媒介与文化书系

Media & Culture Series

电影与文化的现代性

Cinema and Cultural Modernity

〔英〕吉尔·布兰斯顿

Gill Branston

媒介与文化

书系

Media & Culture Series

电影与文化的现代性
Cinema and Cultural Modernity

〔英〕吉尔·布兰斯顿
Gill Branston

总　序

　　传播学是 20 世纪诞生于美国和欧洲的一门新兴学科,引进中国只有二三十年。1998 年国家教育部才将它列入正式学科目录。中国经济持续高速发展,带动了媒体产业的大改革、大发展,传播学就成了顺应时代潮流的热门学科。

　　然而由于这是一门年轻的"舶来"学科,按照一些学者的说法,尚处在从"译介"到"本土化"的初级阶段。在教学、研究的过程中,我们常感到对一些术语、概念、理论难以把握,往往是众说纷纭、莫衷一是。有时在激烈争论之后才发觉问题出现在翻译上。例如将"communication"译为"传播",有人就方便地将"传播"误解为"宣传＋广播"。既然新闻是宣传,传播也是宣传,就可以用"新闻传播学"来涵容,甚至取代传播学。有人说,新闻学研究新闻媒体,新闻媒体就是大众媒体,所以新闻学与传播学没有多大区别,因为新闻学研究的就是大众传播。于是出现了将传播学视为新闻学之分支的怪现状。究其原因,一些模糊或错误概念的产生,根子还在对原义的理解。仍以英文"communication"为例,这个词在中文里没有对等词,译为"传播"是很勉强的。"Communication"含有双向的意思,如:"to share or exchange opinions"(*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*),而中文的"传播"有明显的从一方传往另一方的倾向。如果直接阅读英文词典或原著中对"communication"的界定和解释,就很容易把握原义,在讨论中也可以避免因译文歧义而白费口舌。

　　以本人阅读译文的亲身体验为例。在读亚里士多德的《修辞学》时我查看了几种英文译本,其中最令我受益的是 1926 年的译本,它采用希腊文原文与英译文逐页对照的版式。其他英译本多将书名译为"*Rhetoric*"(中国人民大学出版社的最新中文译本也译为《修辞学》),而 1926 年英译本却译为"*Aristotle's 'Art' of Rhetoric*"。这是按照希腊文原版本直译出来的,中文对应译文为《亚里士多德的讲演"读本"》。希—英对照译本传达了其他译本中"损失"掉的一个重要的意义:"art"在希腊文中是多义词,此处的"art"意为"handbook"(读本、手册),也就是讲演手册。亚氏写此书的背景是,他不满于当时"智者"(Sophists)们撰写的多种"读本"(art),于是自己写一部读本来正本清源,因而书名为《亚里士多德的讲演"读本"》。如果不是读到 1926 年的希—英对照译本,笔者就无法了解原著书名所含有的如此重要而丰富的信息。

　　我们当然不能一概否定甚至取消翻译,因为没有翻译,不同文化之间就无法交流,艺术家、科学家、思想家的智慧就不可能为全世界共享,人类文明也不可能像今天这样灿烂。然而目前我们的翻译作品,尤其是学术著作的翻译,反映出浮躁、不负责任的态度。

我们需要大力提倡认真、严谨的译风,像严复那样,"一名之立,旬月踌躇"。对于学术译作,如果有条件,我们还应当尽量提供方便,至少让读者在遇到疑问时能够查对原文。

基于以上理由,北京大学新闻与传播学院与北京大学出版社共同编辑出版了《世界传播学经典教材》书系,分为英文版和中文版两类。英文版为原著影印本,加上我们的导读或部分译文;中文版为全文翻译,而每部英文中译本都有原作可以对照。书系中所有影印本和中译本都将依据我们获得版权的原著最新版本。

