Arkansas further brings forth a close-knit Japanese American community out of the seeming absence of Japanese Americans in the U.S. public. Moreover, it is not without significance for Olivia to inherit from her real father, Jack, not a "home" but a vending-machine route. In appearance, Jack fails to establish a "home" to hand it down to his daughter; he remains frequently "unhomed," tending a vending-machine route that runs across California, Arizona, and Nevada. It turns out, however, several home-communities have grown along his vending-machine route. When Olivia services the route in her own turn after Jack's death, she realizes that she has inherited from her father home-communities that crop up along the route:

A couple of the most out-of-the-way places were tiny offices for which Jack had simply laid out candy on shelves, with no machines, and the office workers paid on the honor system. He'd gotten to know the people in those offices better than the people at his more profitable locations. I thought maybe he'd told some of those smaller customers about me, maybe showed them picture, if he carried any. In any case, "Jack's girl" is what a couple of them called me. (157-158)

And Jack is not the only one who inscribes his Japanese American presence into the U.S. public sphere by owning and servicing a route. In another significant passage, Olivia describes

how the migrant ethnic workers form “three main rivers” in the United States: “I read once that there were three main rivers in the country, one on the West Coast, one on the East, and one in the Midwest. The rivers, made up of migrant farmworkers, traveled down the country every year during the growing season” (146). Constituting a major part of these migrant farmworkers, Japanese Americans re-write the American landscape in spite, or because, of their “unhomeliness.”

From Genetic Continuity to Makeshift Families

The previous section is devoted to an analysis of the Japanese American traveling “unhome” as embodied in *The Floating World*. Probing into the complicated implications of “unhome,” I demonstrate Kadohata’s attempt to re-read the seeming Japanese American “homelessness” into a position of socio-historical intervention. On the one hand, the post-war dispersion of Japanese Americans seems to render them invisible. The disintegration of their families and communities results in their being removed from any fixed place called “home.” On the other hand, however, their being specifically no-where ends up—ironically—with the possibilities of their being everywhere in the United States. Infiltrating into the world through their travels and movement, Japanese Americans create spaces through their “unhomely” existence.

Yet, as I have also pointed out at the beginning of the previous section, the Japanese American family in *The Floating World* is “unconventional” not only because it is not territorially bounded but also because it challenges the genetic unity and patrilinear continuity of an idealized modern bourgeois family. Olivia’s is not only a household that sprawls toward the outside but also a domicile that generates the foreign, the unfamiliar, or, in the Freudian term, the “uncanny” from within its own structure. Significantly, the Freudian “uncanny” is precisely “unhomely” (*unheimlich*) in its original Germany. It adds another twist to our understanding of “unhome” as Freud interprets the prefix “un” not as a “negation” or an “opposition” but as a “repression.” The “uncanny” is the re-occurrence of the repressed and the forgotten. Freud reiterates that it is not the completely new and the unfamiliar that gives rise to the feeling of the “uncanny. What accounts for *unheimlich* is rather the return of “something which is familiar and old-established in the mind and which has become alienated from it only through the process of repression” (241). There is as such no sheer opposition between *unheimlich* and *heimlich*. “Unhome” sheds light on what has been repressed or forgotten in the process through which the “home” assumes its unified and continuous appearance. It reveals the hybridities in the constitution of a household from within itself.

Freud makes this clear in his assertion: “This *unheimlich* place [. . .] is the entrance to the former Heim [home] of all human beings” (245). “Unhome” restores a “home” to its more hybrid and convoluted shape.

Drawing upon this Freudian insight on the “uncanny”/“unhomely,” I would like to investigate in the rest of this paper the domestic complexities of Japanese American families first in *The Floating World* and then in *Talking to High Monks*. As has been noted, implicit in Freud’s theory of the “uncanny” is a radical re-conception of “home” from its within. A home is never as “unified” and “self-enclosed” as may have been expected; it only appears “unified” and “self-enclosed” after a process of repression. And since this repression is never a complete process, “repression” in a household actually bespeaks the “return of the repressed.” A “home” as such is never free from its “unhomely” underside. This explains why an “idealized domesticity” can only be projected unto the future or embodied in one’s nostalgia. As demonstrated by the examples of Ichiro and Mura mentioned above, Ichiro dreams about a future family/home, which nonetheless remains not yet achieved in *No-No Boy*, and Mura has grown to be aware of the existence of a hybrid Japanese American history and identity the moment he comments on his father’s attempt to set up an American bourgeois household. In the case of *The Floating World* and *Talking to High Monks*, the question of patrilinearity, the disruption of genetic unity, and the (material) other’s interventions most obviously characterize the “unhomely”/“uncanny” underside of Japanese American families.

