書　　評
Reviews

Visionary Journeys: Travel Writings from Early Medieval and Nineteenth-Century China. By Xiaofei Tian. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011. Pp. xii+381.

Jonathan Pettit，中央研究院歷史語言研究所博士後研究

　　近期少有著作比本書的研究範圍更爲廣泛。作者田曉菲在本書中不僅比較六朝與清末兩個時期之間的異同，也爲探索兩個時期中國及其對異地認知之異同奠定了比較的基礎。作者之所以選擇六朝與清末，是因爲這兩個時期的作家受到日漸增加的外來文學、商品，以及外來旅人的影響，並對前往異地旅遊的興趣大增。作者鉅細靡遺地分析這兩個時期的作家如何刻意地採用、融合這些異地的思想與習慣。藉由分析此二時期的作家與異地的衝擊與邂逅，她更進一步檢驗這些著作的作者與「他者性」(otherness) 之間的交流。藉由分析這些旅遊文學作者對「他者性」的認知，解讀其看待世界的視野與觀點。

　　作者首先提出了文人對遠方景物的視覺化 (visualization)。這些文人不外乎遁世的隱士。他們藉由身心的修煉試圖「觀看」事物背後的眞相，顯示他們對修煉冥想的推崇。作者同時指出六朝時期作家在「觀」景之時「想」其景色。舉例來說，當作家在文獻中描述一地景物之美時，不完全是描述實體的美景，而是穿插觀者對其景物的認知。此認知非全然出自實際親臨經驗，而部分是出自冥想。她進一步分析畫作與其他異象的關係，像是佛像常出現在景物畫作之中來當作觀想的一部分，觀畫者藉此啓發這些視覺化的體驗。這些觀想的體驗也融入寫作的過程，作家僅能於文學作品中部分呈現實體景象的描述給讀者，其餘皆是藉由心靈的視覺化來傳遞。

　　本書接著指出六朝作家對於前往異地探索的欲望。但正如作者所述，這些對遠方景物的寫作，許多是出自對異地的遐想，她特別對僧人法顯從中國到印

度之遊記加以分析。在此，首度提出「文化敘述」(cultural narrative) 之說。所謂「文化敘述」意指一個社會中眾所周知的故事以不同形式呈現，但一般民眾並未察覺或是不強調其論述之結構。作者歸結法顯的遊記係結合了兩類普遍的敘述內容：一為「入地獄」的敘述，而另一則為「思歸」的敘述。不同於其他學者把法顯的遊記視為平鋪直述的旅遊行程，作者指出法顯將印度中部視為被險境包圍的極樂世界。法顯在穿過重重難關進入印度極樂世界之後，反而發現自己因思念凡塵而必須斷絕所有極樂之境的關聯。

　　本書後半將焦點轉移至十九世紀中葉旅者遊歐的修辭論述，如斌椿 (b. 1804) 及張德彝 (1847-1918) 之作。第四章說明中國文人如何在著作中呈現遙遠而強大的境外之地。作者於此再度提到佛教天堂地獄的模式如何在十九世紀的文本中出現。舉例來說，作者論述在斌椿的「航海述奇」中，天堂地獄的二分法被用來描述他所造訪之處：他將歐洲國家高捧為天堂般的異地，而南亞或是非洲則被貶抑為地獄之境。這些遊記的作者更不時提到要如何教化這些「蠻夷之地」。

　　一般而言，分析兩個完全不同時代背景的文獻，很容易讓人作出武斷的連結。作者將六朝及清末的作家截然分成兩組，表面看似忽視了兩個時期論述模式的相似性。然而，若進一步深讀，作者的比較分析方法成效極佳。本書每個章節環環相扣，逐步建立在先前的分析之上，並藉由大量且廣泛的文獻分析，呈現出多種不同「他者性」的重要性。作者成功地分析歸納出這兩個時代中國對異地的認知與情結。這促使未來的文史學者在分析一般性主題時，能超越時代的限制來進行整合比較。

　　作者亦指出六朝及清末時期不同旅遊文學的題材被應用在不同的文體中。十九世紀的旅者有些用散文，有些用詩來記錄他們的遊記。此二文體差別很大。詩的高度延展性提供作家一個不一樣的空間來表達他們面對異地時的衝擊。有位作家在其散文中大加頌讚科技的美好，但在詩中，卻痛陳科技是造成社會墮落的淵藪。不同的文體提供作者不同的管道來表達他們在異地旅程中的衝突與複雜的情緒。

　　筆者認為，作者若能將「他者性」更緊密地與本地實體景物聯結會更加完整。當作者討論六朝文學時，她主張這些旅遊文學滿足了大眾對於遙遠異國情調的渴望。但是作者若能能納入本地廬舍、道觀、佛寺等建築的相關分析，則其論述會更有說服力。這些本地仿外的建築不只滿足旅人在旅途中休憩的需

求，在建構過程中也反映出重建者對外地的想像以呈現其自身的論述目的。這些重建的仿外建築，也反映了另一種對他者性的實體呈現[1]。

另外，筆者建議有兩個觀點可以強化本書作者所提及的「他者性」。一是早期僧侶藉由出土的外來文物來勸說他們的贊助者。這個觀點很重要，因為這些出土文物說明了「他者性」並非子虛烏有的想像，而是一個可以發掘、重塑的概念。許多故事中的佛教文物都與印度具傳奇色彩的阿育王有關。據說阿育王當時在世界各地建了八萬四千座舍利塔，佛教作家認為其中四座在中國國境內。這些舍利塔的發現被用來證明佛教不是一個後期外來的宗教，而是已在中國流傳多時。這些與阿育王有關的出土文物也許對現代讀者來說太過虛無飄渺，但在六朝早期具有相當的立足點。最早有關中國阿育王舍利塔的記載是佛圖澄勸說石虎的故事，故事中佛圖澄告訴石虎他欠缺建造佛塔所需的材料，所以要去臨漳的一座古廟發掘他所需的建材。《高僧傳》的作者未明言佛圖澄是如何取得這些資訊，但記載中，佛圖澄在挖掘之前，已對地中之物瞭若指掌。石虎對佛圖澄能清楚明白指出地中所藏之物大為驚奇，因此派遣一隊人馬前往挖掘並重建佛圖澄所描述的建築[2]。

在四世紀時有關挖掘阿育王遺址的故事也指出：在帝王資助這些寺廟建築之後，這些地點成為重要的地標。西元三七四年僧人慧達（劉薩河）在長干寺所見的異光讓他得以順利挖出一只藏有舍利的古箱。慧達認定此遺物為阿育王時代所傳，並藉此勸說晉孝武帝加蓋三層的舍利塔：

> 乃告人共掘；掘入丈許得三石碑。中央碑覆中有一鐵函，函中又有銀函，銀函裏金函。金函裏有三舍利，又有一爪甲及一髮，髮申長數尺，卷則成螺，光色炫耀，乃周敬王時阿育王起八萬四千塔，此其一也。既道俗歎異，乃於舊塔之西更豎一剎，施安舍利。晉太元十六年，孝武更加為三層。[3]

---

[1] 田曉菲之前的著作 *Beacon Fire and Shooting Star: The Literary Culture of the Liang (502-557)* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 2007) 對六朝時期中國建築的文學分析提供了極佳的例證。她不只分析類書中的著作，也進一步針對藏經樓的實體建築作出分析。

[2] 〔梁〕慧皎：《高僧傳》，卷 9，收入《大正新修大藏經》（東京：大正一切經刊行會，1924-1934 年），第 50 冊，頁 385b。

[3] 同前註，頁 409b。Koichi Shinohara, "Two Sources of Chinese Buddhist Biographies: Stupa Inscriptions and Miracle Stories," in *Monks and Magicians: Religious Biographies in Asia*, ed. P. E. Granoff and Koichi Shinohara (Oakville, Ont.: Mosaic Press, 1988), pp. 150-180.

慧達後來在鄮縣也掘出另一個阿育王的舍利塔並藉此勸說其資助者。在鄮縣一個荒蕪之碑，他再次看見神光因而發掘第二個阿育王的遺址。慧達的傳記指出，此是籌措修廟費用之創舉，自此許多政府機構開始協助其擴張宗教基地。

> 頃之進適會稽禮拜鄮塔。此塔亦是育王所造，歲久荒蕪示存基蹟。達翹心束想乃見神光焰發，因是修立龕砌。群鳥無敢棲集，凡近寺側畋漁者必無所獲。道俗傳感莫不移信，後郡守孟顗，復加開拓。[4]

這些四世紀時期有關發掘阿育王遺址的故事顯示當時在中國所挖掘出的外來文物和廟宇建造的關係。不管是對佛教僧侶還是道教道士來說，這些外來的文物不只是歷史的證物，而且也是他們在勸說資助者時強而有力的利器。甚至，這些出土文物與寺廟建築的由來緊密相連。到了西元六世紀時，這些宗教性的發掘不只普遍，也常被用來向皇室尋求大量的資助。西元五二二年梁武帝的詔書指出：在陶弘景的建議下，將於一古遺址挖掘阿育王寺並加以重建。梁武帝僱請鄉紳顧胤祖撰寫碑文來紀念此一事件：

> 梁祖普通三年，重其古跡建木浮圖，堂殿房廊周環備滿，號阿育王寺[5]。四面山繞，林竹蒗翠。華卉間發飛走相娛，實閑放者之佳地也。有碑頌之，著作郎顧胤祖文。寺東南三里山上有佛右足跡，寺東北三里山頭有佛左足跡，二所現于石上莫測其先。寺北二里有聖井，其實深池中有鰻鱺魚，俗號爲魚菩薩也。人至井所禮拜，魚隨聲出。[6]

另一個有助於闡釋「他者性」的觀點是可以從外國人在中國仿建異地建築著手。一個極佳的例證是當時來自克什米爾的僧侶曇摩密多 (356-442) 在中國的故事。曇摩密多年少時被龜茲拘留，一天國王夢見一位神靈告訴他應讓曇摩密多東行。即使龜茲國王不願意，但曇摩密多仍東行前往中國。曇摩密多後來到達敦煌，在那他將一個古驛站修葺爲精舍。除了修建精舍以外，他還在百畝之地種植了一千株蘋果樹。後來他搬至涼州（甘肅與寧夏邊境），也將一座官府改建成佛寺：

---

4 同前註，頁 410b。

5 有關梁武帝重建阿育王寺之記載見〔唐〕姚思廉：《梁書》（北京：中華書局，1973 年），卷 54〈諸夷列傳〉，頁 790-792; Li Yuqun, "Classification, Layout, and Iconography of Buddhist Cave Temples and Monasteries," in *Early Chinese Religion, Part Two: The Period of Division (220-589 AD)*, ed. John Lagerwey and Lü Pengzhi (Leiden: Brill, 2009), p. 653; 諏訪義純：《中國南朝佛教史の研究》（京都：法藏館，1997 年），頁 67, 148-49。

6 〔唐〕道世：《法苑珠林》，卷 38，收入《大正新修大藏經》，第 53 冊，頁 585c。

遂度流沙，進到燉煌。於曠野之地建立精舍，植榢千株，房閣池林，極爲

嚴淨。頃之復適涼州，仍於公府舊寺更營堂宇，學徒濟濟，禪業甚盛。[7]

在曇摩密多的傳記中，僧祐詳細描述曇摩密多由西往東的旅程。他先到鄧縣，然後到鍾山。西元四三三年，他在鍾山建定林寺。僧祐強調曇摩密多在鄧縣所修建的佛塔和佛寺改變了當地流行的巫術傳統[8]。雖然曇摩密多在定林寺相當成功，他仍再次遷徙。這次他找到一個更清幽的環境。經過丈量卜卦，破石砍樹，建立定林下寺，聚集了許多的信眾：

後還都止鍾山定林下寺。禪師天性凝靜，雅愛山水，以爲鍾山鎮岳，特美嵩華，常歎下寺基構，未窮形勝，於是乘高相地，揆卜山勢，斬石刊木，營建上寺。殿房禪室肅然深遠，實依俙鷲嚴，彷彿祇樹矣[9]。於是息心之眾萬里來集。[10]

