

中文社会科学引文索引(CSSCI)来源集刊

主编 王 杰

马克思主义美学

Research on Marxist Aesthetics

研究

Research

on

Marxist

Aesthetics

第11卷 | 第2期



中央编译出版社
Central Compilation & Translation Press

马克思主义美学 研究

第11卷 | 第2期



中央编译出版社
Central Compilation & Translation Press

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

马克思主义美学研究. 第11卷第2期/王杰主编.

—北京:中央编译出版社,2008.12

ISBN 978-7-80211-810-2

I. 马…

II. 王…

III. 马克思主义美学—研究

IV. B83

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字(2008)第195432号

马克思主义美学研究. 第11卷第2期

出版人 和 龔

策划编辑 谭 洁

责任编辑 朱 虹

责任印制 尹 珺

出版发行 中央编译出版社

地 址 北京西单西斜街36号(100032)

电 话 (010)66509236 66509360(总编室) (010)66509350(编辑室)
(010)66509364(发行部) (010)66509618(读者服务部)

网 址 www.cctpbook.com

经 销 全国新华书店

印 刷 北京瑞哲印刷厂

开 本 787×1092毫米 1/16

字 数 430千字

印 张 21.75

版 次 2008年12月第1版第1次印刷

定 价 49.00元

本社常年法律顾问:北京建元律师事务所首席顾问律师 鲁哈达

凡有印装质量问题,本社负责调换。电话:(010)66509618

编 委

(按姓氏英文字母顺序)

托尼·本尼特	英国开放大学
阿里夫·德里克	香港中文大学
特里·伊格尔顿	英国曼彻斯特大学
冯宪光	四川大学
弗雷德里克·詹姆逊	美国杜克大学
刘纲纪	武汉大学
刘 康	美国杜克大学
陆贵山	中国人民大学
汝 信	中国社会科学院
王 杰	南京大学
张异宾	南京大学
赵宪章	南京大学
周 宪	南京大学
朱立元	复旦大学
斯拉沃热·齐泽克	斯洛文尼亚卢布尔雅那大学

Editorial Board

(Alphabetically by Last Name)

Tony Bennett	Open University, UK
Arif Dirlik	Chinese University of Hong Kong, China
Terry Eagleton	University of Manchester, UK
Feng Xianguang	Sichuan University, China
Fredric Jameson	Duke University, USA
Liu Gangji	Wuhan University, China
Liu Kang	Duke University, USA
Lu Guishan	Renmin University of China
Ru Xin	Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
Wang Jie	Nanjing University, China
Zhang Yibin	Nanjing University, China
Zhao Xianzhang	Nanjing University, China
Zhou Xian	Nanjing University, China
Zhu Liyuan	Fudan University, China
Slavoj Žižek	University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

卷首语

1

卷首语

这一辑《马克思主义美学研究》以新的面貌出现了，我们在格式的国际化 and 规范化方面又作了一点改进。从这一辑起，我们以专栏的形式陆续就一些重要的理论现象和理论问题组发一些稿件，我们希望以这种形式推动不同国家、不同流派的马克思主义美学之间的交流和对话。对于马克思主义美学研究中面临的许多现实和理论上的问题，开阔视野、积极对话无疑是重要而积极有效的。今后国外学者的访谈我们将用原文刊发。

在这一辑里，我们着重选编了英国马克思主义与中国马克思主义美学和文论研究方面的一些成果。本集刊主编王杰教授与中国石油大学的徐方赋教授在英国曼彻斯特大学对本集刊编委特里·伊格尔顿的访谈，对了解国外马克思主义美学的现状、伊格尔顿目前的学术兴趣，都是很有价值的。伊格尔顿的论文《悲剧、希望与乐观主义》就悲剧观念在现代性时代如此突出地经久不衰的原因，以及他对当代悲剧观念的理解都作了精辟的论述，是一篇值得注意的文章。在这个栏目中麦克·桑德斯关于宪章运动时期工人阶级诗歌写作的研究以及付德根关于英国文化研究与工人阶级教育关系的研究都是很有价值的成果，对学术界正在讨论的“底层写作”的有关问题，提供了马克思主义理论视角的研究，是很有价值的声音。