It is quite clear that Olivia’s family in *The Floating World* is not built upon a strict patrilinear order; nor does this family assume the appearance of a harmonious household of bourgeois idealization. It is by nature a makeshift family originating from the need of Olivia’s mother to find a legal husband when she is already eight months pregnant. If we do not count in Olivia’s real father—Jack, her mother’s extramarital dates, and the other families or individuals they travel with, Olivia lives in a family made up of primarily seven members: Olivia, her mother, her step-father Charlie-O, her three younger half-brothers born between her mother and Charlie-O, and Obāsan. That this family does not develop out of a clear paternal line is evident in many aspects. First, there is no mentioning of Charlie-O’s background. Though Olivia likes him and addresses him as “my father” (in contrast to her calling her real father “Jack”), the father’s story—particularly the ancestral lineage on his side—is left out by Olivia’s narrative. Olivia confesses that “I don’t know exactly how my grandmother found Charlie-O”; she only later hears from Obāsan that “she’d first brought him to Fresno to meet [. . . her] mother” when the latter is already pregnant (39). Secondly, Charlie-O is not presented in the novel as a father with paternal authority. The readers are told

that Charlie-O is an amateur painter who sells paintings only “in his imagination” (60). Also, he loves Olivia’s mother yet is “loud and undignified” whereas Olivia’s mother is “graceful and pensive and intellectual” (39). Another thing we know about Charlie-O is that he never owns anything until his purchase of the garage in Arkansas. Worst of all, Olivia once comments upon the power relationship between her parents: “[T]hrough my mother was several years younger than Charlie-O, she always struck me as womanly, whereas my father was boyish” (43). Last but not least, the novel never mentions Charlie-O’s last name. Actually, there is no mentioning of the last name of any major father figures in the novel. Neither Charlie-O and Jack, nor the three fathers of Olivia’s mother are remembered by their last names. In a quite intriguing way, *The Floating World* presents a world with many fathers yet none of them is powerful enough to head a family with a name-of-the-father.

This lack of a paternal name may appear to some readers as an echo to the anxiety of ethnocide many Japanese Americans have suffered since their traumatic experiences during World War II. To be noticed, however, is that the lack of the name-of-the-father does not seem to pose an issue of special concern to most characters in the novel. In a sense, *The Floating World* is written in a way to counteract the worries of Japanese American ethnic extinction. The novel presents a family that can develop and grow despite the lack of the father’s name or a clear paternal lineage. One of the most obvious examples is that, although the marriage between Charlie-O and Olivia’s mother is marked by endless problems, Olivia’s family continues to grow and thrive. In addition to Olivia, three sons are born after Olivia’s mother marries Charlie-O. Even when the family falls apart because of the marriage problems between the parents, the community comes forward to organize for the children a makeshift family. Olivia and two of her younger brothers are sent to stay in Nebraska with Charlie-O’s friend as their “foster parent” when Charlie-O and Olivia’s mother are broke (12). And when the parents come back to stay together again, they pick up their children and continue their family life on the road. This makeshift nature of families is also seen through the life story of Olivia’s mother. Olivia’s mother grows up through three households with three different fathers, ending up remembering little about her real father. In fact, the father Olivia’s mother remembers the most is her second father, Bill; similarly, Olivia is in better terms with Charlie-O than with Jack. “I spoke to [. . . Jack] only a couple of times,” Olivia confesses, “Charlie-O was the one who was ‘Dad’” (151).

Briefly, characters in *The Floating World* are concerned more about the makeshift communities that may emerge anytime on the road in response to their needs of company and help than about genetic unity or patrilinear order that defines a traditional bourgeois family. It

is the everyday trifles, not paternal lineage, which bound people together. Olivia points out that it always takes her by surprise “how naturally and quickly new people covered the surface of [. . . her] life” (152). To her, a car accident on a bus station is able to cause the formation of a community on the road by bounding together a group of people from different places and with unknown identities. Moreover, despite the apparent differences in personality between her mother and Charlie-O, she claims that they “matched” because they “lived in the same world, used the same shampoo, ate the same foods” (43). Olivia is also interested in the “unplanned quality” in the emergence of the Japanese American community in “Arkansas: “It is as if a giant had taken a bunch of houses and thrown them randomly on the ground, and people took up residence wherever the houses happened to land” (96). Here, so long as there are people around and communities available, who cares about patrilinearity? Near the end of the novel, although Olivia inherits from Jack his vending-machine route, the patrilinear implications of this episode are also cast into question. First, it is Charlie-O who accompanies Olivia, though only halfway, to undertake her first journey of servicing the route. Moreover, when Olivia encounters what she claims to be the “ghost” of Jack on one station of the vending-machine route, she finds she has so little to tell him that she pours out the news about her three half brothers in a tone that casts Jack to be an outsider of the family she is truly concerned about:

Did I ever show you any pictures of my brothers? Walker’s pretty quiet, but he’s not really shy, the way he used to be. He just doesn’t like to talk to people if they don’t interest him. Ben’s the opposite. He has too many friends. Walker and Ben are in high school. Peter’s in grammar school. He skipped a grade because he’s so smart. (160)

Olivia even talks to Jack’s face: “If it weren’t for you, maybe my mother would have loved my dad more” (160). Indeed, after saying this, Olivia starts to worry about her work in the station and “forgot about Jack” (161). The return of the “real” father as a ghost ends up being a mere bluff. As he is simply forgotten, fading into the background of a dark night, the daughter appropriates the vending-machine route to be her own

From National “Courtyards” to a Transnational Family

In comparison with *The Floating World, Talking to High Monks* appears to present a more “conventional” Japanese American family. At first sight, the protagonist-narrator Lydia grows up in a pretty “typical” American middleclass family. Her father is a Nisei who possesses a Ph.D. degree and serves throughout his career as a research scientist in a private

lab. His life story, including his moving farther and farther away from his parental home in the east Washington desert until finally settling down in Albany, New York, his idolization of his white employers for whom he works as a child servant, and his being a loyal and excellent employee all his life, figures one of the most typical processes of Japanese American assimilation into the American mainstream. Moreover, *Talking to High Monks* narrates an episode in which Lydia's parents, in a gesture echoing the attempt of Mura's father, tries to move to a "suburban neighborhood, where daughters were expected to graduate from four-year colleges or universities" (26). In fact, when Lydia is born, her father searches hard for a "conventional" (so that she can merge into the national mainstream without difficulties) yet "uncommon" (so that she won't be easily disregarded as a nobody) name for her. The father finally comes up with "Lydia Minatoya," which, according to him, is meant to prepare Lydia for the "full true promise of America" (31).

"Lydia Minatoya," however, is not Lydia's complete name. Her complete name has a "Yuri" in-between "Lydia" and "Minatoya," secretly marking Lydia's Japanese origin as well as her mother's intervention into Lydia's naming process.⁵⁴ Similarly, the attempt of Lydia's father to set up an idealized American household is not as successful as it appears to be. The powerlessness of the father is revealed most clearly in that, three years before his retirement, he learns that he has been paid "the same salary of his laboratory assistant" (21). More ridiculous than this is that the father refuses to sue the lab for this unfair treatment. His reason is that he does not like to assume the role of a victim. Instead of filing a suit he would certainly win, he chooses to negate the fact that he has been discriminated against in work. The seemingly successful story of a Japanese American here turns into a self-deceived myth, which Lydia gradually sees through as she grows up. In 1981, holding "a brand-new tenure-track contract to teach graduate studies in a large university" and "a doctorate degree that was two weeks old," Lydia moves to the heart of Boston, the cradle of the U.S. civilization and "the Hub of Universe" (55). Although in appearance she is already on her way to setting up a "foothold" on Beacon Hill and lives "near to America's oldest, wealthiest families," she starts to realize that American Dream does not necessarily apply to her. She wonders how she could define her self and her family when "everyone knew all real American families were white" (32).

Talking to High Monks as such does not tell a simplistic story of the ascendancy of

⁵⁴ According to one episode in *Talking to High Monks*, Lydia's middle name, "Yuri," is chosen by her mother. Besides, her mother writes "Yuri" not in its traditional character that means "lily flower" but in a character that means "clever." She secretly instills her wish for her daughter into the name, "Yuri": "Too many flowers already. In America, it is better to prepare a child to be clever—to be open to the world, to accept imagination, to see the