《世界传播学经典教材》书系共 14 部,包括下列类型的著作:(1)传播学中有影响的名著,如曾 10 次再版的《说服:接受与责任》(*Persuasion:Reception and Responsibility*)。(2)传播学的重要分支学科,如《组织传播:方法与过程》(*Organizational Communication:Approaches and Processes*)、《跨文化交流》(*Communication Between Cultures*)、《媒介法原理》(*Major Principles of Media Law*)、《电子媒介经营管理》(*Management of Electronic Media*)等。(3)综合性研究,如《媒介研究:文本、机构与受众》(*Media Studies:Texts,Institutions and Audiences*)和《影响的互动:新闻、广告、政治与大众媒介》(*The Interplay of Influence:News,Advertising,Politics,and the Mass Media*)等。

我们即将推出的第二个书系是《媒介与文化》,包括《媒介文化中的罪与法》(*Crime and Law in Media Culture*)和《电影与文化的现代性》(*Cinema and Cultural Modernity*)等。

《媒介与文化》书系有三个特点:(1)主要是从文化批评的视角来剖析媒介、文化、社会的三角关系。(2)作者多为英国和澳大利亚学者,作品代表美国以外的学术观点。(3)这是一批研究性著作,但作者多数在大学任教或从事研究,他们既有深厚的学术功底,又善于将文章写得深入浅出,所以这些学术著作也多被推荐为大学相关课程的基础教材或必读参考书。

传播学理论的译介是一项庞大的工程,我们欢迎并希望更多同行、专家和有志者参与其事,互相切磋,共同推进传播学在中国的发展。

书籍的前言中经常流行一句套话:由于时间仓促,水平有限,错误在所难免,请读者见谅。有人批评说,时间仓促就不要急着出书,水平有限就应当等水平够格再发表,怎么反过来要求读者原谅呢?这话说得真好。我们将以严肃负责的态度,尽力把好本书系的质量关。读者诸君如发现问题,恳请不吝赐教。

<div align="right">龚文庠　于北京大学

2006 年 2 月</div>

SERIES EDITOR'S FOREWORD

In seeking to open up new possibilities for thinking about cinema, Gill Branston's *Cinema and Cultural Modernity* recasts a number of familiar assumptions underlying current debates within film studies. At issue, she maintains, is the need to understand cinema within the broader formation of cultural modernity, an objective best realized through the careful elucidation of its histories, institutions, representations and, not least, audiences across time, space and place. Such an approach is thereby defined as much by its resistance to the lure of more traditional modes of critique as it is by its interrogation of the shifting boundaries demarcating the limits of cinema today. This is an exciting book, one which makes a host of intriguing observations about the 'mutating forms' of cinema while, at the same time, throwing into sharp relief an original basis for their examination.

The Issues in Cultural and Media Studies series aims to facilitate a diverse range of critical investigations into pressing questions considered to be central to current thinking and research. In light of the remarkable speed at which the conceptual agendas of cultural and media studies are changing, the authors are committed to contributing to what is an ongoing process of re-evaluation and critique. Each of the books is intended to provide a lively, innovative and comprehensive introduction to a specific topical issue from a fresh perspective. The reader is offered a thorough grounding in the most salient debates indicative of the book's subject, as well as important insights into how new modes of enquiry may be established for future explorations. Taken as a whole, then, the series is designed to cover the core components of cultural and media studies courses in an imaginatively distinctive and engaging manner.

Stuart Allan

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

目录

（本书目录、作者简介及内容提要的编译者为云国强）

CONTENTS

SERIES EDITOR'S FOREWORD

In seeking to open up new possibilities for thinking about cinema, Gill Branston's *Cinema and Cultural Modernity* recasts a number of familiar assumptions underlying current debates within film studies. At issue, she maintains, is the need to understand cinema within the broader formation of cultural modernity, an objective best realized through the careful elucidation of its histories, institutions, representations and, not least, audiences across time, space and place. Such an approach is thereby defined as much by its resistance to the lure of more traditional modes of critique as it is by its interrogation of the shifting boundaries demarcating the limits of cinema today. This is an exciting book, one which makes a host of intriguing observations about the 'mutating forms' of cinema while, at the same time, throwing into sharp relief an original basis for their examination.