在中国马克思主义美学方面，丹尼尔·伍科维奇和汉斯·海因兹·霍兹的

论文是作者在去年“马克思主义美学与当代中国”（南京）国际学术研讨会的论文，因为作者会将论文作了修改，因而放到这一辑刊发。丹尼尔·伍科维奇的论文较为深入地讨论了中国式东方主义的马克思主义有关的一系列理论问题，分析了中国和平崛起之后西方学者所面对的有关问题，他的研究对我们关于马克思主义美学中国化的研究和讨论也提供了一种参照。关于审美意识形态的讨论也是本集刊关注的一个理论问题。董学文关于“意识形态”概念复义性的考察无疑是有价值的，对于中国学术界的这一重要的讨论，伊格尔顿在他的访谈中也发表了自己的意见。本集刊欢迎国内外学者撰文继续深入讨论关于审美意识形态理论的有关问题。在“中国马克思主义美学”这一栏目中，我们还刊发了邹华的《崇高的历史提升与更新——周来祥美学简论》的研究性文章。周来祥是1949年之后新中国培养出来的第一代美学家，为中国现代美学的发展作出了贡献。今年是周来祥从教五十五周年，本集刊刊发《崇高的历史提升与更新——周来祥美学简论》以表示敬意。

审美人类学是本集刊积极推动的一个研究方向，这一辑里的三篇论文分别从方法论、个案研究和基本理论阐释三个方面讨论了不同的问题，相信对读者会有不同程度的启发。

本辑我们组织了关于日本近代无产阶级文学的兴起与发展过程中几个重要文学运动与文学理论问题的讨论，其中包括两篇论文与一篇译文。赵仲明的《日本近代从自然主义到无产阶级文学运动及其若干理论争论》，主要从历史的视角观察了日本文学从自然主义到无产阶级文学运动的历史阶段的发展脉络，着重讨论了其中自然主义、无产阶级文学和新感觉派文学中独特的文学理论和文学特征，为中国近现代文学的理解提供了一定的借鉴依据。丁瑞媛的《日本无产阶级文学思潮的理论建构与历史演进》，主要分析了日本无产阶级文学运动本身、文学理论指导、文学创作实践，以及战前无产阶级文学运动的重要理论家及其代表性作家在二战期间及战后的发展轨迹，总结出日本无产阶级文学运动具有进步性与局限性，为今后有关日本无产阶级文学的研究提供了一个较为客观的依据。译文胜本清一郎的《艺术运动中的前卫性与大众性》，是在日本近代讨论文艺理论问题中的观点较为先端的论文，胜本在谈论有关无产阶级文学运动发展方向的时候明确指出，必须认清无产阶级艺术的确立运动与大众化运动的特殊意义和价值，同时，也只有正确认识这两种运动，并将它们有机结合起来，才能使无产阶级政治运动正确成长。以上通过对若干占据日本近代文学史上重要地位的文学运动与理论的分析与探讨，试图为近代日本文学的发展历史和理论建构一个较为立体的认识，为今后有关日本无产阶级文学的研究提供一个较为全面客观的依据，相信对中国现当代的文学研究与文学理论建设具有一定的借鉴意义。

明年的集刊除了继续编好原有栏目外，我们拟在第12卷第1期着重组织一

组关于英国马克思主义文论与美学的研究文章和译文，也很欢迎对中英马克思主义美学作比较研究的论文。在第12卷第2期我们想就“文化研究的关键问题”这样一个重要的理论问题展开研究和对话，欢迎国内外学者踊跃来稿，参与到讨论和对话中来。