Japanese Americans *qua* model minorities in the United States. Weaving together Lydia's narrative of her family history, her personal story, her traveling experiences, and her conversation with her mother, the text exposes a complicated underside of a seemingly "conventional" Japanese American family. While *The Floating World* demonstrates how the dispersed Japanese American families after the war intrude into the American open roads, *Talking to High Monks* shows how a seemingly male-dominant, self-enclosed, middle-class Japanese American household is haunted by its own immigrant history, particularly by a missing maternal ancestral lineage due to the banishment of Lydia's grandmother from the family. Certainly, the complexities of Olivia's family are more self-evident than those in Lydia's family because the former features an obvious makeshift household that gets along with its "unhomely" emergence. Olivia's family takes everything in and grows on the way it travels. The immigrant past of the family is passed down without difficulties to Olivia as her Issei Obāsan "talked on and on" through their journey (1). Besides, since Olivia's family members keep adding "pictures of whatever appealed to [. . . them]" (96) to the family pictures hung "on the wall behind the cabinet" (95), the household develops naturally on the road. Lydia's family, on the contrary, does not allow such an easy and smooth entrance of the heterogeneous. Excluding the unwanted and the unfavorable, it first banishes the divorced Issei grandmother and then negates the racism it confronts in the United States. The fact that the conversation between Lydia and her mother is punctuated by pauses and silences further testifies to the gaps and repressions of her family history. For one thing, the memory of the Japanese American relocation during the Second World War is "the wall" that her "mother's music could not scale" (14). For another, the circumstances of her Issei grandmother's banishment has "remain[ed] a family secret for over forty years" (5). The family also attempts to hide its Japanese association. In an interesting episode, Lydia narrates how her cousins are scared by their possible exposure to television cameras when they visit Japantown: "They hid from exposure like white-collar criminals caught in some scandalous indiscretion" when "the television cameras swept the crowd" (45). Lydia's cousins are afraid of being spotted in "Japantown." They are, as one of them insists, "*California*" girls (45).

The family's insistence on its image of being a successful "American" family makes Lydia's attempt to excavate its underside difficult. The first two chapters of *Talking to High Monks*, entitled respectively "My Mother's Music" and "My Father's Career," best illustrate how Lydia has been torn between her mother's and father's guidance since her childhood. If Lydia's pursuit of an academic career marks her effort to follow her father's footsteps to seek

the promises of the American dream, her decision to undertake international travels to Japan, China, Nepal, etc. is to follow her mother's advice to "soar" beyond the "Courtyard walls" (3). Literally, the "Courtyard walls" in her mother's story refer to the walls of a traditional household into which a married woman disappears. For Lydia, the "Courtyard walls" further refer to the national boundary of her family and her identification. The child and adolescent Lydia assumes that, unlike her mother as well as her other female ancestors, she is an American daughter "indulged" by her family with the freedom to leave and return home (119). Yet after reaching her adulthood, she cannot but admit that it is not true that she can "grow up to be anything" she wants (34). Her freedom in America is limited: Why does she suffer from a "crush" on a white teacher who cares not a bit for her? Why does she always "fake good" and score high in the good-impression scale? Also, why does she have to sacrifice her health, yet still not able to fulfill the requirements of a tenure-track teaching position? In the chapter entitled "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall," she wonders why she should force herself to fit into Boston, a city holding the strictest line between ethnic territory and why she does not meet a Japanese American who is not her relative until she is twenty. Lydia joins the 1983 gathering of East Coast Asian American women on the Boston University, which brings many Japanese Americans face to face, like "toddlers," shocking at the similar appearances they share with each other (59). All of a sudden, Lydia realizes that she has to "soar" beyond the boundary not only of her family in Albany but also of the United States as a whole in order to meet people and communities who bear similar appearance and share related historical memories with her.⁵⁵

Talking to High Monks can thus be understood as a bildungsroman. The book traces the meandering of Lydia's life story, evolving from a remembrance of her parents' life, their marriage, the establishment of their family, Lydia's childhood learning experience, her career as a young professional, her "youthful identity crisis" (50), her travels beyond "home" and the United States, and ending—exactly like what usually happens in traditional bildungsromans—with Lydia's wedding ceremony. Subtitled "An Asian American Odyssey," *Talking to High Monks* features Lydia's life "odyssey," which concludes at Lydia's wedding and hence the establishment of her own family. The question is: To what extent does this establishment of her own family mark Lydia's assimilation into the United States? Also, whether "assimilation" is what Lydia still wants after she travels abroad and has achieved a