這些論述可以更強化作者所主張的「他者性」並非只是虛擬想像。像曇摩密多這樣外來和尚在中國境內仿建異地景物提供了一個最佳實證。而阿育王寺的故事更說明這些在中國的異國寺廟並不僅僅是名稱上與印度古蹟相符，而且是在中國境內被大眾所接受並體驗的「異國風情」。顯然地，體驗這些「異國風情」不只是在認知上明白有此異地的存在，而且是實體上存在於國境內。對於印度的異國風情不只是想像，而且能真實地呈現，並於一般人的生活中加以體驗。

　　筆者所提出的這些觀點，非貶抑本書的貢獻。實際上，本書讓讀者更深入理解「他者性」在心理層面的意義。然而，若作者能提供更多關於讀者在閱讀這些遊記時是如何面對這些外來衝擊，如何解讀或討論這樣的異國風情，還有在社會層面上具有何種意義，將使本書的主題更爲凸出顯著。

　　整體來說，本書不但內容豐富並且提供中國文學研究新的方法。作者推翻以往單一作家或單一時期的研究，跨時代地總結出一個廣闊的比較研究觀點，

---

[7] 〔梁〕僧祐：《出三藏記集》，卷 14，收入《大正新修大藏經》，第 55 冊，頁 105a。

[8] 同前註。

[9] 鷲嚴 (Gṛdhrakūṭa-parvata) 位於王舍城 (Rājagṛha) 附近，釋迦牟尼在該處講道多次，而後來釋迦牟尼則多次在祇樹 (Jetavana Grove) 精舍居住和講道。僧祐所謂的「依俙鷲嚴」未明言是建築設計相似，還是此僧院是按照印度古遺址建造。另外可參見〔北魏〕楊衒之：《洛陽伽藍記》，卷 1，同前註，第 51 冊，頁 1004a。Yang Hsüan-chih, *A Record of Buddhist Monasteries in Lo-yang*, trans. Yi-t'ung Wang (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), pp. 58-59.

[10] 僧祐：《出三藏記集》，卷 14，頁 105a-b。

此書成功地展現中國文人在不同時期面對外界衝擊時所產生的複雜情結與認知過程。

Transformative Journeys: Travel and Culture in Song China. By Cong Ellen Zhang. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2011. Pp. xv+301.

徐力恆，牛津大學東方研究所博士候選人

　　旅行文化是社會文化史的新興課題之一，近年益加引起學界關注。學界對西方歷史上的旅行已經有所關注[11]，但專攻中國文史的研究者除了注意旅行文學，比較少對歷史上人們的旅行活動進行專門研究。本書是近來處理這主題的一部英文著作，脫胎自作者張聰在華盛頓大學的博士論文。作者現爲美國維吉尼亞大學歷史系副教授，主要從事宋代歷史研究。除了旅行文化的相關著作，她還編過一部中文的論文集，選譯漢學界研究中國思想文化史的論文成果[12]。在出版本書之前，作者對宋人的旅行文化已經做過一些先行的研究，包括文人旅途中暫留館壁時寫的題詞[13]。

　　本書出版以前，有幾部跟宋代旅行文化最爲相關的著作。根據出版時間排列，依次爲伊原弘的《宋代中國を旅する》、王福鑫的《宋代旅遊研究》和吳雅婷的《移動的風貌：宋代旅行活動的社會文化內涵》[14]。宋代以後的旅行活動，如明清文人的旅遊文化近年也愈來愈受關注[15]。

---

[11] 有關介紹參閱彼得・伯克 (Peter Burke) 著，劉華譯：〈西方新社會文化史〉，《歷史教學問題》2000 年第 4 期，頁 26。已譯介到華文世界的旅行的社會文化史著作主要有諾伯特・歐勒 (Nobert Ohler) 著，謝沁霓譯：《中世紀的旅人》（臺北：麥田出版，2005 年）。另外一部重要的參考書是 Stephen S. Gosch and Peter N. Stearns, *Premodern Travel in World History* (New York and London: Routledge, 2008)。

[12] 張聰、姚平主編：《當代西方漢學研究集萃・思想文化史卷》（上海：上海古籍出版社，2012 年）。

[13] Cong Zhang, "Communication, Collaboration, and Community Inn-Wall Writing During the Song (960-1279)," *Journal of Song Yuan Studies* 35 (2005): 1-27.

[14] 伊原弘：《宋代中國を旅する》（東京：NTT，1995 年）；王福鑫：《宋代旅遊研究》（保定：河北大學出版社，2007 年）；吳雅婷：《移動的風貌：宋代旅行活動的社會文化內涵》（臺北：臺灣大學歷史學系博士論文，2007 年）。

[15] 例如巫仁恕、狄雅斯 (Imma Di Biase)：《游道：明清旅遊文化》（臺北：三民書局，2010 年）。

我們只要翻閱一些宋人的年譜，就能很容易看出士人的遷徙非常頻繁。進而思索他們的旅行經驗和對社會的影響，是相當自然的事。宋代的旅行者不限於士人，不過作為當時的政治、文化精英，他們的活動舉足輕重，又留下了豐富的文字紀錄，所以本書著重分析他們踏上這些旅途所產生的影響。旅行對這些士人的生活固然造成重大變動和影響，對中國宋代社會也有引人矚目的影響——就本書作者看來，宋代士人的宦遊遷徙推動了社會和文化的整合。

全書除〈導論〉和〈尾聲〉外，一共八章。章節內容從宋人旅行的一般結構性安排開始，介紹旅行者面對的物質和制度條件。然後本書的眼光彷彿跟隨士人出遊，從士人赴任前的送別活動到出發後路途上使用各種交通工具，處理住宿問題，接受地方官的招待等，均一一介紹；還有造訪地方上的名勝，詠懷古人，如何影響地方文化，作者也加以分析，引出旅遊對兩宋社會的全國性影響。

〈導論〉奠定了本書的基調，尤其點出對現有宋代社會研究及相關學術領域的意義。正如作者引用馬伯良 (Brian E. McKnight) 所言，人的機動性在宋代達到前所未有的高度，遷移愈發頻繁。作者以范成大和鄒定兩位同樣來自江西的士人引出本書的主題——他們兩位的名氣和地位雖異，但同樣面對仕宦需要而遷徙出遊。出於應付宋朝的科舉和官僚制度所需，士人絕大多數需要經常旅行，少有例外。〈導論〉提示，這部專書主要是從兩方面展開論述：(1) 從制度和物質層面看旅行；(2) 旅行者在旅途中對地方認同的形塑。總體而言，作者在前六章處理前一主題，然後在第七、八章處理第二個主題。本書利用的史料主要為文人旅途的記述，例如陸游的《入蜀記》[16]、范成大的幾種日記體遊記等。另外，作者也網羅許多筆記和文集材料。描述制度安排時主要根據《宋會要》、《慶元條法事類》等官方記載。

第一章〈來去匆匆的人生：旅行與宋代士人〉(“A Transient Life: Travel and the Song Literati”) 先追溯宋以前社會精英旅行的形態，尤其點出新型精英在唐中葉以後伴隨科舉制度的推廣而興起，構成本書關注的旅行者主體。作者繼而勾勒展開旅途的幾個主要原因，其中因出任官職而需要遠遊是本書討論最多的

---

[16] 陸游《入蜀記》有 Philip Watson 的英文新譯，本書作者似未參考。見 *Grand Canal, Great River: The Travel Diary of a Twelfth-Century Poet*, trans. Philip Watson (London: Francis Lincoln Limited, 2007)。

一種。作者抽樣統計了宋代地方志資料，顯示府一級的地方官任期平均在一年半上下，官職輪值調換產生了定期遷移旅行的需要。當時還有另外幾種出遊的理由，例如跟隨家人遷徙的「隨侍」，尤其是任官時一併攜帶家眷；又或是爲了準備應考科舉，開赴學校或考試所在地。還有因官職產生的出遊原因，例如履行公務的旅行，或因政治情勢而遭貶謫，放逐他方。在介紹這些原因之後，作者列舉五位著名士人（歐陽修、王安石、洪邁、陸游、范成大）生平中經歷的旅途，並繪圖呈現。兩宋士人旅行之頻繁，從他們的生平活動可見一斑。

　　第二章〈基礎設施：水路和官道〉(“The Infrastructure of Travel: Water Routes and Official Highways”)，有關於宋代交通的基本條件。交通設施和制度的發展已經有學者專門討論[17]，作者在這一章側重從旅行者的觀察和體驗來談這些交通系統「如何被該時代的旅行者表現出來」（頁 45）。首先是水路運輸。陸游和蘇軾都記載他們沿長江旅行乘搭的船隻種類。因爲水路交通往往不是安全可靠的，文人記載裏不乏旅行者向龍王祈禱獻祭。至於陸路交通，士人長途旅行仰賴官道，所以官府對道路的維護相當影響他們的觀感。有趣的是，所謂「官路」和標記里程的「堠」經常被士人借以詠懷自身的仕宦生涯，成爲交通設備融入士人感性世界的一種表現。

　　第三章〈準備出發：文書和行政程序〉(“Readying for Departure: Paperwork and Procedures”)，內容圍繞官員赴任前要執行遵守的制度規定。具體來講，官員必須領取告身、黃牒，由官府發給曆紙、印信，文件備全之後再進行朝謝、堂謝等儀式，正式拜官。在一般情況下，接著就要擬定日程出發。不過，作者指出，官員赴任的效率未必盡如人意——雖然朝廷對赴任時間有所規定，但不是所有官員都嚴格遵守，常得以在途中展開各種旅行，他們在路途上也容易遇到各種狀況而延誤。值得一提的是，劉馨珺在一篇論文裏對一些官員赴任的安排也有涉及，可作補充[18]。另外，隨著南宋徐謂禮文書近來的發現和公布爲研究宋朝官方文書帶來新的材料[19]，相信宋史學界以後會對這些官方程序產生更大的興趣。

---

[17] 作者對現有研究已有論列，不在此贅述。這裏只舉出一本以供參考——張錦鵬：《南宋交通史》（上海：上海古籍出版社，2008 年）。

[18] 劉馨珺：〈從墓誌銘談宋代地方官的赴任〉，《東吳歷史學報》第 12 期（2004 年 12 月），頁 159-196。

[19] 包偉民、鄭嘉勵編：《武義南宋徐謂禮文書》（北京：中華書局，2012 年）。

本書第四章〈官府對公務旅行的支援：侍衛、交通工具和住宿〉("Government Assistance for Official Travel: Porter-Guards, Means of Transport, and Lodging") 介紹官府為官員遷移所提供制度上的支援，包括旅行中侍從官員出入的士卒的作用、旅行者在路上使用的交通工具和途中暫住的旅店。官員鮮少單獨旅行，因有朝廷配給的兵卒為他們提供保護，攜帶行李細軟，甚至擔任信差傳遞訊息。作者列出四項主要交通工具，包括舟船、馬、驢和轎子，專門探討士人如何用在著作中表現這些交通工具之利用。交通工具的選擇代表了士人對某些特定形象的投射，例如騎馬是跟男性氣概、軍旅生活聯繫在一起，騎驢則是虛懷若谷的表現。到了南宋，轎子在各階層普及起來，慢慢成為一種身分象徵。住宿安排上，官員們可以選擇入住商業旅館、佛教寺廟等，不過一般都會利用官府指派士卒管理的驛舍，用樞密院簽發的驛券入住。這些驛舍往往成為旅行者跟地方上接待官員交流的場所。

士人開赴目的地之前，往往有友人同僚相送宴請，這是第五章〈出發的儀式：送別宴會〉("Rituals of Departure: Farewell Parties") 探討的內容。士人們經常連續多天日夜舉辦這些送別的宴會，當場贈序唱和。宋人文集裏不乏這些場合產生的篇章。經過作者的統計，這些篇章各占歐陽修和曾鞏所撰詩作的十分之一強。作者另外舉出三個具體例子，說明送別活動的實際情況。然而在我看來，這一章的內容，與其像作者所說，是為了解釋士人「參與這些送別儀式大大地形塑了這些男性的性別身分」（頁 111），還不如就這些送別儀式作為士人的社交活動來進行分析，會更為貼切。理由是，這裏涉及最重要的社會身分不是性別角色，而是士人作為文人社交圈、朋友圈，還有官僚體系的一分子，在送別儀式中得以強化認同感。因此，他們對送別活動樂此不疲。我認為這才是第五章的焦點所在，而非「性別身分」。