2008年10月15日

《马克思主义美学研究》编辑部

目 录

卷首语

1

○英国马克思主义美学

Terry Eagleton, Wang Jie& Xu Fangfu

I am not a Post-Marxist, but a Marxist 1

特里·伊格尔顿

悲剧、希望与乐观主义（许娇娜译） 16

付德根

战后英国成人教育与文化研究 23

迈克·桑德斯

“轮流谈论政治和诗歌”（姚建彬译） 33

○马克思主义美学基本理论

董学文 凌玉建

文学本质界定中“意识形态”术语复义性考略 53

姚建彬

试论作为马克思主义阐释学主要策略的“历史化” 64

马克思主义美学研究

2

姜迎春

马克思对粗俗文化的批判及其当代价值

78

○中国马克思主义美学

邹 华

崇高的历史提升与更新

——周来祥美学简论

87

徐碧辉

和谐社会的美学解读

98

李志宏

新时期文学实践昭示下的文艺与政治关系

127

伍世昭

历史之脉·知识体系·话语资源

——论中国 20 世纪认识论文论·

135

苏东晓

文艺与文化领导权：析 40 年代的中国文艺理论形态

152

○审美人类学

斯科特·拉什 西莉亚·劳瑞

方法：存在论、发展、映射（方焱译）

——全球文化产业研究

165

向 丽

“美”如何作为一种被建构的存在

——关于“美”的审美人类学阐释

180

沙伦·麦克唐纳

骚动不安的记忆（陈春莉译 强东红校）

——对棘手的公共遗迹的干预与争论

195

○马克思主义美学在日本

赵仲明

日本近代从自然主义到无产阶级文学运动及其若干理论争论

208

胜本清一郎

艺术运动中的前卫性与大众性（王艳梅译）

221

丁瑞媛		
日本无产阶级文学思潮的理论建构与历史演进	232	
○来自欧洲大陆的声音		
谢·涅博里辛		
俄罗斯形式论学派在西方文论界的“旅行”（周启超译）	244	
杨向荣 刘永利		
文化社会学视域中的齐美尔与西方马克思主义	255	
丁国旗		
论马尔库塞与弗洛伊德的学术缘分	272	
卡拉·奇瓦莲		
曼弗雷多·塔夫里：从意识形态批判到微观史学（胡恒译）	284	
陈 越		
葛兰西和孤独	297	
胡 恒		
一个马克思主义者的威尼斯梦幻曲		
——曼弗雷多·塔夫里与《建筑与乌托邦：设计与资本主义发展》	318	
约稿启事	333	3
《马克思主义美学研究》投稿格式	334	／
	336	目
		录

I am not a Post-Marxist, but a Marxist

An interview with Professor Terry Eagleton

■ by Wang Jie & Xu Fangfu

Terry Eagleton is Professor of Cultural Theory and John Rylands Fellow at the University of Manchester, UK. This is an interview with him by Professor Wang Jie, from Nanjing University, and Professor Xu Fangfu, from China University of Petroleum (Beijing), in the School of Arts, Histories and Cultures of the University of Manchester.

Time: 10:30-12:00, 2nd May, 2008

Place: W104, Samuel Alexander Building, the University of Manchester.

Prof. Wang Jie (Wang): Good morning, Professor Eagleton. Shall we begin our talk with your *After Theory*, which came out in 2003? On the one hand, this book has had a widespread influence in China. Quite a few Chinese scholars are trying to clarify and respond to the questions raised in it. In 2007, three experts in literary criticism, namely Sheng Ning, Wang Ning and Zhang Xudong, were invited to give talks in the Institute of Advanced Studies at Nanjing University, where I am working. Interestingly, they all happened to talk about your *After Theory*. So I would like to know the incentive for you to write this book. On the other hand, since 2006 Chinese scholars in the fields of literary

theories and aesthetics have had some heated debates about the relationship between aesthetic ideology and Marxism. It is interesting that these discussions concern the notion of 'the ideology of the aesthetic,' which is the title of your 1990 book. We have translated your book into Chinese, but there are quite a few debates on the translation of the title. So could you help distinguish the two notions, i. e. aesthetic and aesthetics?

Prof. Terry Eagleton (Eagleton): I think that from the ideological point of view, aesthetics is very ambiguous. It can serve the power of the president, but it can also present the power of the artwork, can present a certain kind of emancipated future. So, I wouldn't say that the ideology of aesthetic is confined to Marxism. But I would say that most work on it has largely been the Marxist kind.