⁵⁵ Lydia's question about her "American" identity is best demonstrated by the children's story about a bird that she remembers from her childhood: The bird "was hatched far from his nest." Although he was happy for a while and other animals "tried to teach him their way of survival," he soon realized that he did not belong to them and set out to look for his real mother. He ended up asking "every creature he met one question, 'Are you my

better understanding of the transnational connections of her family? In her exploration of Asian American bildungsromans, Patricia P. Chu studies Asian American writers' various strategies of assimilation into the United States. Whether they "deploy" or "interrogate" traditional narratives of Americanization, most of the writers discussed by Chu strive to write into "the city of words," to "make a place in the American national literature where their stories belong" (Chu 3). *Talking to High Monks*, however, provides a different kind of Asian American bildungsroman. Essential to my understanding of this text is that it seeks not as much a place within the American national boundary as a space beyond the existent borders of a "nation-family." Instead of writing into "the city of words," Minatoya writes in a sense to transgress the confinement of the "city." The family Lydia establishes toward of the end of the book, as I will demonstrate below, is not necessarily a "typical" American family. It is rather a Japanese American extroverted household, evolving from Lydia's transnational traveling experiences and her recovery of the maternal genealogies of her family.

Indeed, once unfolded to reveal the repressed and the forgotten, Lydia's family is by no means less complicated than that of Olivia's. While Olivia's Obāsan is notoriously "unconventional," Lydia's grandmother is "a romantic, an adventurer" (5) who reads "all the European, great romantic novels" (6) and talks to her children "about science and foreign countries" (5). In Japan, she "caused scandal when she bought a set of encyclopedia" (5); after getting married and moving to the United States, she "fell in love with a young Filipino who could read and speak Japanese" and "courted her by bringing books" (6). Due to her extramarital affair, she is sent back to Japan with her children, divorced after five years, and then banished perpetually from the family network. She enters into her second marriage afterwards and moves to Manchuria where she lives until the end of her life without ever returning to Japan or to America again.

And the Issei grandmother is not the only divorced woman in Lydia's maternal line. Auntie, the elder sister of Lydia's mother, is also a divorced woman. Her difference from her Issei mother is that divorce is "her choice" (113). With four children to support after the divorce, Auntie sets up a single-parent family first by working in a sweatshop as a modest sewing laborer but soon determining to "step away from the rigid code of her past" (113) and become a "hostess" in restaurants. Although she could have been disowned and exiled like her Issei mother if her father lives to see her work as a "hostess," Auntie achieves an alternative kind of success in her life. While others expect her to become "a hardened woman, losing her youth, wheedling drunken men" (114), Auntie remains "willful" and "beautiful" (113): she

mother?" See 66.

makes money, purchases a house, and saves enough money for her daughters' college educations in the United States.

The stories of these exiled women and unwanted daughters constitute the underside of Lydia's family history. They form counter-stories to the dominant family history that emphasizes the genetic purity of the family lineage. The chapter titled "The Family Union" recites the dominant history: Lydia's maternal line is noted by "centuries of glories and affluence" in Japan—a line produced out of "eight hundred years of inbreeding" (87). In "The Patriarch," the Issei grandmother's younger brother—the current patriarch of the family—further gives Lydia a lecture that "wove a narrative of [Japanese] national history and family honor" (101). He urges Lydia to be proud of the family's glories in Japan and asserts to her that "[t]his is who you are" (101). However, how could the "glorious" past of a Japanese family define Lydia's Japanese American identity? The patriarch's assertion, made out of a complete lack of understanding of Lydia's Japanese American background, sounds self-deceived, if not ignorant. For one thing, instead of being a product of "intermarriage" between affluent Japanese families of the same region (88), Lydia is born out of a "new familial network" that is formed in America between a Kibei girl and a Nisei boy (11).⁵⁶ For another, the Patriarch neglects his family's underside constituted by the exiled women and disowned daughters. Fortunately, the authoritative father does not provide the only voice of interpellation in *Talking to High Monks*. Lydia grows up also under a maternal influence.⁵⁷ As we shall see, every time Lydia's father iterates: "I have encouraged my girls to be nurses or librarians. Daughters need duty, not daring" (115), her mother gives her an "other" education, filling her "timorous world with flight dreams" by transforming her Issei grandmother and Auntie into "heroines" (115). Lydia remembers how her mother usually listens politely to her father's teachings with smiles, but would afterwards drag her to the kitchen, "fiercely" hissing to her ear: "Do not listen to those old men [. . .]. Soar as high as you can. Go as far as you want. *Never* let anyone stop you" (115).

