

學術翻譯(部分)

The Fantastic: A Structural Approach to a Literary Genre

Tzveten Todorov

《論奇幻：對一種文類的結構性考察》(1973)

茨芬特·托多洛夫

【翻譯(一)】若不完整性在虛構世界中是個合理的缺失，這則會是個重要的美學效果。「空泛性」(empty domains)不亞於「填塞性」(filled domains)做為虛構世界的組成要素。空泛性與填塞性的比例受到了美學的影響，如作家的風格、時代與文體慣例等。許多近期文學語義學的研究提出了不完整性的美學意涵。1舉例而言，我曾指出(Doležel 1980a)虛構角色的不完整性反映了傳奇敘事的風格(文體學)要素；特別是，受到空泛性影響的物理狀態為自己提供了象徵性閱讀的條件。帕維爾(Thomas Pavel)曾發現到：「作者與文化決定著要將虛構世界的『不可避免的不完整性』最大或最小化」；他認為該文化與該時代的「穩定世界觀」會傾向於縮小其不完整性，而該時代的「過渡與衝突性」則會放大它。瑞恩(Ryan, 1984)在相同的基礎上，提供了虛構世界的三元類型學；她的理論特別在論證類型學如何於完整世界架構(model)下的泛空性的分級下產生與規範。瑞恩的最完整世界—現實主義小說(Realistic fiction)的世界—曾是虛構語義學中的一個議題。現在我們開始了解這個「似現實性」(reality-like)的完整世界只不過是個看似命運般的去填補空洞處的幻象罷了。(Dällenbach 1984: 201)。現實主義小說與其他虛構世界並談，除了在語意的飽和度(semantic saturation)上，並無不同之處。

【原文】If incompleteness is a logical “deficiency” of fictional worlds, it is an important factor of their aesthetic efficiency. Empty domains are constituents of the fictional world’s structure no less than “filled” domains. The distribution of filled and empty domains is governed by aesthetic principles, i.e., by a writer’s style, by period or genre conventions, etc. Several recent studies in literary semantics have revealed the aesthetic significance of incompleteness. Thus, for example, I have indicated (Doležel 1980a) how the incompleteness of fictional characters reflects the stylistic principles of Romantic narrative; specifically, the focus on a physical detail surrounded by emptiness provides the impetus for a symbolic reading of this detail. Pavel has observed that “authors and cultures have the choice to minimize or maximize” the “unavoidable incompleteness” of fictional worlds; he has suggested that cultures and periods of “stable world view” will tend to minimize the incompleteness, while periods of “transition and conflict” tend to maximize it (Pavel 1983: 51ff.). Ryan(1984) offers a triadic typology of fictional worlds on the same foundation; her proposal is especially stimulating in demonstrating how the types can be generated in a graduate emptying of the domains of the complete world “model.” Ryan’s most complete world, the world of realistic fiction, has been a puzzle to fictional semantics. Now we are beginning to realize that its reality-like completeness is nothing more than an illusion “destined precisely to camouflage [its] blanks” (Dällenbach 1984: 201). Realistic fictional worlds do not differ from other fictional worlds in kind but only in degree of semantic saturation.

【翻譯(二)】若將虛構語義解讀成非現實可能性(non-actualized possibles)，介於虛構與真實人物、事件、場景等的不同將會凸顯出來。每個人都了解虛構人物是不存在、無法與真實的人類溝通與互動的，然而，這個異別卻不易見於以名人、名詞為題的作品。可能世界語義學堅持著虛構角色無法與真實角色共享一個身分。(cf. Ishiguro 1981: 75)。托爾斯泰的拿破崙或是狄更斯的倫敦，皆與歷史上的拿破崙與地理上的倫敦大有不同。虛構角色有著不倚靠其實際原型的歷史與性質。虛構的羅賓漢便與歷史毫無關係可繫。因此得以肯定，真實拿破崙與所有虛構拿破崙間的關連得必先預定假設；他們的關連也已突破了現實與虛構世界的界定線，且有了橫跨雙向的身分。然而虛構角色的身分則受到了界定線的保護。

【原文】If fictional particulars are interpreted as non-actualized possibles, the difference between fictional and actual persons, events, places, etc. becomes obvious. Everybody would agree that fictional characters cannot meet, interact, communicate, with actual people (cf. Walton 1978/79: 17). In the fictional semantics of the one-world model frame, however, this distinction is often blurred on the account of shared proper names. Possible-worlds semantics correctly insists that fictional individuals cannot be identified with actual individuals of the same name (cf. Ishiguro 1981: 75). Tolstoy's Napoleon or Dickens's London are not identical with the historical Napoleon or the geographical London. Fictional individuals are not dependent for their existence and properties on actual prototypes. It is irrelevant for the fictional Robin Hood whether a historical Robin Hood existed or not. To be sure, a relationship between the historical Napoleon and all the possible fictional Napoleons has to be postulated; this relationship, however, reaches over world boundaries and requires *cross-world identification*. The identity of fictional individuals is protected by the boundary between the actual and the possible worlds.