Wang: There is a technical question about aesthetic and aesthetics. Remember I was one of the translators of your *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*? In the first edition, I translated the title into Chinese *Meixue* (aesthetics), and received criticism from quite a few scholars. Then I changed the translation to *Shenmei* (aesthetic) in the second edition, but got criticized from other scholars. All this makes me quite confused and depressed. So what do you think is the difference between the two terms, aesthetic and aesthetics?

Eagleton: Oh, right. Not really. 'Aesthetics' is the term usually used as a study or science of art. 'Aesthetic' of course can be an adjective, like aesthetic experience. I think, as far as the noun goes, really they are pretty interchangeable. If you talk about the study of aesthetics, the study of art, you say 'aesthetics.' But if you're talking about the view of art of a particular person, you say 'his aesthetic,' meaning his view of art. That's the only difference, I think. They're pretty similar.

Prof. Xu Fangfu (Xu): So people don't have to argue about it.

Eagleton: No, I don't think so. I don't think they need to argue about it. There's a technical difference as I've just said, but it's very small.

Xu: So I think that's solved.

Eagleton: On the second question, *about After Theory*. I think that it has taken people in the West a considerable amount of time to realize that the high point of cultural theory in the West is now twenty years or so behind us. It doesn't seem like that, but the great major bodies of work of Derrida, of Badiou, now at least twenty years away, are very much associated with the end of the 1960s' political events at that time. Theory, in a way, is a kind of way of keeping those ideas warm, as you can see what I mean, when the actual political movements were forced back. So I was in the book really trying to alert people to the fact that when we are talking about theory now, we are talking about almost a historical phenomenon. And that's partly because, as I said in the book, the rise or emergence of theory is very much associated with the period in the West in which the Left was in the ascendancy. Well, it was a kind of optimistic period between the mid-60s and the mid-70s. If you look at the date, a lot of the major theories were produced in that time. So my book, in a sense, was trying to act as a kind of balancing sheet between what is permanently valuable about that and what is now changed.

Xu: Does that mean all those theories were important at that time, and then afterwards there was a period of silence?

Eagleton: Well, I think what happened was that a lot of those theories came out of political events. Then they lingered on, they continued on for a long time, maybe fifty years or so after those events were long since over. So they have a kind of afterlife. But now I think we can say that it has come to the end of a period of high theory, of major theory. And so my book is an attempt to say what we turn to is not that we just turn our back on them, but that the historical moment to which they belonged is now over. So we have to rethink.

Xu: So re-think is the central idea of *After Theory*.

Eagleton: I think so, yes.

Wang: Some think that the development of the various theories in the 1960s was influenced by Marxism. But today, for obvious reasons, Marxism is faced with serious crises and challenges, to which Chinese academics have paid much

attention. What do you think of the status quo and the future of Marxism in the UK?

Eagleton: Marxism in the West in general, of course, has suffered an enormous setback. Some people think that was because of the collapse of the Soviet Union. I don't think that's true because Marxism in the West was becoming out of fashion long before the events of the late 1980s. So it's not really simply a reaction to those events in Eastern Europe. I think it was really a reaction partly to changed political conditions in the West in the days when Reagan and Thatcher moved to the right wing, making it far less easy for radical ideas to survive. The second factor is social changes in the West-the traditional working class is now much smaller than it used to be. The classical industrial working proletariat has vanished from the West. Changes in, which we have called postmodernism, the advent of postmodernism, and politically, the growth of interest in different kinds of politics, particularly what we would call in the West identity politics, like women's liberation, gay liberation, ethnic struggles-all this has had influence on the fate of Marxism. So I think that Marxism, for all of those reasons, has no longer been in the central position as it used to be. On the other hand, there is increasingly in the West a kind of anti-capitalist movement, which is not specifically Marxist though it contains Marxism. But that has carried on certain left-wing traditions. And if you want to look into the future, then, that's a very broad, popular movement of many young people in particular. So I think that the decline of Marxist criticism in the West is very deeply connected with the decline of Marxist politics as a whole. And at the moment, the Western hegemony (Western power) is simply too powerful, is simply too strong. So, if we would see a resurgence of Marxist criticism, which I hope that we will, I think we have to command different political conditions.