With her desire to "soar," Lydia's travel to Japan and her visit to her grandmother's family should not be interpreted as a simple attempt of roots-search. Rather, it is like a venture to restore her Japanese American family to its transnational dimensions. While *The Floating World* delineates a Japanese American family's meandering through the U. S. national time and space, bringing otherness and heterogeneity into the U.S. national presence, *Talking to*

⁵⁶ More elaboration of the marriage between Lydia's mother and father is attempted in "Coda: The Domestic Intervention."

⁵⁷ Lydia claims, not without significance, that "[t]he Japanese love their mothers [. . .]. To them, the creative force *must* be maternal" (113).

High Monks not only retrieves the repressed and the forgotten in a single Japanese American household but further defines the Japanese American family as transnational. The re-inclusion of Lydia's Issei grandmother into her family circle, for example, renders her Japanese American family no longer simply landed in Albany, New York, but remaining linked to Japan or even to Manchuria. The Kibei background of Lydia's mother also adds transnational dimensions to Lydia's family. A product of a series of makeshift households, Lydia's mother is born in her parents' house in America, moved to Japan when her Issei mother is sent back to her parents' house in Wakayama, relocated to a separate domicile belonging to her father's sister when her mother is divorced, and eventually handed over to the care of a seventeen-year-old cousin when her father's sister dies. In total, she spends fourteen years in Japan before returning to the United States.

In addition to her grandmother's and mother's experiences, Lydia's travels to Japan and her later decision to work in Okinawa and China further her family's transnational trajectory. By undertaking her journey to Japan, Lydia "relinquished stability and embraced mobility" (69). She even changes her appearance to look like an "Asian-blooded Brigitte Bardot" (73) or, in the words of Lydia's actress friend, like "a composite of all those immigrant brides at the turn of the century" (74). Lydia does not completely agree with her friend's comment, though. Instead of being an immigrant bride who is passively married to the United States, Lydia contends that she be one of the brave "immigrants"—the "pioneer women" who dare to venture out and live "within a kaleidoscope where familiar shapes lay shattered in shards of color: dazzling, fascinating, infinitely varying" (74). In a significant manner, Lydia displaces her stable American citizenship with her "immigrant soul" (74). From Albany, Boston, Wakayama, to Okinawa, Lydia opens up new routes for the development of her family.

Talking to High Monks concludes with Lydia's wedding. The epilogue appears to mark Lydia's successful "homecoming," a symbolic narrative "closure" that is usually seen in traditional bildungsromans. This seeming "period" of Lydia's story, however, is soon made problematic. First, although Lydia marries a white American, what is emphasized in the narrative is neither the racial background of the husband nor Lydia's prospective "assimilation" into the American mainstream but the fact that the husband is the man "with whom [. . . Lydia] taught in China and traveled in Nepal" (266). This marriage is thus a product of Lydia's transnational travels. It heralds a new kind of (mixed-race) family that grows out of one's world acquaintances. Secondly, the novel arranges Lydia's uncle to visit Lydia's family on this specific wedding day. As the eldest son in the family of Lydia's mother, this uncle spends years traveling between the United States and Japan to trace the story of his

missing Issei mother. In addition to bringing to the wedding a family photo in which Lydia's Issei grandmother poses the last time with her children on the day before she is banished from the family, he also brings the news of his newly-found half-brother (the son the Issei grandmother gives birth to in her second marriage) and reveals right after the wedding ceremony a shocking story about the Issei grandmother: The grandmother plans to murder all her children before her separation from them; the family line continues only because this plan falls through. Here, the epilogue dramatically links up Lydia's wedding, the recovery of a family photo, the reclamation of a family member, and the revelation of a piece of the previously unspoken family secrets. With subtlety, it connects the wedding to the continuation of the family's maternal line. To me, the story of the Issei grandmother's attempt of murder, be it true or not, reflects the family members' general anxiety about the extinction of their family—an anxiety given rise to by the banishment/disappearance of the Issei grandmother. And as soon as the secret is spoken out, the anxiety loses its command. When Lydia's mother declares before the end of the text that she “gain[s] son and find[s] half-brother” (269), she knows that her family has survived and thrived no matter what. Both her Issei mother's second marriage and Lydia's marriage build up new affiliations and contribute to the extension of her family.