第六章〈旅行者和他們的接待者：招待、娛樂和用費〉("Travelers and Their Local Hosts: Receptions, Entertainment, and Their Cost") 集中討論士人旅行中沿路受到地方官接待時參與的各種社交活動。作者以陸游為例，爬梳他的文集材料後指出，其社交圈絕大多數都跟他的旅途緊密聯繫[20]。因為宦遊生涯使得士人必須經常旅行，可以結識遠方的朋友，締結長達數十年之久的友誼。不過，

---

[20] 從驛館角度看這些文學作品的研究主要有李德輝：《唐宋時期館驛制度及其與文學之關係研究》（北京：人民文學出版社，2008 年）。

作者在這裏沒有提及另一重要因素，那就是在人的移動以外，訊息和文字也在不斷地流通移動──宋代文人通信活動頻繁，常有往來信札，因此得以跟遠方友朋互通消息，聯絡感情。我認爲必須把這亟待研究的社會史課題跟旅行活動一併進行檢討，方可以全面詮釋移動的社會意義，並據以解釋士人之間的關係。至於士人途中經常得到地方官員設宴款待，這些娛樂交際活動對地方官員來說很難完全避免，但又會造成額外的經濟負擔。官員的官職大小、彼此交情各異，雖然一般有公使庫的公用錢可支付其中一部分開銷，但宋代官員的薪俸往往不高，所以仍會構成經濟壓力[21]。

作者在〈導論〉引述「文化朝聖者」(cultural pilgrims) 的概念，提出宋代士人旅行中造訪名勝古跡，是讓自己參與構建當地歷史的方法。這種觀點在第七章和第八章的論證最集中。第七章〈觀光和勝跡的營造：對地方的造訪和題記〉("Sightseeing and Site Making: Visiting and lnscribing Places") 講述士人在參訪勝跡時，相當注意這些景點的文化地位，還有往昔曾有哪些名人造訪。在宋代文人的一般觀念裏，遊歷和修身兩者是分不開的，而且自太史公以降，考察山川屬於精進學問的重要實踐辦法。於是作者選取兩例來說明文人的這類遊歷活動，包括眾多文人造訪夷陵的三遊洞，還有范成大歷次沿江的旅行。他們參訪這些勝跡時，對該地人文、自然景觀進行詠唱書寫，這樣做實際上共同參與了對過去的營造，「把自身整合到一個景點的歷史中」（頁 175）。如此就導致這些士人的旅行活動產生了跟一般人不同的社會意義。

第八章承接上一章的討論而來，題爲「精英的旅行、名勝和地方史：蘇軾之後的黃州」("Elite Travel, Famous Sites and Local History: Haungzhou after Su Shi's Time")。對宋代遊記文學素有研究的美國學者何瞻 (James M. Hargett) 主要關注文人造訪名勝時的記述，例如蘇軾訪問廬山的創作[22]。本書討論的重點跟何瞻不一樣，比較關心士人參訪名勝古跡以後對當地留下什麼影響。所以，以黃州爲例研究時，著重探討蘇軾到訪以後，後世如何追述、書寫這個地方。黃州本爲落後偏鄉，蘇軾謫居時曾遍訪附近古跡，如暢遊赤壁，對之吟詩填詞詠歎，又建造雪堂居住，以耕作地點「東坡」自號。往後陸游、范成大等文人

---

[21] 參閱衣川強著，鄭樑生譯：《宋代文官俸給制度》（臺北：臺灣商務印書館，1977 年），頁 81-99。

[22] James Hargett, "Su Shi and Mount Lu," in *Traditions of East Asian Travel*, ed. Joshua A. Fogel (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), pp. 1-19.

遊歷黃州時都措意訪尋這些景點，撰文追述東坡遺跡，讓黃州的文化地位驟然
上升。對黃州而言，跟蘇軾有關的遺跡獲得一種核心地位，同時意味著其他古
跡以及相關的古人都退居次要。從更宏觀的角度看，蘇軾到訪以後，黃州的這
些轉變屬於對地方歷史的追求和相關知識的書寫活動的一部分，地理書、地方
志因此在南宋紛紛出現，儼然在重寫各個地方的文化史。誠然，作者對黃州的
研究只是個開端，士人遊歷層疊形塑出來的地方文化景觀和傳統還有許多可供
學者挖掘的內涵。單單是出於某種相似的原因而移動到某個地區的士人群體，
例如遠赴嶺南的宋代謫宦，即有不少討論空間 [23]。

〈結語：本土的、在地的和帝國的〉(“Epilogue: The Native, the Local, and
the Empire”) 簡短地總結全書，指出旅行對宋代士人的意義：「官員們在宋代需
要進行的頻繁旅行，是他們形成文人的理想概念，豐富他們的文學、文化經
驗，並擴大其社會和思想世界的重要手段。」（頁 208）在他們的宦遊歷程中，
遊歷經驗改變了地方文化，也直接影響那些地方在全國文化地景中的地位。

本書以士人為考察焦點，從重要性和史料來源來講，當然是言之成理的選
擇，也跟題目裏「文化」一詞最貼切。然而，對宋代社會生活感興趣的人，必
定對其他人群的旅行活動也感到好奇。作者曾引述王福鑫專書中的分類，指出
宋代旅行除了士大夫以外，主要由另外三種人群構成：商人、農民、宗教人
士。關於這些人群的旅行記載較少，不過在本書研究士人群體以後，值得對其
他幾種人群作更深入研究。尤其就僧人的旅行而言，遊方問道是修行重要的一
環，他們這些活動對禪林影響也不小，涉及許多重要歷史話題，應得到更多的
注意 [24]。

最後，本書有一些亥豕之誤和文字誤植的問題，列舉如下，以備參考：

(1) 頁八十八，倒數第二行：by 和 horse 之間漏植 boat。

(2) 頁一七四，倒數第十行：effective 當作 effect。

(3) 頁一七四，注八：Sonfgai 當作 Songdai。

(4) 頁二一二，第五行：「方與勝覽」當作「方輿勝覽」。

(5) 頁二七〇，倒數第十八行：「青瑣高義」當作「青瑣高議」。

(6) 頁二七一，第十四行：「夢蹊筆談」當作「夢溪筆談」。

---

[23] 金強：《宋代嶺南謫宦》（廣州：廣東人民出版社，2009 年）。

[24] 例如蔣義斌：〈宋代禪宗僧人的行腳及其困境〉，收入浙江大學宋史研究中心編：《宋學
研究集刊》第二輯（杭州：浙江大學出版社，2010 年），頁 308-328。

(7) 頁二七一，倒數第二行：「與地紀勝」當作「輿地紀勝」。

(8) 頁二七二，第二十一行：「袁氏示范」當作「袁氏世範」。

(9) 頁二七三，第六行：「方與勝覽」當作「方輿勝覽」。

(10) 頁二七七，第十七行：「孔繁禮」當作「孔凡禮」。

(11) 頁二八四，倒數第四行：「王玉濟」當作「王育濟」。

(12) 頁二八七，倒數第 八行：「濱」前漏植「鞏」字；「遊」後漏植「記」字。

另有幾處正簡體轉換問題，此處不盡錄。

　　總括而言，本書很準確生動地描繪宋代士人旅行文化的圖景，並對士人活動有很具體的分析，可以爲處理宋帝國如何維繫高度的文化整合這個重要問題提供一種解答的路徑。作者解讀史料準確，描述生動有趣，有助我們走近宋代士大夫的生活。

A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci 1552-1610. By R. Po-chia Hsia. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010. Pp. xiv+359.

潘鳳娟，臺灣師範大學東亞學系副教授

　　二〇一〇年是利瑪竇逝世四百週年，全球有關中國與天主教的機構與學者，均爲此舉辦各式紀念活動，包含學術會議、紀錄片和紀念專著。美國賓州州立大學夏伯嘉教授 (R. Po-chia Hsia) 也在這個深具紀念意義的年份出版本書，爲利瑪竇的傳記再添磚瓦。二〇一二年，本書中文譯本《利瑪竇：紫禁城裏的耶穌會士》列入復旦文史叢刊，由上海古籍出版社出版。同一年，義大利文譯本 *Un gesuita nella città proibita. Matteo Ricci 1552-1610* 由 Bologna 的 Il Mulino 出版。二〇一三年五月十四日，在利瑪竇的故鄉，馬切拉達大學 (Marcerata University) 在本書的義大利文本出版之際，專門舉辦了一個以作者爲主題演講者的論壇 (Missioni, saperi e adattamento tra Europa e Imperi asiatici)[25]。這本以英文撰寫新的利瑪竇傳記，在短短兩年之內，即以三種語言出版。在這兩三年來，國際上不少重要期刊，例如 *The American Historical Reviews*，*History:*

---

[25] 詳參 http://spocri.unimc.it/it/site-news/eventi/missioni-saperi-e-adattamento-tra-europa-e-imperi-asiatici，檢索日期：2013 年 8 月 2 日。

Reviews of New Books，*The Journal of Asian Studies* 等也陸續刊登此書的書評[26]，
可見本書受到關注的程度[27]。

　　利瑪竇在中西交流史上的重要性毋庸置疑，他的中外文傳記和以他爲主題
的論著之多，可以用汗牛充棟來形容[28]。要在這麼豐富的現有研究中別出心裁、
另出新傳，是一件高難度的工作。除了必須花費相對大的精力消化前人研究之
外，利瑪竇研究有關的一手史料涉及多種語言，也是一個不低的門檻。作者精
通多國語言，以歐洲宗教改革史的研究起家，早年發表的專著集中在十六至
十八世紀歐洲的宗教與社會，例如 *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535-1618*，
Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe 1550-1750 和 *The World of
Catholic Renewal, 1540-1770* 等[29]。近年以耶穌會在中國爲主題的著作明顯增加。
第一本與中國耶穌會有關的專著是 *Noble Patronage and Jesuit Missions: Maria
Theresia von Fugger-Wellenburg (1690-1762) and Jesuit Missionaries in China
and Vietnam*[30]。作者對歐洲語言和耶穌會背景的掌握能力，毋庸置疑。爲這本

---

[26] Anthony E. Clark, "Review of R. Po-chia Hsia, *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci,
1552-1610*," *The American Historical Review* 116.4 (Oct. 2011): 1101-1102. Christopher S.
Agnew, "Review of *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City: Matteo Ricci 1552-1610*, by R. Po-chia
Hsia," *History: Reviews of New Books* 40.2 (Jan. 2012): 55-56. Gianni Criveller, "Review of
Matteo Ricci: A Jesuit in the Ming Court by Michela Fontana, *A Jesuit in the Forbidden City:
Matteo Ricci, 1552-1610* by R. Po-chia Hsia, *Mission to China: Matteo Ricci and the Jesuit
Encounter with the East* by Mary Laven," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 71.3 (Aug. 2012):
768-773.