Wang: Yes. I agree. We should adapt to changed political conditions. On the other hand, I am also thinking how we can hold on to the basic principles and ideas of Marxism. We all know that Althusser's ideological theory reflected his response to the 1968 student movement in France and gave rise to the development of various theories in the 1970s. But as these theories became out-dated one after another, can we say the influence of the student movement has also disappeared? This is the 40th anniversary of the movement, but I did not see many people celebrating it. Could you share with us your view about it?

Eagleton: Well, I think that part of what I'm saying in response to the last question is that sort of movement was forced back at a political level but it survived in terms of certain ideas, changed values and changed life styles. What has happened since then, however, is that universities in the West have become increasingly integrated into the capitalist system. In the days of the students movement in the 1960s there was much less integration. So, the university and the students could behave as a kind of critique. Universities were still the bases where you could have room for critique. I think that's less and less possible now, which is one of the more pessimistic aspects of students' life in the West. Universities are now very much behaving, in the West, like capitalist corporations. They are very, very managerial and corporate. They are very concerned with investment, and take very mechanical attitudes towards education, purely education for vocational reasons. Students, however, are obligated to resist that. There was a meeting in Manchester last week. You were there. You see the concerns of students. I think that's quite widespread. This phenomenon of universities' being increasingly incorporated into the system is widespread from the West. It's true in South Africa, it's true in Australia, it's true in America.

Xu: And also somewhat true in China.

Eagleton: Yes, also somewhat true in China. I think the danger is that the traditional idea of university as a source of critique and a center of discussion is now endangered, is under peril in the West. That's one reason, why developments like the student events here are very hopeful in a sense.

Xu: Do you think the school authorities will pay enough attention to these events?

Eagleton: I think, what happened in 1968 was that they were forced to eventually. But I think they were forced to only when the students begin to link their demands to other people's demands. That happened in 1968. Workers and students formed a kind of union. I think the universities are very worried about having a bad public image. They are very vulnerable to that kind of publicity.

Wang: Marxist criticism has become diversified also in China. Literary crit-

ics in China have focused their studies on how to understand the notion of 'aesthetic ideology.' To put it simply, there are basically three views. The first is to study it from the Kantian point of view. The second is from the classical Marxist perspective. And the third is to follow your point of view. So could you clarify your understanding of the nature of the ideology of aesthetic from the Marxist point of view?

Eagleton: All right. Well, I'm surprised that there's a Kantian school because in the West that's not now so important. But I don't think there's a single thing called the Marxist critique of literature. Instead, it works on different levels. And one of them has been the critique of the ideology of the work of art itself. And there is a very important aspect that has been concerned with what in the West we've called the ideology of form. That is to say, it's not the ideology in the text, it's not in the work of art, not simply as a matter of content, but also as a matter of genre, and style, and structure, and narrative, and so on. So I think there was interest in Marxist criticism of the West. People have also been concerned with the interrelation between the ideology and formal properties, qualities of the work. I think that's one level. But at the same time, there's been a concern in the West with what you might call the idea of cultural production. And here there's been a use of certain Marxist concepts of production in general, but specifically applying to what you might call the cultural mode of production. This is concerned with audiences, with genres. In a word, a relation that sees culture itself as a social institution, not simply as a collection of isolated texts, but actually as a kind of social practice. And here a work of Raymond Williams, my own mentor if you like, was very important. There's literature of social practice, not literature as so much reflecting other social practices, as a material reality of itself. And another interesting aspect of this has been a growing concern with the role of the reader. There's a lot of criticism, a lot of aesthetics, including Marxist aesthetics, which seems to have concentrated on the author of the work, or, the social context of the work, but not so much on the reader. And this has been known as the reception theory. But I think there can be a sort of specifically Marxist form as we see what are the factors which influence the way the work is received, what social and historical factors influence the actual interpretation. All of this is another branch of Marxist aesthetics. So I would say it would go at many levels. It works at many levels. Even if one looks at classical Marxist criticism or aesthetics, I don't think there's ever a