Coda: The Domestic Intervention

Indeed, Lydia's marriage also reminds us of another important marriage described earlier in the text. Of the many family stories Lydia hears from her mother, the marriage between her parents remains her favorite. Lydia and her sister repetitively urge their mother to re-tell “the whole story [. . .] in correct sequence” (10). Their strong interest in the process of the courtship and marriage of their parents may be dismissed as young girls' general fascination with whatever romantic. Or, one may argue that the marital union between parents is always important of their children, for it provides the children with a sense of safety, a feeling of familial belonging, and a guarantee of their familial unity. To me, however, Lydia and her sister's strong interest in the story of their parent's marriage could be attributed to this marriage's special position in preserving and extending Lydia's family line. And the fact that this marriage takes place during the wartime Japanese American relocation adds further symbolic significance to this marital affiliation. First, the union between a Kibei mother and a Nisei father—two persons of different backgrounds—testifies to the family's ability to grow by taking in the different. As Lydia asserts, the marriage between her mother and father creates a “*new* familial network” (11, emphasis mine). Moreover, arranged during the Second

World War, when most Japanese Americans are under the threat of familial disruption and community disintegration, the marriage features a wish-fulfillment for most Japanese Americans. It symbolizes the strength and resilience of a Japanese American family that grows despite the hostile socio-political situation. By formulating this marriage, Minatoya intervenes into the history. She writes Japanese American relocation into a chance-ground for two Japanese Americans, who would otherwise remain strangers to each other, to meet and achieve a marital union.

To conclude, this paper explores the possible domestic interventions into our conception of Asian America. Paying special attentions to the domestic dimensions of Japanese America in *The Floating World* and *Talking to High Monks*, I have tried to make clear how an “unhomely” Japanese American domicile intervenes into the open world through a re-inventing of its own constitutive complexities. Both texts present Japanese American families as temporally-shifting and territorially-unbounded. The familial present is perpetually invaded by the emergence of its past in the form of telling-stories or re-told histories. Moreover, the open road, be it domestic or international, is—to quote from Obāsan—always of “too much magic” (32) and provides the space of unpredictable development and emergence of Japanese American families. The writing of a family, a home, and a domestic space remains inseparable from our conception of the community, the nation, and the public domain. The fluidity of families mirrors the heterogeneous constitutions of a nation. Never completely self-enclosed, the family life intervenes into the nation with its everyday convolution. As this paper should have demonstrated, when unfixing the boundary of Japanese American families, both *The Floating World* and *Talking to High Monks* help us conceive a Japanese America that ceaselessly stretches to other people and different places. Making mobility and contacts with others the dominant mode of existence, the two texts restore our conception of Japanese America to its “real” hybridities, porosity, movement, and transgression.

Works Cited

- Bammer, Angelika. “Mother Tongues and Other Strangers: Writing ‘Family’ across Cultural Divides.” *Displacements: Cultural Identities in Question*. Ed. Angelika Bammer. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994. 90-109.
- Bhabha, Homi K. “The World and the Home.” 1992. *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation,*

- and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 445-455.
- Chu, Patricia P. *Assimilating Asians: Gendered Strategies of Authorship in Asian America*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000.
- Dirlik, Arif. "The Asian Pacific Idea in Asian-American Perspective." *What Is in a Rim?: Critical Perspectives on the Pacific Region Idea*. Ed. Arif Dirlik. Boulder: Westview, 1993. 305-329.
- Freud, Sigmund. "The 'Uncanny.'" 1919. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Trans. and Ed. James Strachey. Vol. XVII. London: The Hogarth Press, 1955. 217-252. 24 vols.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar, eds. Preface. *No Man's Land: The Place of the Woman Writer in the Twentieth Century, Vol. III, Letters from the Front*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994. xi-xvii.
- Hareven, Tamara K. "The Home and the Family in Historical Perspective." *Social Research* 58.1 (1991): in Database: *Academic Search Premier*, 26 pages.
- Kadohata, Cynthia. *The Floating World*. New York: Ballantine, 1989.
- Kaplan, Amy. "Manifest Domesticity." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 581-606.
- Lacan, Jacques. *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XX Encore: On Feminine Sexuality and the Limits of Love and Knowledge*. 1972-1973. Trans. Bruce Fink. Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. New York: Norton, 1998.
- Li, David Leiwei. *Imagining the Nation: Asian American Literature and Cultural Consent*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998.
- Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1996.
- McClintock, Anne. "'No Longer in a Future Heaven': Gender, Race, and Nationalism." *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Ed. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997. 89-112.
- Minatoya, Lydia Yuri. *Talking to High Monks in the Snow: An Asian American Odyssey*. New York: HarperCollins, 1992.
- Mura, David. *Where the Body Meets Memory: An Odyssey of Race, Sexuality, and Identity*. New York: Anchor Books, 1996.
- Okada, John. *No-No Boy*. 1957. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1976.