[27] 不僅如此，作者也接受哈佛大學藝術史系 Francesca Borgo 女士專訪，介紹此書。這是
該校 De Bosis Colloquium in Italian Studies 的一部分，大約十分鐘的專訪，詳參 http://
www.youtube.com/watch?v=AojRKnEoNsQ，檢索日期：2013 年 8 月 2 日。

[28] 二〇一〇年既然是如此具紀念意義的年份，這幾年以利瑪竇爲題的專著就有好幾本，
例如：Michela Fontana, *Matteo Ricci. Un gesuita alla corte dei Ming* (Milan: Mondadori,
2008)，此書之英譯本爲 *Matteo Ricci: A Jesuit in the Ming Court* (Laham, Maryland:
Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2011)。另外還有 Mary Laven 的 *Mission to China: Matteo
Ricci and the Jesuit Encounter with the East* (London: Faber & Faber, 2012)，以及宋黎明：
《神父的新裝——利瑪竇在中國 (1582-1610)》（南京：南京大學出版社，2011 年）等。

[29] R. Po-chia Hsia, *Society and Religion in Münster, 1535-1618* (New Haven: Yale University
Press, 1984). R. Po-chia Hsia, *Social Discipline in the Reformation: Central Europe, 1550-
1750* (London: Routledge, 1989). R. Po-Chia Hsia, *The World of Catholic Renewal 1540-
1770* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[30] R. Po-chia Hsia, *Noble Patronage and Jesuit Missions: Maria Theresia von Fugger-
Wellenburg (1690-1762) and Jesuit Missionaries in China and Vietnam* (Rome: Institutum

新出版的利瑪竇傳，他大量使用年信等一手歐洲語文的資料，以第三人敘事的寫作方式，淺白易懂的文字，在出版時間的壓力下，重建天主教在中國傳教最初期的歷史，並非易事。

目前學界有關利瑪竇的文獻蒐集，以德禮賢 (Pasquale D'Elia, 1890-1963) 歷時多年編輯的三大卷《利瑪竇全集》(*Fonti Ricciane*)[31] 最具權威性，至今仍是學者必引的重要文獻。德禮賢的章節安排以利瑪竇所在的城市爲次序，從澳門到南昌，從南昌到北京兩大部分。這樣的安排讓讀者很容易在時空發展之中，透過德禮賢詳細的註解、編譯的史料，理解利瑪竇在中國傳教的歷程。本書大體也以利瑪竇所在城市依年份安排章節，不過在肇慶與韶州之間加入一章〈羅明堅〉("Ruggieri")，並在〈北京〉("Beijing") 之後安排了三章：分別是〈天主實義〉("The True Meaning of the Lord of Heaven")，〈奠基〉("Laying the Foundations")，〈弔詭的人〉("The Man of Paradox") 則爲利瑪竇歷史定位，並爲本書做結。基本上，視利瑪竇爲中國傳教史的奠基者，不會引發太多疑義。筆者認爲，這本書非常值得一提的是作者一併處理了有關羅明堅的公案（頁97-115，309-310），就是關於他的通姦指控。在耶穌會於中國傳教初期階段的資料，特別是反教文獻中可以觀察到，這一類的指控是對耶穌會士的攻擊重點之一。作者提供了一分地方官府的判詞（頁 309-310），證實羅明堅似乎成爲蔡一龍眼中的肥羊，意圖藉此指控其謀取不法利益。無論計謀是否得逞，羅明堅在當地的名聲，已或多或少受到負面影響。作者認爲：毋庸置疑地，羅明堅是耶穌會在中國傳教工作的奠基者，也是學習中文的第一人，更是耶穌會第一本中文出版品的作者（頁 97），然而他來華不久即遭遣返。作者筆下的羅明堅和利瑪竇，在歷史舞臺一上一下，形成強烈對比。即使在〈羅明堅〉這一章裏，有關利瑪竇的篇幅仍具相當份量。羅明堅之所以被遣返歐洲，中文程度不佳是最重要的因素之一，年老似乎是個藉口（頁 108）。然而，沒有說出口的，或許也令人好奇是，這是否和羅明堅被指控通姦的事件有關？耶穌會中國傳教史初

Historicum Societatis Iesu, 2006). 本文僅舉出作者撰寫的專書，擔任主編或合編的相關書籍，以及所發表的單篇論文非常多，詳細的著作目錄請參見 http://history.psu.edu/directory/rxh46/MyCV，檢索日期：2013 年 8 月 2 日。

[31] *Fonti ricciane: documenti originali concernenti Matteo Ricci e la storia delle prime relazioni tra l'Europa e la Cina (1579-1615)* editi e commentati de Pasquale M. d'Elia sotto il patrocinio della Reale accademia d'Italia (Roma: Libreria dello Stato, 1942-1949).

期，若羅、利兩人之間有著瑜亮之爭，恐怕已就此分出高下。利瑪竇成爲天主教在中國傳教的奠基者，四百年來備受關注與讚揚。在歷史舞臺上，羅明堅雖然是先驅者，卻曇花一現般就此謝幕，拱手將中國傳教的舞臺讓給利瑪竇，僅能回義大利度過餘生。他在中國的經歷，逐漸成爲遙遠的記憶（頁 110-111）。

　　另外一個值得討論的議題是，本書最後一章以「弔詭的人」(the man of paradox) 來形容利瑪竇。全章一開頭，作者說：「贊助耶穌會傳教工作的不是聖人 (saint)，而是老謀深算地運用權力方式贊助。利瑪竇的舉止更像是一位部長 (minister)」。他用了「部長」一詞來形容利瑪竇在北京的生活：每天忙碌地接見訪客、介紹教堂裏的各種新奇事物，而且一語道破耶穌會與權力核心之間的密切關聯（頁 268）。這顯然與一般人印象中傳教士每一天的活動內容有相當大的距離。或許是爲了鋪陳耶穌會士對佛教的抨擊，以及後來耶穌會在中國將面臨佛教徒的反擊，這一章裏作者大篇幅引用利瑪竇與佛教徒之間的論辯，將近五頁之多，不確定是否是用來凸顯利瑪竇與佛教之間的緊張關係（頁 270-275）？除此之外，這一章的內容，大量使用利瑪竇的書信與年信的內容，重建利瑪竇晚年的北京生活。作者運用歷史想像，彷彿揣摩利瑪竇心靈狀態一般，描述利瑪竇自一五八三年抵華後，在中國土地上超過二十年之後，於其人生最後階段，將其原生母國的文化和中國文化融爲一體的狀態（頁 284）。這位被稱爲「弔詭的人」彷彿在晚年，語詞字面意義上的「弔詭」已經取得平衡？實際上，這一章裏所謂的 "the man of paradox"，是中文「畸人」的英譯。「畸人」或可解釋爲遺世而獨立的人，有趣的是，作者的這個翻譯，倒是引發了一些聯想，可與黃一農教授的「兩頭蛇」比喻做對照。當然兩個名詞所指的對象不同；一個用來形容耶穌會士，一個形容第一代天主教徒。儘管全章內容並非凸顯利瑪竇的「兩難」，而是陳述北京時期他與中國官員與佛教徒之間的往來，但是，以這英譯之後的「弔詭的人」形容利瑪竇，似乎更貼近他在北京的處境。

　　最後，如果單從本書的大標題 "A Jesuit in the Forbidden City" 判斷此書主題，讀者對於這位「紫禁城裏的耶穌會士」之身分或許會稍有質疑：或許會以爲傳記主角可能是湯若望或南懷仁。明末清初來華，確實進駐紫禁城的耶穌會士，應當沒有利瑪竇。與藩屬國派遣前來進貢的人員一樣，他曾經在進獻禮物時非常短暫地進入紫禁城，但其餘時間都在紫禁城外。二〇一三年五月中旬，筆者有幸在利瑪竇的家鄉遇見作者，當面請教這個問題。獲得的回覆是：應書商的要求。基本上這個回覆是可接受的。但話說回來，如果換一個角度思考，

這個 Forbidden City，禁忌的城市，或說：「閒人勿入」的城市，若從其字面意義來理解，也可以作爲利瑪竇在北京城的一種隱喻，在這個不得傳教的城市裏，羅明堅、利瑪竇及其跟隨者，如何從沿海走向京師，從邊緣到中心，奠立中國天主教的基礎，也是一種合理的用法。

　　如同前面所說，古今中外有關利瑪竇的研究，無論質量都相當多。相關史料涉及的語言種類繁多，常令研究者望之生畏。本書能納入現有成果，又充分利用大量中外文一手史料，運用淺白文字，而非生硬的學術語言，娓娓道出利瑪竇一生的經歷，已經是一大貢獻。此外，本書不以教會內部歌功頌德的敘事角度，而是透過資料的重建呈現相對中性的第三方觀點，更使本書在諸多利瑪竇傳當中，占有一席之地。

An Anatomy of Chinese: Rhythm, Metaphor, Politics. By Perry Link. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2013. Pp. viii+367.

Paolo Magagnin, Assistant Professor, Dipartimento di Studi sull'Asia e sull'Africa Mediterranea in Ca' Foscari University, Venice

In this monograph combining the rigor of scientific research with an informal, even entertaining approach, Perry Link sums up the first-hand observations and the scattered notes about the Chinese language gathered over three decades. The task he undertakes is an ambitious one: to probe a number of features of modern Chinese—namely rhythmic patterns, metaphorical devices, and the "language game," and rhetoric prevalent in the realm of officialdom—that go normally unnoticed by native Chinese speakers, but affect nonetheless the meaning of the utterance, making a significant difference in what is communicated.

In the introductory chapter, having outlined the genesis of his study—incidentally devoting some space to motivating his choice of avoiding unnecessary academic jargon (pp. 1-2)—Link announces the structure of his work and the basic ideas underlying the three main chapters, devoted—as indicated in the book title—to rhythm, metaphor, and politics respectively. In the case of rhythm, Link argues, the more or less conscious use of such features adds something to the phrase: not only

the feeling that the phrase sounds "right" and aesthetically pleasant, but also "meaning" in the sense that rhythm conveys implications that can be successfully construed by native Chinese readers or listeners. (p. 6) When shifting his focus to metaphors, the author acknowledges his indebtedness towards Lakoff and Johnson's theory of metaphor[32] and the later developments in the field of cognitive linguistics. (pp. 8-9) Link is led to argue that Chinese and English—despite the tendency by Western languages to complicate meaning by stressing entities and abstraction over processes and action—present more similarities than differences in everyday metaphorical usage (e.g. the use of space as a metaphor for time), partly by virtue of a universally shared experiential basis. (pp. 10-11) In reflecting about the "meaning" of rhythms and the thought-structuring function of established metaphors, Link begins to investigate how these factors can be involved in the language used in the official sphere. Although less pervasive in scope than it was during the years of high Maoism, officialese continues to play a major role in the PRC as a specific register of the Chinese language. It remains largely separate from everyday expression, and is characterized by its "implicit claim to moral weight" (p. 15) and "goal orientation." (p. 17) In the final section of the introduction, the author divulges that the following chapters will investigate the question of how such common features as rhythm, metaphor and political rhetoric can be related to the way we think. (pp. 19-20)

At the beginning of the first chapter, Link states that the focus of the section is the analysis of "conventional rhythmic patterns," (p. 21) whether or not they present occasional exceptions. Link then proceeds to give an account of the prevalence of rhythmic patterns in Chinese: what interests the author is not creative or complex rhythms, such as those that can be found in oratory and literature, but rather those observable in everyday communication. For example, the pervasive *wuyan* 五言 and *qiyan* 七言 patterns, extremely common in poetry and folk songs, can also be found in more popular and non-elite forms such as graffiti, chants, menus, ball game cheers, popular ditties (*shunkouliu* 順口溜), comic dialogues (*xiangsheng* 相聲), etc.

---

[32] George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live by* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

(pp. 24-32) The use of rhythmic pattern is also common in Mao's personal speech and in the big-character posters (*dazibao* 大字報) of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution: there is an evidence, Link suggests, that some people in the government were aware of the importance of rhythm in propaganda work, although they likely were not conscious of the self-contradiction of using such traditional devices to attack "old culture." (pp. 33-34) Nowadays, *wuyan* and *qiyan* rhythms are still widely employed in social and commercial advertisements.