The Issues in Cultural and Media Studies series aims to facilitate a diverse range of critical investigations into pressing questions considered to be central to current thinking and research. In light of the remarkable speed at which the conceptual agendas of cultural and media studies are changing, the authors are committed to contributing to what is an ongoing process of re-evaluation and critique. Each of the books is intended to provide a lively, innovative and comprehensive introduction to a specific topical issue from a fresh perspective. The reader is offered a thorough grounding in the most salient debates indicative of the book's subject, as well as important insights into how new modes of enquiry may be established for future explorations. Taken as a whole, then, the series is designed to cover the core components of cultural and media studies courses in an imaginatively distinctive and engaging manner.

Stuart Allan

INTRODUCTION

For some film is dead, and film study with it. Even if we limit the term to moving, audio-visual, non-serial fictions, its boundaries have spread so far – to include ads, music videos, digital and TV forms – as to make the study of 'film' seem anachronistic. The January 2000 merger of AOL with Time-Warner, and then EMI, is seen as emblematic of the fate of the now dimly visible names of the big US film studios. (The deal was even discussed as 'television' or 'entertainment' merging with 'information' and Internet forms.) Within such conglomerate global holdings, the major film studios seem now no more than anchors for cross-industry marketing ('synergy') of toys, cars, music, computer games, fashions, fast food and so on.

If films are defined as existing on celluloid, they are a threatened species. They now circulate in mutating forms: celluloid, video and digitality, and forms that are a mix of all three (*Toy Story 2* was made without a camera, and screened without conventional projectors). This means that another one of their early and abiding fascinations, their status as a kind of 'trace' off the real, whether that be in giving documentary evidence or the sheen of a star's skin, is undermined. Films now are not necessarily made with real actors and settings: the illusioneering capacities of digital technologies proudly display their capacities to outstrip all the previous efforts of cinematic special effects (FX) (see Romney 1997).

If films are defined as seen, in complete form, on large cinema screens, in a space both public and private, then what of the fact that this is no longer the space where most films are viewed, or that zapping and other forms of pleasurably incomplete viewing, within home screenings, are now common? In other words, through all of the above, films' specific-ness as film, which

has been traditionally handled in Film Studies, largely through textual work, seems to have been swallowed up by commercial and technological developments in other parts of huge conglomerates.

Cinema is not dead

This book argues that far from being 'dead', film and cinematic imagery are, and have been, central to high consumer cultures of the visual, in all their globally unequal spread. It is key to the convergence of screens in the twenty-first century. This is despite the greater importance of TV, for the circulation of certain kinds of cultural imaginings; despite the absorption of film into headings such as 'entertainment'; and despite the emphasis of distinguished film economists on the relatively small scale of 'Hollywood' compared to the turnover of, say, Microsoft or General Electric. Cinema spearheads conglomerate ownership of cutting-edge media industries.

Just as cinema could be argued to be the first truly mass medium, so Film Studies was the prototype for moving image media study. A book of this length can focus on only a few of the relevant issues. I have assumed that cinema is not so much dead as mutating, and in any case was always best understood through study attempting to hold together of all its constituting processes, rather than through the textual exclusivity sometimes implied by 'film study'. Some distinguished recent books (such as Stam and Miller 2000) collect writing on film with that on TV almost without comment as to their institutional and historical differences. While the overlap is now hard to disentangle, I shall assume that we can still talk of a cinema composed of 'films' which are mostly fiction narratives, overwhelmingly deploying the continuity, narrative and genre systems first developed in studio Hollywood. I do not include discussion of advertisements or music videos, though they can well be seen as tiny films, and have functioned materially as such in the careers of some of the biggest names in contemporary Hollywood. Nor is there space to treat documentary, though related issues around realism are briefly discussed.

Modernity

The book's ambition is to draw on and relate together recent positions in both film study and political debate, and to argue for the value of understanding cinema through an emphasis on its place in the formation of cultural modernity more broadly. There is an emerging sense that 'modernity' offers much

for the materialist and critical understanding of media. The boom 1980s discourses of **postmodernism** (or 'pomo' as it's often called) seem unable to provide such a historical grasp, whatever the attractions of, by turns, Frankfurt gloomy or consumer-power-chirpy puns and rhetoric.