- Ono, Kent A. "Re/signing 'Asian American': Rhetorical Problematics of Nation." *Amerasia Journal* 21:1&2 (1995): 67-78.
- Park, You-me and Gayle Wald. "Native Daughters in the Promised Land: Gender, Race, and the Questions of Separate Spheres." *American Literature* 70.3 (1998): 607-633.
- Pearlman, Mickey. "Cynthia Kadohata." *Listen to Their Voices: Twenty Interviews with Women Who Write*. New York: Norton, 1993. 112-120.
- Sarkar, Sheila. "Cynthia Kadohata and David Wong Louie: The Pangs of a Floating World." *Critical Mass: A Journal of Asian American Cultural Criticism* 2.1 (1994): 79-97.
- Yanagisako, Sylvia. "Transforming Orientalism: Gender, Nationality, and Class in Asian American Studies." *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*. New York: Routledge, 1995. 275-298.
- . *Transforming the Past: Tradition and Kinship among Japanese Americans*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985.
- Yogi, Stan. "Japanese American Literature." *An Interethnic Companion to Asian American Literature*. Ed. King-Kok Cheung. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 125-154.

IV.

Title : Skinny Ladies, Skinless Women: Eating, Bodily Surface, and Bodily Fluids in *The Edible Women* and *The Blind Assassin*

Proposal :

What could "eating" mean to women? Do women's relationship with food change when they are no longer just the servers, but also the consumers, of food? To what extent do women eat for social purposes, that is, for the maintenance of their position in the social network and what does it mean for women to eat for the nourishment of their own bodies? In fact, what are women more concerned with when they eat—the consolidation of their bodily surface or the enrichment of their bodily depth? That is, do they "eat" (and sometimes "not eat") for their image *qua* "woman" or for their living power as subjects? Doesn't the food provide bodily heat that brings life to women's fluids under the seeming coldness of their bodily surface? This paper intends to study first the "eating politics" as featured in two Margaret Atwood's novels, *The Edible Women* (1969) and *The Blind Assassin* (2000), in relation to the symbolic (un)making of women's bodies and secondly the recovery of women's bodily depth—demonstrated in the texts most through the generation of their bodily heat—in relation to the excavation of the multiple layers of the Canadian

socio-political contexts. Central to my analysis is how Atwood teases from the conventional “skinny ladies” of social etiquettes and anorexia the “skinless women” of bodily depth and fluids. Also, I explore how bodily depth and fluids are reinforced in the texts to be the resources of women’s inter-/intra- subjective connections and contrivances against the symbolic orders imposed on them.

I choose *The Edible Women* and *The Blind Assassin* as the main texts of analysis not only because both are rich in eating imagery but also because they intriguingly correlate the symbolic (un)making of women’s bodies with how, what, where, why, and for whom they eat. Certainly, the frequent allusions to the images of fire and ice in these two texts make Atwood’s writings even more pertinent to the theme of the conference. In *The Edible Women*, rarely do women eat simply for their physiological needs. Sometimes they eat for confirming their position in the social network, and more frequently they eat to impress others or to please men. The protagonist-narrator Marian actually becomes anorexic after she realizes, consciously or unconsciously, that through eating she has made herself a (cold, lifeless) commodity to be consumed in the male-dominant gender market. The many parties (held in individuals’ houses, formal restaurants, or in the male-dominant working-places) in the novel further reiterate the social functions of eating and serve to cover up (yet at the same time expose) the splits of women’s bodily surface from their bodily depth. In *The Blind Assassin*, Atwood again picks up the eating imagery but this time she creates the 82-year-old Iris Chase whose body, after long years of being nothing but a “cold” skin-shell, has developed a “warm heart” and hence become three-dimensional. Instead of eating like a machine (which follows others’ commands) or eating like a bird (which follows social etiquettes), she eats for strengthening her heart and bodily fluids. Indeed, while *The Edible Women* portrays the consuming dilemma of “skinny ladies,” *The Blind Assassin* brings to the fore “skinless women” with burning bodily fluids. Moreover, the many “parties” in the former is replaced in the latter by “picnics” that not only take fire (from the kitchen) into the open but also enable the “skinless women” to venture beyond their houses. Briefly, one important goal of this paper is to explore how Atwood writes “woman” beyond a fetishized image or a flat surface of meaning inscription. Women in Atwood’s texts are “real” human beings with hearts and bodily fluids. They actively intervene into the gender market and the Canadian socio-historical (re-)writings.