When reflecting on the factors determining the preference for rhythm, Link notices that they sometimes are to be found in the grammar of Chinese: the latter provides considerable rhythmic flexibility and combinatory power due to its morphemic monosyllabism, thus allowing one to easily produce lines of equal length and games or puzzles. Moreover, the question of whether language users make conscious decisions when selecting rhythmic patterns that "sound right" is a subtle one, and the "irony of articulate intent versus inadvertent use of rhythm" is extremely common in, but not limited to, the slogans and chants of the Mao years. (pp. 37-44) Link's hypothesis that rhythms have gone through fads in contemporary Chinese is also supported by evidence, as in the case of four-syllable phrases typical of the Great Leap Forward, or patterns such as *hao de hen* 好得很 in the Cultural Revolution. (pp. 44-49)

An investigation into the origins of rhythms suggests the preference, in Chinese, for syllabic balance both in modifier-modified phrases and in verb-object constructions, commonly in a 2+2 pattern, and consistently following a rule where the stress is received by the component of a phrase that is not the head. Meaning can also be a factor influencing the stress, and even plays a major role in deciding what is "sayable" and what is not. (pp. 49-53) Link then proceeds to explore what he calls external rhythms, i.e. those originating outside grammar or meaning: among these, dominant rhythms are used consciously for artistic purposes, whereas recessive rhythms are culturally defined but are not consciously noticed, nor grammatically explained—such as those at work in grammatically parallel strings of syllables or in item lists. (pp. 54-59) Among the preferred recessive rhythms in Chinese, the author lists common patterns in which each syllable receives equal stress, such as 1+1 and

1+1+1, and—more interestingly—notes the preference for 2+2, 2+3, and 2+2+3 patterns (the latter two being *wuyan* and *qiyan*). Strings of 3+3 or 2+2+2 syllables are less common, while strings of 9 or more syllables tend to be built from shorter phrases. (pp. 60-67) Recessive rhythms can affect a phrase not only because they can cause the addition or subtraction of syllables, but because rhythmic variation can affect the way in which a phrase is construed by the recipient. Recessive rhythms can also affect the number of syllables in a phrase, influence their arrangement, or even alter the standard grammar of a phrase. (pp. 68-74)

As for the universality of rhythmic patterns, Link notes the commonality of some patterns (e.g. 5- and 7-syllable patterns, 4-beat rhythms, and especially the 3-3-7 pattern) across different cultures and epochs, possibly because of the shared structure of the human brain. (pp. 74-82) When reflecting on the "meaning"—in the sense of an understanding or feeling—conveyed by rhythms, the author identifies a number of pragmatic functions. Whereas certain rhythmic patterns can suggest humor or affectionate respect, others (especially *qiyan*) carry a sense of authority, inevitability, wisdom, and accordance with what is "proper" and "true," and are therefore ubiquitous in formalized language. (pp. 82-94) Of course, Link argues, other formal features besides rhythm can contribute to meaning, i.e. tones, vowels or consonants, pitch, parallelism, and chiasmus: the latter two are particularly significant, because they convey the same authority, naturalness, and persuasiveness that rhythms—with which they often work together—communicate. (pp. 94-109) In the final part of the first chapter, Link argues that "meaning" and conscious use of rhythms are not contradictory: even though rhythms go generally unnoticed, native speakers are well aware of their effects and this seems to reveal a subconscious obedience to the "rules" of rhythms governing what "sounds right," just in the same way grammar rules operate in the mind. (pp. 109-112)

In the opening of the second chapter, devoted to metaphor, Link states that the study of creative figurative language is not the aim of this section: what interests him is the analysis of metaphors that pervade everyday language. The author then proceeds to give an account of Lakoff and Johnson's theory of conceptual metaphor (hereinafter CM), starting from the two scholars' assumption that our normal

conceptual scheme is metaphorically structured, that the logical processes of interpretation of CMs are defined by context and by a form of cooperation between the individuals involved in the communication act, and that the implicit claims of such metaphors do not need to be true to work properly. Moreover, CMs are productive in that they can underlie a broad variety of related expressions, and are sometimes strong enough to shape the way individuals absorb new experience. As for "mixed" metaphors, i.e. two or more metaphors used together, Link suggests that having to switch conceptual schemes does not inhibit understanding, although metaphors tend to occur in consistent families. (pp. 115-128) The relation between metaphor and thought, intensely explored since Whorf, is also one of the major aspects focused on by Lakoff and Johnson: if reality is defined by metaphors, the two scholars claim, and metaphors vary across cultures, then so do the realities that metaphors define. The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis seems to have been (at least partly) given new credibility by recent studies, confirming that languages tend to shape thought about abstract domains, resulting in speakers being influenced by the metaphorical habits of their own languages. However, Link states, the idea that the structure of the human mind conditions the way we think, regardless of language or culture, does not contradict the point above. In the following sections, the author proceeds to illustrate how Chinese and English reveal different ways of conceiving things. (pp. 128-136)

The use of space as a metaphor for time is a nearly universal one, but this same metaphor can work in different ways, even within a single language. Summing up the results of a number of studies in the field and providing several clarifying examples, Link identifies three time lines existing in both Chinese and English: two kinds of horizontal time lines (one where events form a linear sequence moving out of the future and toward us, and then pass us into the past, and one where we are looking toward a specific direction, i.e. the future) and a vertical one. These three lines can also be mixed. Chinese and English, Link maintains, do not differ in the conceptualization of the time metaphor, but in the relative frequency of the use of these particular time lines. (pp. 136-147) Link then proceeds to investigate the question whether the metaphorical use of color is a cultural invention, and to what

extent the definitions of colors are the same across languages. Although Chinese and English show remarkable differences in color definition (e.g. the spectra covered by *huang* 黃 and *qing* 青 in Chinese are much broader than those entailed by "yellow" or "green" in English), one basis for commonality in the metaphorical use of colors is rooted in the physical experience of the world (e.g. the color green associated with youth, etc.) However, some metaphors cannot be traced to physical bases; moreover, a single color can have different connotations even within a single language, and such connotations can be complicated by linguistic borrowing. Although similarities in metaphors across languages can be explained by simple coincidence, Link argues, a form of experiential basis may be at work in this respect. (pp. 147-155) With reference to the CM "more is up, less is down," Link notes that it is well established in both Chinese and English, where it can refer—in different ways and to varying extents—to technical or moral quality, status, mood, place (in the administration), etc., although "up" (and *shang* 上) and "down" (and *xia* 下) can also express the idea of "unknown or unsettled" and "under control" respectively. This incongruity, however, does not seem to hinder communication, as both CMs are available to speakers. (pp. 155-162) "North" and "South" are metaphorical conventions, and the reasons for favoring one or the other are rooted in geomancy. Although traditional Chinese topographical maps were conceived to be viewed from any angle, the author notes, the South seems to be preferred as "up" (at least until the Northern Song period), and "pointing South" (*zhinan* 指南) also seems to refer to the "correct" direction. (pp. 163-169) Even though there are exceptions on both sides, the CM "consciousness is up, unconsciousness is down" is typical of English, whereas Chinese generally employs a horizontal metaphor expressed by the directional complements *lai* 來 and *qu* 去. (pp. 169-170) Link then points out that, in ancient Chinese thought, the "self" is often metaphorically conceived as two coexisting but different entities, an active and conscious "Self 1" and a "Self 2" that is acted upon. (pp. 171-174) Finally, when reflecting on the Chinese predilection for dyads, Link observes that a "plus" item generally comes before a "minus" item (a peculiarity largely shared by English), and the first member in a dyad comes first as the default term for measuring attributes. As for the notions of "here" and "there," the ability of

the speaker to project the center of things to the location associated with the listener is typical of Chinese and does not exist in English. The "male+female" dyad is common (with some exceptions) in both languages: in addition, both Chinese and English often implicitly understand gender-neutral terms as male, and add a gendered term or a prefix to mark their femaleness. (pp. 174-183)

In the final section of the second chapter, Perry Link undertakes the task of analyzing the similarities and differences in metaphorical usage between Chinese and English. Because of the remarkable overlapping in human experience and in spite of differences in worldviews, many CMs are basically shared in the two languages although with different specific images, e.g. "affection is warmth, unaffection [sic] is coldness," "stinky is bad," "difficulties are burdens," "more form is more content," "closeness is strength" etc. (pp. 183-198) The thought patterns and values of Chinese and English can lead to significant divergence in metaphorical preferences, too. For instance, the "eating" metaphor is much more productive in Chinese than in American English—which favors metaphors of sports, marketing, and the driving of vehicles. The same can be said of the CM "government is family," rooted in ancient times and still widely used today. Link then focuses on the "opera/acting" metaphor, arguing that, because the use of language is a form of ethical behavior from the Chinese cultural perspective, the preference for such metaphors reveals the importance of outward performance and the predominance of moral value over the true/false distinction. (pp. 198-209) When investigating these dissimilarities, the author suggests, a useful distinction can be made between differences by custom (the same basic CM is used in the two languages, but with different frequency) and differences by concept (one language uses a CM that the other does not use). Among these conceptual differences, then, Link notes, for example, that the "an instrument is a companion" ("to cut with a knife") and "seeing is understanding" metaphors do not exist in Chinese. Similarly, the "causation is emergence" (e.g. "to do sth. out of despair") metaphor is more productive in English than in Chinese, where the directional complement *chulai* 出來 indicates that the main verb results in something being understood or recognized. (pp. 209-215) Link then proceeds to explore what Lakoff and Johnson call ontological metaphors, i.e. "shorthand labels we give to

phenomena whose description in literal detail would involve inordinate difficulty or tedium." (p. 215) Ontological metaphors are very common in English, where they usually appear in nominal form, but the ideas they convey can usually be expressed using verbs in Chinese. In English, Link claims, things are often conceived in terms of nouns, producing often unnecessary "container metaphors" that are hard to translate into Chinese, whereas the latter appears to be more "eventful" and verb-oriented, and does not usually treat "container metaphors" as if they were physical things. However, because this difference between the two languages is merely the product of a grammatical act, this act has no power to change the real world. (pp. 215-231)

In the final section of the chapter, after this detailed comparison of how CMs work in Chinese and in English, the author draws a number of conclusions. Instead of revealing alternative worldviews, the results of his investigation lead him to ascertain that, in addition to the differences between Chinese and English in the use of CMs, a high degree of incoherence in such use exists even within each of the two languages. Nevertheless, there also exist a large number of similarities, even in examples embedded in different ways in the two languages: the reasons for such a phenomenon, Link insists, can be traced to the shared structure of the human brain and to the commonality of human experience. The main benefit in noticing cultural difference, the author concludes, is the realization of the fact that things can be conceived in different ways across different cultures, as well as of the arbitrariness of all the aspects of one's culture that one has taken for granted. (pp. 231-233)

In the third and final chapter, devoted to the political, or official language (hereinafter OL) of modern and contemporary China, Perry Link's in-depth research produces the most remarkable results. The author first stresses how OL reveals a deep bifurcation from ordinary talk in several respects (vocabulary, rhythm, tone, and grammar), the two registers being two varieties of the same language that are expected to operate in their respective proper spheres. Especially during the Mao era, the people had to be able to handle both registers according to the circumstances: since in the Chinese world the OL produces social effects in the real world, in times when the use of wrong political terminology meant a wrong political stance, the incongruity resulting from the mixing of the two levels could bring about serious

consequences. (pp. 234-242)

　　The author then proceeds to give a detailed account of the characteristics of OL, devoting special attention to the language in use during the years of high Maoism (although the distinction from post-Mao OL is not always a clear-cut one). At the lexical level, Link notes the major role played by Western-derived abstract nouns in the formation of modern Chinese OL. In addition to their ambiguous potential, abstractions (e.g. ubiquitous nouns such as *xingshi* 形勢 or *jumian* 局面 "situation", empty verbs such as *jinxing* 進行 "to carry out" etc.) allow the preservation of multiple options and the providential avoidance of controversies, without losing their "air of scientific impartiality" (p. 246) and their appearance of irrefutability. (pp. 243-250) The Chinese OL also presents a number of characteristic metaphors, such as "stage" (a traditional trope considerably revived by the Communist movement), military (less pervasive than in the Mao years, but still prominent in issues of a higher political sensitivity), and medical metaphors (originated in the Yan'an era and common throughout the Deng Xiaoping years). When investigating the preference for metaphorical language, the author points out three main reasons: (1) the association abstract = high = good is deeply embedded in the conceptual world of both Chinese and English, and allows considerable room for the instrumental use of euphemism; (2) abstraction adds syllables to empty talk; (3) abstract language associates the speaker with a specific (correct) political trend or style. (pp. 251-260) The syntax and morphology of Chinese OL, the author states, is also heavily influenced by Western-style grammar: for instance, the growing frequency of the aspectual particles *le* 了 and *zhe* 著 seems to be an imitation of the past tense and progressive forms of Western languages. (pp. 260-264) The "correctness" of official statements is also often reinforced by the use of rhythm, repetition, and numbers which, besides lending an air of completeness and correctness to the message, seem—especially in the PRC—to have an "infantizing" function on the recipient. (pp. 265-267) The alleged correctness and moral weight of OL is conveyed through careful lexical, grammatical, and rhythmic choices: for instance, animal terms used to define the enemy are intrinsically negative, whereas some terms (e.g. *kexue* 科學 "scientific") are presented as unmistakably positive. (pp.