Modernity is far from a simple concept or periodization (see Morley 1996). It poses almost as many problems of definition as the notoriously slippery terms postmodernism and postmodernity. I have settled for a periodization which traces it back, through continuities from the nineteenth century, to the social, economic and cultural transformations emerging ultimately from the late eighteenth century political revolutions in France and the United States, and the industrial revolutions occurring initially in Europe. It is also associated with the accompanying rationalist ambitions of those intellectual movements that were known together, in all their contradictions (see McGuigan 1999: ch. 2) as 'the Enlightenment'. Very broadly, such changes, soon embodied in the emerging mass media, looked to a democratized future instead of to the deferences and stabilities of the feudal past. 'Modernity' can, more easily than 'postmodernity', with its highly textual and relativist emphases, be made to point towards egalitarian, redistributive political ideals. Although these are now understood as discursively constructed, nevertheless they will not go away and indeed often found the very identity politics which have so pleasurably fragmented the 'big' emancipatory politics of an earlier period. They, paradoxically perhaps, emerge from the Enlightenment's emphasis on the concepts of 'progress', 'productivity' and 'individualism', all so central to the dynamic needs of capitalism. The period needs to be located as capitalist, with all that has involved for transformations of power structures in the areas of gender, race, sexuality and class.

'The Enlightenment' and its political ambitions have been powerfully critiqued, from different directions – as no more than a 'grand narrative', yearning for history to have a shape and a happy ending; as Euro-centric; as proceeding via a rhetoric tellingly centred on 'Man' and his 'rights'; as oblivious to either the ways that discourses of 'Reason' and then science, can be operated instrumentally or oppressively, or have drives and goals of which they are unconscious. I do not want to operate a barricaded form of argument, but it seems, whatever the problems with these associated values, that 'modernity' can alert us to more satisfying projects than those fashionable approaches which announce that 'history is over' or that we are living in 'knowledge' or 'virtual' economies. These come close to celebrating only irrationality, meaninglessness and consumption, though this celebration is done often in a hip style, implying that some cool version of 'progress' is at work, which surely itself forms another, not new, 'grand narrative'?

Such debates have been replayed in the 'third way' politics of the British Labour government which, thankfully, replaced the part-feudal routines of the Tories on 1 May 1997. As Stuart Hall and others pointed out (Critical Politics conference, London, January 2000), because Thatcherism had represented itself as modernizing, in order to bring together an effective opposition (as well as to admit the strength of some of the arguments) it was felt necessary to mirror this thrusting rhetoric. In the process not only were certain forms of redistributive political emphases, as well as an interest in class inequality, lost (partly by being called 'Old Labour') but a sense of history, as well as of *different* possible modernities, was weakened. 'Thatcher's old friend TINA (There Is No Alternative) was revived' (Stuart Hall) especially around the supposedly inevitable capitalist logic of globalization.

In the late 1990s, in a move to connect the 'public' (male?) emphasis of 'Enlightenment rationality' to the more supposedly private (female?) pleasures of consumption, an emphasis was made on the fundamental modernity of 'cultures of consumption'. The realm of production, from Marxist approaches, has also been re-imagined. The 'rational, free-thinking individual' (read, 'man') set up by much Enlightenment thought perhaps

> learned some of these ways of being by being rational and individual in the experience of going to work and of materially constructing new forms of domesticity, in dressing as a fashionable urbanite and in going to newly commercialised leisure activities.
>
> (Slater 1997: 24)

Hollywood, cinema studies and this book

This may sound a long way from Film Studies. Yet it opens up possibilities for thinking about cinema, its audiences held in fascinations and spaces conceptualized as both intensely public (classically, arrangements made to leave the home for the evening; movies watched with many unknown others) and private (the darkness ensured that responses were not overlooked by those others, the films made it possible to privately imagine the most 'deviant' ways of being).

My first excitement in the area was bound up with the political energies deriving from 1970s debates which drove to insist, first, that popular, denigrated media such as film should be celebrated and better understood. Though interested in form and the 'languages' of cinema, this was partly an