267-270) The tendency to stress goals—without necessarily specifying how to attain them—is indicated by the author as another characteristic of Chinese OL: one of the most striking examples of this goal orientation is the pervasive use, since the 1950s, of the flexible "dummy" verb *gao* 搞, meaning "to bring about" a result without specifying the actor. A similar phenomenon can be observed in political slogans, subject-free predicates that possess, nonetheless, a camouflaged imperative nature. (pp. 270-274) Finally, Link comments, Chinese OL reveals in the most powerful way the intimate equivalence between "fit" and "true": as a matter of fact, the Party watchwords (*tifa* 提法) are an extension of grammar and a form of power in themselves; they limit the conceptual perspective of their users by cutting off alternative ways of thinking. As a consequence, although the practice of giving fixed names to things is rooted in the Confucian *zhengming* 正名 tradition, in modern Chinese authoritarianism the formal correctness of a message overrides the distinction between "true" and "false." (pp. 274-278)

The complexity of the factors listed above obliges the citizens of the PRC to engage in what Link calls the "language game" (hereinafter LG) of officialdom. Its basic function is to pragmatically serve the speaker's interest, even against plausibility if necessary, and the practice of dealing with the official version of things in political issues—particularly inescapable in the Maoist period—can be performed as a form of defense or with a goal in mind: the LG produces actual consequences in the real world, although in some cases reality is bent to fit its official linguistic representation. Under such circumstances, the popular response to the LG can take two forms: one is to stand apart or to satirize it, the other is to actively engage in it in an attempt to seek personal advantage. The LG of the Mao era deeply shaped the linguistic tools available to a whole society, to the point that breaking free from its constraints becomes a hard task. Link points out that even the Tiananmen protesters could not extricate themselves from Maoist language when drafting their documents; in the literary domain, some authors strived to find new means of expression, as in the case of "obscure poetry" (*menglongshi* 朦朧詩), or in that of Chinese writers choosing to abandon their native language. (pp. 278-295)

Link then undertakes the task of analyzing how the LG is played, on opposite

sides, by the rulers and the ruled. From the perspective of those in power, as a distinctive part of the Communist Party of China's "linguistic engineering,"[33] OL has become so well-established and powerful that it often brings about, in a person's mind, a psychological mismatch between their own memory and politically correct language use. Besides the "push" side of the OL, there is also a remarkable "pull" side, whose function is to assert the moral centrality of the Party by stressing the minority status, the displacement and the moral inferiority of its opponents, thereby creating the illusion of a mainstream. Link also lays particular stress on the association between correct language use, moral status, and political legitimacy. After exploring the pervasive use of euphemisms by officials when dealing with problems, the author probes various forms of linguistic vagueness: vague warnings and threats are more frightening and encompass a wider range of activities; vague charges allow for arbitrary targeting and prove useful in obtaining information; unclear or contradictory instructions can be used to shift the blame away from those responsible and veil the identities of the targets, etc. In the end, Link comments, strong-arm language and vague expressions combine to pursue a common goal, though—of course—language is only one of the tools available to those in power to attain their goals. (pp. 295-321)

After examining the problem of how the rulers play the LG, the author shifts his focus onto the ruled. After the bifurcation between official and ordinary language became pervasive (in the late 1950s), the two registers began to operate in different spheres. Under these circumstances, a citizen of the PRC might find it useful, when necessary, to avoid OL and take refuge in ordinary talk and informal contexts, where common language is normally used. Under the authoritarian rule, the ruled can also exploit the distance between OL and common language to make the latter become extraordinary: in this respect, Link lists and analyzes a rich array of forms of expressions (puns, *shunkouliu*, graffiti, internet jokes etc.) that provide tools for resistance against repressive rule. (pp. 321-341)

---

[33] Fengyuan Ji, *Linguistic Engineering: Language and Politics in Mao's China* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2004).

In the final part of the third chapter, the author touches upon the effects of the LG in the Mao era and in the years that followed. He begins by emphasizing the fact that the demarcation is not a clear one, and that both change and continuity can be observed: if the basic structures remain essentially the same, there has been also undeniable evolution. However, Link concludes, even after the end of Mao's rule two significant dangers remain: (1) the intensification in the use of OL to exploit nationalism, in order to distract from actual problems and improve the image of Party leaders, and (2) the risk of an acceptance, by the citizens of the PRC, of the normality and inevitability of the LG—and therefore, for instance, the general acceptance of the prohibition of certain sensitive topics (above all, the Tian'anmen massacre) from public discussion. (pp. 341-348)

In the epilogue, Link sums up once again the reasons for choosing to explore the topics of rhythm, metaphor, and politics. These topics, he believes, are distinctive features of the Chinese language, and possess two characteristics: (1) they are usually unnoticed by Chinese speakers, who nonetheless master them and rely on them in daily communication, and (2) they affect meaning, because they add specific connotations to the message that can be correctly construed by the linguistic community to which the speakers belong. Link concludes by pointing out the advantages of reflecting on such features: becoming consciously aware of how "meanings" are delivered is a way to cultivate our critical judgment; especially in the case of metaphors, it provides interesting insights on how the human mind works across different languages and helps to avoid cultural misunderstanding. More generally, the author suggests, consciousness about the language used in daily life is a helpful intellectual exercise and can be enjoyable in itself, as a way to gain awareness of the general commonality of human experience.

One of the most eminent merits of Perry Link's book—in addition to the richness and significance of the real-life examples presented—is the ability to analyze a broad variety of materials with remarkable linguistic and cultural awareness, refraining both from drawing sharp distinctions between "China" and "the West" on the one hand, and from jumping to definitive conclusions on the other. What interests the author is the process of analyzing the way the human mind works

across languages and cultures, and the results of his research reveal that the shared aspects—especially in metaphorical conceptualization—outnumber the differences. This is a refreshing change from a large part of the China-West debate, which too often tends to exacerbate the allegedly irreducible distance between the two "worlds." Moreover, by resorting to a composite methodology—based on the results of research carried out in different domains, from metaphor theory to cognitive sciences, from linguistics to musicology—the author presents and dissects each phenomenon, paying attention also to the inescapable exceptions, without trying to provide a unified theoretical framework that would allow him to account for every facet of the problem. If most features regarding rhythms and metaphors are indeed shared among the different areas of the Sinosphere, it would have been interesting to read a more detailed comparison between the political language used in the PRC with the OL used in other Chinese-speaking areas (a few considerations are made throughout the book, although not systematically). However, since the book essentially focuses on the language used in the PRC, such a task would have exceeded its scope. In the final analysis, Perry Link's extremely enjoyable book makes acute and enlightening reading for those who wish to study the intimate connection between modern China and its language, as well as to acquire a new set of tools for interpreting the politics and culture of contemporary China by gaining a deeper awareness of the mechanisms and rules of the complex "language game" at play on different levels.

No Man an Island: The Cinema of Hou Hsiao-hsien. By James Udden. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009. Pp. ix+226.

吳佳琪，臺灣師範大學英語學系助理教授

James Udden's *No Man an Island: The Cinema of Hou Hsiao-hsien* is the first book in the English language devoted exclusively to Taiwanese director Hou Hsiao-hsien 侯孝賢, one of the most important figures in contemporary art cinema. Before the book was published in 2009, chapters were devoted to Hou Hsiao-hsien in

English in the books of David Bordwell, Yeh Yueh-yu 葉月瑜 and Darrell W. Davis, and June Yip.[34] *No Man an Island* not only furthers previous studies in explicating Hou's works and illustrating his miracle-like oeuvre, but also presents a tour de force auteurist and film historical and cultural study that is rarely seen in East Asian cinema studies.

The book starts with the questions of culturalism and (self-)orientalism that have persisted in, if not often plagued, the critical appraisal of any East Asian filmmaker who is in the global limelight. Udden astutely situates such a problematic in the history of "Western scholarship on Asian cinema," (p. 3) originally epitomized by Nöel Burch's *To the Distant Observer*.[35] In an effort to counter the dominant mode of representation in the West (i.e. classical Hollywood), Burch's book notoriously objectifies Japanese cinema as a total "other" to the West, and conveniently attributes its "otherness" to Japanese cultural traditions. Udden detects a similar tendency in the assessment of Hou Hsiao-hsien's radical textuality by both Western and Chinese critics as "very Chinese," and he rightly notes the ideological sleight of hand in such descriptions to subsume Hou under the banner of Greater China or "Chinese culture." Udden introduces his thesis by objecting to the (self-)orientalizing tendency and culturalist readings. "Chinese culture, most of all traditional culture, is found to be wanting in its explanatory power." (p. 8) To fully unpack the complexity and illuminate the virtuosity of Hou's works, Udden proclaims, we need to zoom in on Taiwan, its political, economic, sociological, and cultural history.

Hence the book gives an exhaustive, if not exhausting, contextualization of Hou Hsiao-hsien as a unique and uniquely Taiwanese filmmaker, as well as a thorough account of the "Taiwanese experience." Udden chronicles the stages of Hou's life and works based upon a solid and expansive reservoir of research and

---

[34] David Bordwell, *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2005). Emilie Yueh-yu Yeh and Darrell William Davis, *Taiwan Film Directors: A Treasure Island* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005). June Yip, *Envisioning Taiwan: Fiction, Cinema, and the Nation in the Cultural Imaginary* (Durham, NC.: Duke University Press, 2004).

[35] Nöel Burch, *To the Distant Observer: Form and Meaning in the Japanese Cinema* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1979).

writings on Taiwan in both English and Chinese. A key phrase running through the book, "the Taiwan experience" is used to encapsulate the process of both historical over-determination and self-making miracle by which Hou the Taiwanese filmmaker became Hou the international art-house trademark. In this book, "the Taiwanese experience" usefully fulfills three interpretative functions: (1) neatly summarizing Hou's biography and the thematic scheme of many of his films (since most of them center on his experiences growing up in Taiwan and Taiwan's historical traumas); (2) marking a film culture and film viewing experience, epitomized by Hou, which is not to be found or even possible anywhere in the world but Taiwan; and (3) explaining and articulating a political and cultural identity of Taiwan distinct from China.

The first chapter, "Hou and the Taiwanese experience," sketches Taiwan's postwar history and film industry and carefully places Hou in these contexts, with a brief discussion of Hou's first, pre-New Cinema films (1980-1982). This discussion is obviously based on the insightful work done by Udden's mentor David Bordwell.[36] The book then breaks down Hou's career from 1983 onward into four stages and chapters: his Taiwan New Cinema works (1982-1987) in chapter two; two historical films made in 1989 and 1993 in chapter three; three films made from 1995 to 1998 in chapter four, which marked Hou's stylistic changes; and a concluding chapter on the four films made in the 21st century. Determinedly focused on "the Taiwanese experience," each chapter begins with an account of the background of the films, sometimes brief and sometimes lengthy: the historical and political backdrops against which a film is set, and/or Taiwan's cultural and industrial scene when the films were made and released. And it is always following such an account that Udden treats a film with a bona fide analysis, attending to the film's structure and thematic concerns and giving a stylistic description in "real," cinematic terms—stylistic features and their quantification—which elucidate Hou's themes and show his visual breakthroughs in different stages.

Time and again Udden emphasizes the relevance of "the Taiwanese experience" to Hou's peculiar authorship. In the first chapter, Udden argues that Hou

---

36　David Bordwell, *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*, pp. 186-201.

came to define Taiwan New Cinema because he "had. . . experience in every sense of the term," seeing Taiwan's changes before his eyes and joining the movement as an old hand in the film industry. (p. 48) In the concluding chapter, Udden re-asserts that "Hou owes just about everything to Taiwan and the 'Taiwanese Experience'." (p. 164) Through such persistent emphasis upon "historical contexts," Udden impresses a reader, even one who has quite some "Taiwanese experiences," with his strikingly profuse and small details about Taiwan's people as well as its political, cultural and economic configurations. If we tentatively take "Hou" out of the passages up to page thirty-eight, we find the first chapter easily lending itself to a self-contained introduction to Taiwan's history and film industry. We do not come to any focused passage on Hou until page thirty-nine, quite unusual for a book devoted to a filmmaker. And before being rewarded with Udden's analysis of the landmark film of Hou's career, *City of Sadness* (chapter 3), a reader is obliged to plow through fifteen pages of history. (pp. 86-101)

For sure Udden's historical contextualization illuminates our understanding of Hou's works and the controversy surrounding him. For example, at home Hou's *City of Sadness* provoked diatribes from both indigenous intellectuals (spearheaded by the prominent scholar on Taiwan studies Liao Ping-hui 廖炳惠 in the anthology *Death of The New Cinema*) and the Kuomintang's (hereinafter KMT) conservative officials and censors, obviously for different and indeed contrary reasons.[37] The leftist intellectuals chastised *City* as "conservative" because of Hou's hallmark, "indirect" stylistics—long shot/distancing, lighting and slit staging done in a way that challenges visibility, and a number of landscape shots which seem to sidetrack a viewer from diegetic information. The intellectual detractors worried that Hou's stylistics would turn the viewer away from "real" historical trauma and violence. For students and scholars who have been following the critical literature on Hou over the last two decades, the leftist criticism of Hou is now quite a familiar story. However, the details that Udden's book adds to *City's* controversy in the KMT camp have

---

[37] Mi Zou 迷走 and Liang Xinhua 梁新華 eds., *Xindianyin zhi si* 新電影之死 (Taipei: Tangshan chubanshe, 1991).

given me a new critical insight, if not a new (perverse) pleasure. Udden quotes the view of Hao Bocun 郝伯村, the KMT hardliner general under President Lee Teng-hui 李登輝, in a diary published in 2000. To my surprise, Hao's damning of *City* seems to be founded on his "getting" Hou's radical stylistics and therefore taking the film's political message very "directly," literally, and seriously. Allow me to reproduce Udden's translation of Hao Bocun's words here:

> Clearly *City of Sadness* is meant to put both the party [the KMT] and the government in a very ugly light, and stir up the passions between native Taiwanese and mainlanders. Even though some claim its meanings are all concealed, its purpose is most evident. The scene of the soldiers arresting the communists shows only the violence to disgrace the soldiers. . . . Although the film won the award at Venice, it is suffocating and slow. . . . The only thing I can really say is that the opposition clearly has its own plans, and this is why just before year-end elections releasing a film like this will help the cause of Taiwanese independence.[38]

To me, this is amusing and thought-provoking. It suggests that ironically Hao Bocun appears to be a more discerned and capable film viewer than the critics of *Death of the New Cinema*, or at least a viewer who described his film experience more honestly and directly. Although he mistakenly puts Hou in the camp of oppositional activists, Hao's denunciation of *City* is based upon his experience and understanding of the film's oppositional textuality, political as well as formal. Hence Hao indeed objects to *City* for quite the right reason (especially in contrast to the complaint about Hou's films for being "indirect or not straightforward" enough): Hou's textual operation is meant to unsettle and disturb the spectator. In this regard, Hao's comments testify to a mode of cinematic spectatorship: experiencing before understanding, to experience first and to understand later. Yet it is usually art cinema that better illustrates such spectatorship, as a viewer is more likely to experience a delay in understanding the film while and after seeing the film: a viewer sees a non-

---

[38] James Udden, *No Man an Island: The Cinema of Hou Hsiao-hsien* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2009), p. 99.

conventional film, is confronted and shocked by its daring difference, and is thus prompted to comprehend it as radical and audacious, thematically and ideologically.

"Experiencing before understanding" is a major assumption undergirding the formalist approach Udden employs in the book, although, given how preoccupied he is with Taiwan's historical chronicle, Udden does not use much space to fully account for his methodology. Yet Udden's formalism is the true, great contribution he has made to Hou Hsiao-hsien studies in particular and film studies in general. To show how Hou Hsiao-hsien's films are designed "to be experienced first, and understood later," (p. 101) Udden gives superb structural and visual analyses, indeed the kind of stylistic assessments that we want to see applied to any great, but difficult, enigmatic auteur: precise, meticulous, well-written mise-en-scène analysis (of setting, lighting, composition, blocking, and performance, etc.), complemented by hard-to-achieve, statistical style analysis (of shot lengths, scale of shots, and camera movements). On the one hand, Udden exemplifies Bordwell's historical poetics in seeing forms "as themselves historical events"[39] that need to be put forth, and beautifully illustrates his mentor's more recent conceptualization of "cinematic staging" and editing. Hence his study of Hou Hsiao-hsien functions as a reminder of the core of formal analysis: besides the diegesis, there is always a better, more savory story in the filmmaker's formal choices or preferences. Why do we love, say, *Dust in the Wind*? It "is proof enough that sometimes it is not the story that is told, but how it is told, which is important." (p. 78) It is the way in which the story is told that embodies the film's engagement with history, politics, and culture. Hence the narrational process matters: how does Hou communicate nuanced narrative information by way of his stylistic repertoire? When does he obscure a motif and delay the unraveling of a story event? Why and how does he devise a lighting scheme or a (cluttered or zigzagged) framing pattern that frustrates an impatient viewer but enlightens and rewards a patient one? To put these questions in cinematic terms, why use chiaroscuro, extreme long lens, long takes, pronounced flatness or complex staging in depth, a certain range of average shot length (hereinafter ASL),

---

[39] Robert Stam, *Film Theory: An Introduction* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 2000), p.198.

utter stasis, or an intricate combination of tracking, pan and tilt? Why episodic structure (instead of a tightened chain of causality in classical structure) and retroactive, elliptical narration? What do such strategies have to do with Hou's emphasis on the quotidian, the incidental, the daily life, and the seemingly insignificant objects/motifs or non-dramatic activities (a watch in *Dust*, for example; or eating scenes in almost all of Hou's films), all of which, in Hou's orchestration, become the very fabric of Taiwan's history.

On the other hand, Udden continues David Bordwell's work in placing Hou in East Asian cinema and the global history of film style. Yet through a much deeper engagement with statistical formal analysis, Udden demonstrates why the film method established by Barry Salt does and should matter: Salt is one of the few scholars who quantified film style on an international and diachronic scale decades before we could break down shots on a Macintosh laptop using the editing software "Final Cut." The formal parameters or "variables" identified by Salt,[40] which might seem overtly empirical or trivial to the unpracticed eye, turn out to be astoundingly fruitful in understanding and interpreting Hou Hsiao-hsien numerically and visually. For one thing, statistics easily refute "Chineseness" as an overarching analytical

---

[40] In a quantitative style analysis of a film (or a group of films), we look at common formal parameters as "variables"—elements to collect, measure, and test statistically. Some basic variables (usually the terms used by the filmmakers in putting the film together) that reflect a text's (or a group of texts') style are the number of shots, the lengths of all shots, ASL, scale of shot, camera movement, and point-of-view. To Barry Salt, quantification of style would focus "the research on how films are put together, rather than how they are perceived or comprehended" (Elsaesser and Buckland, "*Mise-en-scène* Criticism and Statistical Style Analysis," *Studying Contemporary American Film: A Guide to Movie Analysis* [London: Arnold, 2002], p.108.). Such an approach shows the norm of a filmmaker, a period, and/or a nation, etc. Deviations from the norm are likely to be significant in understanding texts of artistic worth. Most importantly, information given in a statistical study yields textual meanings that cannot be easily grasped by merely watching the film, a synopsis, or a critical reading in (post-)structuralist terms. See Thomas Elsaesser and Warren Buckland, "*Mise-en-scène* Criticism and Statistical Style Analysis," pp. 80-116; and Barry Salt, "The Shape of 1999: the Stylistics of American Movies at the End of the Century," in *Film Theory and Contemporary Hollywood Movies*, ed. Warren Buckland (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 124-149.

framework for Hou. The figuration of ASL alone proves why the long take is not exclusive to Chinese language cinemas, nor particular to any historical period of world cinema. (pp. 158-159) At the same time, figures and charts that tell shot lengths and percentage of shots with camera movements (consisting of or distinguished between slight reframings and ostentatious movements) not only bring into relief Hou's distinctiveness in the Taiwanese context, but also reveal his significance and uniqueness in the history of film style, showing a trajectory of interaction Hou has enacted and sustained with the legacies of world cinema. Adeptly putting Hou in statistical comparisons with other filmmakers, Udden educates us on other Taiwanese and Chinese language filmmakers, meanwhile giving us glimpses of Jean Renoir, Alfred Hitchcock, Andrei Tarkovsky, Ozu Yasujiro 小津 安二郎, Mizoguchi Kenji 溝口健二, Miklos Jancsó, and Theo Angelopoulos, and pointing out Hou's influence on Asian filmmakers (Tsai Ming-liang 蔡明亮, Jia Zhangke 賈樟柯, Koreeda Hirokazu 是枝和裕, Hong Sang-soo 洪尙秀, and Apitchatpong Weerasethakul). Udden's account of Taiwan film history is also a panorama of world cinema.

Udden's apt visual description, careful interpretations of numbers, and natural, sophisticated writing style, clear of postcolonial theoretical jargon, make the book a refreshing read. Extended analyses of Hou's woks are as enjoyable as the films themselves, replicating our visual memory of Hou, and making us want to go back again and again to, say, *Flowers of Shanghai*, for the enthralling aural, visual pleasure only Hou could proffer. This is important since, by the time the book was published in 2009 (or by the time when I started reading Udden around 2005), Hou's international reputation had made him a favorite academic subject fervently characterized, on the one hand, by "Chinese" culturalist interpretations which we always know do not quite hold up, and on the other hand, by cultural-theoretical treatments à la Homi Bhabha (i.e. Hou's films as an alternative or subaltern history, a performative rather than pedagogical cultural feat, or as popular, counter or supplementary memory, decolonization, etc.)[41] While the latter has successfully

---

[41] I, as a graduate student, was part of the trend of reading Hou Hsiao-hsien in such theoretical

rescued Hou from domestic intellectual condemnation, academic defenses of Hou, as Udden points out, are surprisingly uniform despite their being increasingly sophisticated. (p. 100) To put it bluntly, evaluation (positive or negative, at home or abroad) of Hou in postcolonial parlance had become formulaic and trite. To a reader who has been following the critical literature on Hou but has perhaps become blasé about the academics' cultural-theoretical elaboration of Hou's works, the formal-analytical model of Udden supplies quite a fresh breath of air. Udden's writing refreshes our visual and critical sensibility, and, by use of Hou, renews the rationale of film studies and the fun of doing it: the affection for film and the knowledge of world cinema do and should matter.

I started this review by saying that the book is a tour de force auteurist study. And here the word auteurism is also meant in its full historical resonance: its origin in film history and the development of the concept as an evaluative paradigm. In the 1950s, the French *Cahiers du cinéma* critics followed Alexandre Astruc's notion of la camera-stylo (the camera-pen, 1948), pushing the idea that it is the *director*, instead of the screenwriter (at the time in France usually a literary or theatrical personage whose work was adapted into film), that should be considered as the creative origin of a film. The concept of mise-en-scène played a crucial role in staking such an auteurist claim on the director,[42] since it is the director who is

---

terms. See Wu Chia-chi 吳佳琪, "Baoli de yingzi—tan 'Haonan haonu' zhong de lishi yu jiyi" 剝離的影子──談《好男好女》中的歷史與記憶 *Xilian rensheng: Hou Hsiao-hsien dianyin yangjiu* 戲戀人生：侯孝賢電影研究, ed. Lin wen-qi 林文琪, Shen Xiao-yin 沈曉茵 and Li Zen-ya 李振亞. (Taipen: Maitian chubanshen, 2000), pp. 303-320.

[42] Mise-en-scène is a historically variable term. It originates from theater and literally means "direction." In the writings of André Bazin and his *Cahiers du Cinéma* followers, mise-en-scène related to the specificity of film style and meant the elements controlled by the director during shooting—the placement of the camera, lighting, performance, and blocking. This understanding of mise-en-scène was crucial in the *Cahiers* critics' deployment of auteurism and their championing of American studio films as "art". Since then mise-en-scène has varied or been nuanced by different schools of critics. Now mise-en-scène criticism broadly refers to an analysis that reveals "the interrelationship between the subject matter and film style" (Elsaesser and Buckland, "Mise-en-scène Criticism and Statistical Style Analysis," p.81). But David Bordwell, with his idea of "cinematic staging," asks us to distinguish among aspects of the over-generalized mise-en-scène. Cinematic staging thus comprises mise-en-scène (which

responsible for a film's immediate aural and visual qualities on the screen. In the early 1960s, with Andrew Sarris's importation of auteurism into the United States, the auteur theory was popularized as a film method that relied on mise-en-scène analysis as a way to discover and evaluate a director's thematic unity and stylistic coherence, in other words, as a way to pin down a director's "artistic signature." Another version of mise-en-scène criticism, though not popular in the humanities, is statistical style analysis. Like mise-en-scène criticism, it deals with the very elements or parameters of the shot that are directly under the director's control. As a more systematic mode of analysis, it enhances auteur criticism and makes it more rigorous, in that quantification helps identify, prove or re-discover the patterns of a director (a director's preferred techniques and his patterns in combining those techniques), as well as the change or transformation in style across a director's oeuvre. Seen in this historical context of international film theory, Udden's mise-en-scène and stylometric analyses not only sketch Taiwan's film history, but also achieve more detailed, in-depth, accurate descriptions than any previous study on Hou. In doing so, the book stakes a sound, classical claim on Hou's authorship.

It is also in this context of film history and auteurism that I am lodging the first complaint about this book. Staking an auteurist claim "that the films of Hou do represent an exceptionally unique body of work," the book seeks not only to fully account for Hou's uniqueness but also to "properly contexualize all this," (p. 163) evincing an impulse to see Hou as an over-determined formation. The book admirably teases out all historical events, cultural influences, and people that can be brought to bear on Hou's career, and none of them can be denied. Yet to me the case for the influence of Shen Congwen 沈從文 and Chu Tian-wen 朱天文 has always seemed overstated. Critical discourses by established Taiwan film scholars have cited Hou's

---

Bordwell narrows to its core technical sense, i.e. the arrangement of the action, including setting, lighting, costume, makeup and performance) and Eisenstein's mise-en-cadre ('mise-en-shot'), which means the staging within the frame of the image, a term that emphasizes spatial manipulation. See David Bordwell, *Figures Traced in Light: On Cinematic Staging*, pp. 10-18; and Thomas Elsaesser and Warren Buckland, "*Mise-en-scène* Criticism and Statistical Style Analysis," pp. 80-87.

own testimony and recounted the famous anecdotes of how the writings of Shen Congwen, an early twentieth century Chinese writer, were introduced to Hou by Chu Tian-wen, and of how Hou, in trying to "translate" Shen's detached, nonjudgmental perspective, has become a master of distant shots. For years we have also been told that since *Growing Up* (Xiaobi de gushi 小畢的故事, 1983), Chu Tian-wen has been a major influence, a soul mate, and the "screenwriter" of Hou. Udden follows previous publications in highlighting this literary end of the spectrum, and supports it by his own interviews with Chu and Hou. Yet the extent to which Shen (mentioned a dozen times) and Chu (mentioned more than a dozen times) are emphasized strikes me as largely undue, given that Udden's interpretations of Hou's film are, again, primarily formalist analyses—the kind that would assert that film is a different medium from literature. Even if a literary source is an inspiration, or a literary figure a collaborator, it is the director who renders such an inspiration into a distinct, cinematic experience, and Udden's analyses suggest that it is so much more than a "translation" (of Shen Congwen's literary style)—the choice of lens, the miraculously minute gradations of light and shadow, the pointers given to the actors (who, in Hou's films, improvise dialogues and action, and follow the cinematographer's instructions as to how slowly they should swallow the popcorn), the decision on cinematographic equipment, the selection and recording of sound, etc. Moreover, this is a lesson that we all have learned (and shall never forget) from the French critics and theorists of auteurism in the 1950s, who were to become the prominent figures of the French New Wave, a movement that elevated even popular cinema's "craft" to "art" in its defense of the director as the author.

Of course there are problems with this primordial version of authorship. For the simple reason that film is always a collaborative effort, anybody would say that the attribution of the meaning and look of film to the director alone is not very democratic. And ever since the French New Wave, the history of film theory has seen inflections of this model of authorship by various philosophies and/or their combinations: structuralism, semiotics, the notion of the "text," the "subject" as a theoretically untenable entity (Roland Barthes), ideology critique, and the concept of "discourse" (Michel Foucault), etc., all leading to the devaluing of the "masterpiece

approach" implied in auteurism, if not the "death of the author."[43] However, Udden's awareness of the "usual auteurist traps" (p. 163) is less an echoing of the (post-) structuralist suspicion of the subject/author and more a devotion to Taiwan's cultural history out of which Hou emerged. At the same time, as I have hopefully made clear, Udden's analyses cogently demonstrate how Hou's formalism vindicates the primacy of mise-en-scène as the premise of media specificity and auteurism as a film theory and practice. Udden is thus probably misguided in giving so much space to Chu and so much credit to Shen.

At the risk of having the whole circle of Taiwan film critics and scholars jump on me, I would justify my objection by the very terms suggested by Udden: experience and history (international and Taiwanese). In my personal cultural experience as a Taiwanese adolescent and layman consumer, when Hou and Chu Tian-wen's professional partnership began (Chu already an established and famous writer), Taiwan New Cinema was the only, if not the first, cultural product that had an eye-opening appeal of "newness" (I had yet to learn the idea of "avant-garde" at the time). To me, Taiwanese literary style did not have an avant-garde appeal until the emergence of "queer fiction" in the early 90s. Then as a young adult, the education in film and cultural theory I received in the US did not change that layman's observation but instead provided a ground for it. For example, one wonders why Chu's published "scripts" for Hou's films are even called "scripts." By industry standards, these "scripts" are at best a first iteration of scripts—sketchy descriptions of scenes and events—what we usually call blueprints or springboards, which need to be further developed and annotated. There are perfunctory film terms but a close reading would reveal to a film professional how surprisingly "un-cinematic" they are. This "lack of professionalism" is usually overlooked since we know that improvisation and "not really following a script" are key parts of Hou's modus operandi, as Taiwan film industry has become a cottage industry after New Cinema. Chu's own observations, thoughts, and production diaries, always included in her

---

[43] John Caughie ed., *Theories of Authorship: A Reader* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul in association with the British Film Institute, 1981).

published scripts, also rebut her role as a major creative force. In these notes, Chu at times admits that her novels adopted by Hou cannot be compared to Hou's films, acknowledging Hou's status as an "auteur."[44] But at other times Chu spouts rather patronizing remarks (steeped in literary metaphors) about Hou and his technical crew and gives her own criticism of the films—complaining about their failure to get across a certain artistic sensibility while also suggesting her closeness to the crew.[45] Today it would be completely unimaginable for anyone to throw similar comments at Hou or any of Hou's long-term "technical" collaborators. To me, this contradiction bespeaks a historical process in Taiwan cinema in which Hou and his crew only gradually gained the status as "cultural figures" and "artists." In other words, New Cinema could be seen as the Taiwanese counterpart of the French New Wave: both are cine-modernism that went hand in hand with a radical revamping of the very concepts of "film" and "filmmakers" in terms of their cultural meaning, and their re-placement on the higher rung in the cultural hierarchy of Taiwan. Hence for me it is Chu's supportive role in the *community* of New Cinema rather than her (or Shen Cong-wen's) influence on Hou's style that really matters: someone, along with many others (such as Edward Yang and Wu Nien-jen 吳念眞), who Hou often bounced ideas off; someone, along with many others (such as Chiao Hsiung-ping 焦雄屏 and Chen Kuo-fu 陳國富), who would defend him when necessary; and most importantly, someone who lent her elitist, cultural status to Hou, at a time when Hou wasn't considered an intellectual and seemed the "least educated" in the community. Simply put, if Chu (or Shen) deserves so much mention in Udden's formalist book, equal or more space might be devoted to the process of mutual learning between Hou and Chen Huai-en 陳懷恩 and Mark Lee Ping-bin 李屏賓 (cinematographers), Liao Cing-song 廖慶松 (editor), Du Du-zhi 杜篤之 (sound designer), Huang Wen-ying 黃文英 (costume and production designer), and even his actors who, using their own experiences, play a direct, creative role in fleshing out their characters.

---

[44] Chu tien-wen 朱天文, *Zuihao de shiguang* 最好的時光 (Taipei: Yinke chubanshe, 2008), p. 291.

[45] Chu tien-wen 朱天文, *Haonan haonu* 好男好女 (Taipei: Maitian chubanshe, 1995), pp. 15-16.

　　This and other complaints would not in any way compromise the great accomplishment and value of Udden's *No Man an Island*. But there are some minor issues that kept coming up as I went through the book. No doubt this book would serve or has served as a major textbook in English academia for any course on Taiwan, Chinese language, or East Asian cinema. It overshadows previous studies premised upon the idea of Taiwanese/Chinese film study rather than Taiwanese/ Chinese film study. At the same time, Udden's book has set a higher standard for writing on a "foreign-language" cinema, calling for equal proficiency in three languages to achieve critical work of comparable quality: lucid English writing, direct access to written sources in that foreign language, and film stylistic literacy. Yet a reader shall note that Udden's stress on "indigenous" Taiwanese sources or "domestic" discourse on Hou might be further qualified, for a considerable proportion of such sources, though written in Chinese, have been the results of the writers' western education, or have been shaped by the globalization of Taiwan cinema and western thoughts on film and history writing. Besides, in the introductory pages Udden cautions against the political motives or nationalist assumptions underlying Chinese scholars' culturalist readings of Hou. Yet Udden does not alert us to different sets of political motivations, assumptions, or hidden agendas of career investments that come with domestic writing on Taiwan film history and Hou. With enough wisdom and luck, however, Udden takes only useful information (mostly factual data) from problematic sources and steers clear of the troubling assumptions that would otherwise seriously flaw and disqualify such sources. Yet this also means that going to some of the citations given by Udden without his critical discernment might lead to erroneous assumptions about film aesthetic history, Hou's works, and the historical process by which Taiwanese films became a trademark in international art cinema.

　　A reader of *No Man an Island* might also find that Udden's historical details verge on the tedious at times, and even wonder whether such persistence bespeaks a tendency to overcompensate for the smallness of Taiwan. In the overflow of historical notes are *biaohui* 標會, *Jiuguotuan* 救國團, Lo Ta-yu 羅大佑, Teresa Deng 鄧麗君, Cloud Gate 雲門 and Lin Hwai-min 林懷民, among other terms and names

in a seemingly endless list. Yet do we have to know about direct sale commerce, the YMCA, Bob Dylan, Bruce Springsteen, and the Martha Graham Dance Company to fully understand Francis Ford Coppola and Martin Scorsese's modernism in their 80s films? As if Taiwan's insignificance (its contested national status, marginality in international relations, and invisibility in global popular culture) and English readers' presumed ignorance about Taiwan could diminish Hou's significance and global film connoisseurs' knowledge about him, Udden takes on the difficult tasks of exhaustively relating the history of Taiwan and mapping every possible thread of the Taiwan fabric, almost too neatly, onto each of Hou's films. Yet if Thomas Elsaesser jumps right into a complex debate about Rainer Werner Fassbinder, subject, and national cinema without any comprehensive preceding history narrative, and if John Hill starts discussing Ken Loach's works after merely one page of biography, then Udden's *No Man an Island* paves the way for another publication that would tackle a Taiwanese director with some assurance of prior knowledge about Taiwan on the part of a future reader.[46]

---

[46] Thomas Elsaesser, *Fassbinder's Germany: History, Identity, Subject* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 1996). John Hill, *Ken Loach: The Politics of Film and Television* (London: British Film Institute, 2011).